



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 31, 1984
10:15 - 12:30

300 Morrill Hall

AGENDA *

- 10:15 1. Minutes of May 17 (enclosed).
2. Report of the Chair.
3. Nominations to various committees (memo enclosed).
4. Report of ad hoc salary advisory group.
- 10:45 5. Discussion of "Holt" Report.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

- 11:15 6. Institutional Planning Statement: Further information, suggestions, and commentary received from the vice presidents and other Senate committees.
7. Review draft sketch of report on implementing the recommendations from task forces, and the like, all relevant to the third cycle of planning.

* Agenda as amended on 5/29 to add items 6 & 7.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

May 31, 1984
300 Morrill Hall
10:30 - 12:50

Members present: John Howe (Chr.), Marvin Mattson, Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, Burt Sundquist, W. Donald Spring, John Turner, and, at 12:00, Phyllis Freier and Deon Stuthman.

Guests: Shirley Clark, Jeann Linsley; at 11:20: President Magrath, Vice President Keller, Associate Vice President Linck, Douglas McFarland, Jim Borgestad.

1. The minutes of May 17 were approved as distributed.
2. Report of the Chair.

A. Professor Cleon Melsa has been elected faculty representative to SCC from the Crookston campus.

B. Hand-outs. In response to a number of inquiries to the chairperson about whether the structure of central administration is changing and if so, in what way, and about the composition of major search committees, the executive assistant has gathered some data for members' information:

(1) Comparisons of the make-up of the various vice presidential offices in 1979-80 and presently. Data are drawn from the printed budgets and from the student-staff directory.

(2) Lists of the members of major University search committees of the past three years.

FCC role in major searches: FCC members noted that it has been the practice for FCC to meet with the final candidates for a vice presidential position and to submit to the president in writing FCC's assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of each. Professor Howe will request of the president the same opportunity regarding the planning vice presidency.

C. Faculty Senate meeting of June 7 has before it the motion to approve the draft tenure code as now amended. A quorum is essential and strong attendance is important. The chairperson asked FCC members to call their campus or college colleagues in the Senate and urge them to attend or send an alternate.

Professor Howe read the new motion submitted by Professor Naomi Scheman asking deferral of a vote until late in the fall quarter, before which certain public forums would be held. Professor Turner commented that it is a fallacious argument that there has not been sufficient debate of the document.

Professor Howe distributed copies of a motion for a resolution which will be before the Faculty Senate on June 7 as an item of new business. It directs further study concerning academic freedom protection and whether faculty or professional/academic status is the more suitable employment classification for various groups.

Several FCC members urged that an effort be made to persuade the movers to substitute a "Special Committee" of the Senate for a "task force" as the group to be assigned to study the P/A classification. FCC appreciates that such a special committee would nevertheless require substantial administrative representation.

3. Nominations to committees.

FCC members had in hand copies of the recommendations from their nominating subcommittee for openings on the Senate committees on All University Honors and on Planning, and for the President's Student Behavior Review Panel. FCC approved the three short slates.

In addition they voted to ask Professor Mark Brenner to serve a second year as chairperson of the Planning Committee. Professor Douglas Pratt, chair-designate, resigned from the committee following his appointment as acting dean of CBS.

4. Special ad hoc faculty advisory group. (Spring, Howe.)

The group held its second meeting with Vice President Keller on 1984-85 monies on May 24. Dr. Keller reported on his set of proposals on using the money for market-impacted units. He had not at that point yet talked fully with his colleagues. There are but a few changes from the 1983-84 distributions for meeting market competition. While market impact is the chief criterion, the vice president is also taking into account quality within the market-impacted units.

The vice president told the group this would be the last time such a distribution would be done on the present data base. Next time, he would start afresh to determine each unit's peer group for the purpose of salary comparison. Professor Rubenstein remarked that if the University were to quantify its aspirations by declaring its intention to be in, for instance, the top five U.S. public universities, then one could compare salaries on a program by program basis with the peer institutions.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT; UNIVERSITY PLANNING

President Magrath, Vice President Keller, Dr. Linck, Mr. Borgestad and Mr. McFarland joined the meeting at 11:20.

1. President's Institutional Planning Statement. President Magrath.

As the Statement (IPS) undergoes further revision, the emphasis on quality remains central: attracting and retaining first-rate faculty and top students, improving the students' campus environment, and maintaining and improving program quality. The president has consulted on the IPS with FCC, the Planning and Finance Committees of the Senate, and with deans and provosts. He indicated he expects to complete his revisions soon and take the document to the Regents, who will probably make some adjustments. He intends to incorporate a number of specific suggestions given him:

- (a) provide consistent definition for terms defining the architecture of the planning ('goals', 'objectives', etc.);
- (b) specify the time scope of the IPS (three years);
- (c) add a reference to the necessity of adequate civil service support for the faculty;
- (d) recognize the changing demographics of the student body;
- (e) highlight and make more explicit the importance of graduate education and research.

Two further recommendations:

- (f) Address how to save faculty time by not wasting it in assigning inappropriate activities.

The president called it an important matter but said the IPS is not the document in which to address it.

- (g) Quantify the goal of improved quality.

The president indicated his interest in this approach and pointed out that there are several indices from which one might choose. For instance, rather than stating our goal as to be in the top five public institutions (Finance Committee's suggestion) our goal could be to increase the number of our programs ranking in the top ten by 50% or by 100%.

A discussion ensued on this last recommendation. Professor Rubenstein agreed with the President that there are numerous ramifications to quantification. First of all, before setting such a goal there would have to be discussion with the legislature and the governor and agreement that the state would give the essential resources.

Professor Merwin remarked that short range goals need to be visible so we can see what it is we are achieving.

The president suggested a quantification regarding salaries. If it is legitimate, he said, for us to say that we want to be generally at the top of Big Ten football (an aspiration people seem to accept), what can possibly be the argument against declaring we want faculty salaries to be at the top of the Big Ten? He said he favored setting aspirations and goals and establishing one or two quantifications to assess how we are achieving those goals.

Professor Rubenstein remarked that the whole point of setting down numbers in association with goals is to put oneself on the line.

Professor Mattson said there is need for some clear recognition of faculty, though that need not necessarily be in the form of salary improvement.

President Magrath told the committee he and the planning staff would draft some text relating to quantification for the IPS, perhaps in the mode of "challenging ourselves and the state to this aspiration:...". He invited FCC members to submit suggestions on the content.

Other planning concerns. Professor Turner offered several recommendations to be considered relating to the IPS and University planning in general:

A. Be cautious about the tendency to orient planning around a biennium instead of a longer time unit.

B. Add a paragraph in the IPS on the longer term, stating what we hope for ten years hence.

C. We will need to have more interdisciplinary efforts. There is not enough interaction between units which should have it.

D. The humanities need improvement somehow. (The President said he couldn't agree more and that money is the key.)

E. Bear in mind the importance of unit planning. Units know best their strengths and weaknesses. Ask each unit to plan for ten years ahead on a normal budget and ask them also to submit a greatly reduced budget. They would be more willing participants in planning if they really knew that by judicious cutting they could receive reallocation to apply to their strong areas. Because not enough faculty have seen the reallocation and its potentialities, some faculty are saying publicly that the planning process has been worthless.

F. We need to improve departments that have slipped, and we need accountability through an audit of units that have received an infusion of resources on what they have done with it.

Professor Howe suggested the device of contracts between units and central administration, with central administration saying this is what you can have for the next three years, to achieve your objective. At the end of three years the achievement must be measured.

Professor Howe said the administration must hold out some hope to the faculty and the units for help. He referred to a point in the Report of the Task Force on Graduate Education and Research that one cannot have islands of excellence in a sea of mediocrity; however, he agreed that at any particular time one has to target one's resources. People need to know when their time will come.

Vice President Keller acknowledged that somehow we haven't made people aware of the gains that apply widely as a result of reallocation, for example, in the very substantial increase in library acquisitions.

Professor Merwin urged that the administration avoid telling units the message that "we are taking resources away from you to give to them." That presentation is just too damaging, he said.

Professor Rubenstein commented that while planning is important, it should not become a straightjacket. It has to be made clear, he said, that the University can still take advantage of opportunities and can meet problems as they arise. Some faculty inappropriately cite cases where the University has adjusted to meet unexpected circumstances as examples of why planning doesn't work.

2. Personnel items.

A. Regents' professorships. There was one vacancy this year, and the special committee singled out one recipient to propose from among three superlative finalists.

The president reported to FCC the excellent news that he has been able to take additional money from funds raised for the President's Excellence Fund to enable the University to name three Regents' professors this year. He announced to FCC the names which will be confirmed publicly by the Regents on June 8.

B. Steve Roszell, Director of Alumni Relations, will succeed Robert Odegard as Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations.

3. The Recommendations of the Administrative Task Forces and their Implications for the Legislative Request.

President Magrath said six task forces which have reported within the past year will be referenced in the Cycle III planning instructions to deans and major support unit heads:

- Higher Education and the Economy of the State
- Graduate Education and Research
- Communications, Computation, and Information
- Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty ("Faculty Vitality")
- International Character of the University
- The Student Experience.

The President's planning staff will summarize the work of the task forces in at least two forms. For each of the six, under the title, "Implementation of Task Force Recommendations," they will catalog the recommendations and enter staff notes on implementation and whose approval is required. Also for each of the six, they will formulate a brief discussion paper, e.g., "Discussion of the International Character of the University," which will describe the background which prompted the creation of the task force, state the major points in the report, give some details of the recommendations, and report what has already been implemented.

The president distributed the draft summary on the International Character of the University, and the implementation catalog for the same report.*

* The catalog does not yet list recommendations to be implemented. It states, "no action in academic 1983-84" on making OIP directorship into assistant vice president position. It rejects a development officer specifically for international programs and rejects ISA0 as an active recruiting agent.

The staff hope eventually to cluster the themes and recommendations from all task force reports in a horizontal organization of the aggregate.

Funding. The president said the task force recommendations are not being tied into the next legislative request. Vice President Keller said the administration plans a different kind of presentation to the legislature which will lay out large general areas of the budget rather than specific program requests.

Senate role. Professor Howe asked what would be the role of the Educational Policy committee and perhaps other interested committees in sorting out the recommendations. He observed that implementation will direct some of the University's resources for years to come.

President Magrath replied that recommendations which are clearly policy matters have to get endorsement through the Senate process and by the Regents. Everything is out to the relevant committees, he said. We have to count on these committees to submit their reactions if there is something they want to say. The recommendations related to the budget process will of course come up through the deans and through the Senate Finance Committee.

Professor Howe noted that when the committees receive the pertinent documents, they should be told the deadline for any comments they may wish to make.

Vice President Keller pointed out that the SCFA and the report of the Task Force on Graduate Education and Research take opposite positions on the question of a "cafeteria of benefits." Professor Clark said there is reason to reconsider issues as rationales change; SCFA should be given the arguments of the task force and should readdress the question.

Relation to unit budget planning. Professor Howe asked how the recommendations of the task forces relate to the collegiate units in the context of the instructions they receive regarding the next round of planning.

The president and vice president distributed copies of a draft memorandum on Cycle III planning addressed to deans and heads of major support units. Vice President Keller described the request to the units as this: Focus the broad task force questions within the context of the next cycle of planning, which is based on the already established program priorities, and let us know if you have projects to implement relating to the task force recommendations.

Planning and language instruction. Professor Turner called attention to a void he sees in current planning: foreign language instruction. He told the meeting that a recent report on foreign language instruction in the U.S. identifies two problems: (1) the degree of language competence achieved through the instruction is not very high and (2) language instructors continue to lack adequate measures of achievement and competence. He said the instructors need an incentive to attack those problems, yet the University is presently planning as though those problems did not exist.

After a short general discussion about the problems inherent in trying to learn a foreign language within a typical class meeting schedule, the failure to identify instruments to test for competency, and this country's historical and continuing disregard of the need to begin foreign language instruction with young children, the meeting adjourned at 12:50.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2025

cc: SEC

June 11, 1984

Professor John Howe, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
West Bank

Dear John:

Thank you very much for your June 6 letter. Yes, by all means as soon as we have put together the various summary sheets and decision statements with regard to the several task forces that we so usefully reviewed at our last meeting, we will send copies to the various committees that you identified.

I feel it is very important that there be maximum communication and understanding within the Senate and its various committees as to what has happened with regard to the task force reports and recommendations, what is actually being proposed as further follow-through, and what issues are going to need further study -- including some recommendations that obviously will not be implemented.

I will stay in close touch with Jack Merwin and FCC on this entire matter, and will make sure that all of the appropriate material gets out as soon as we have it assembled.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:kb

cc: 1984-85 Chairpersons of
Senate Finance Committee (to be named)
Senate Committee on Educational Policy - Jerry Kline
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs - Thomas Clayton
Senate Consultative Committee - Jack Merwin
Senate Committee on Research - John Sullivan
Senate Planning Committee (to be named)
Vice President Kenneth Keller, Academic Affairs
Associate Vice President Al Linck, Academic Affairs
Dr. James T. Borgestad, Special Assistant to the President



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

June 6, 1984

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

The discussion at last week's FCC meeting about your efforts to pull together and bring some order to the various Task Force recommendations was very useful. Obviously good progress is being made. These reports are certainly not going to gather dust on the shelf! You indicated that you and your planning staff are preparing summaries and decision recommendations for each of the major task force reports -- Holt/Graduate Study, Wallace/Undergraduate Experience, Wallace/International Education, Lilly/Economy, Merwin/Faculty Vitality, and Adams/Communications, etc. You also said that you would be happy to send those materials to appropriate Senate Committees for their consideration. We then agreed that those committees should take the initiative in responding to your administrative recommendations.

I will contact the chairpersons of the committees that would seem to be involved and tell them of this. There is, of course, the problem of the summer hiatus in committee activity. Our discussion on the 31st indicated that that would not present a major problem, since final decisions concerning the various task force recommendations will probably not come until next fall and winter -- other than, perhaps, certain specific recommendations that might be worked into the upcoming legislative request. I'm sure that Jack and next year's Consultative Committee will be ready to help stimulate and pull together committee responses to all this.

C. Peter Magrath
June 6, 1984
page two

Could I then ask that when the summary and decision materials for the several task force reports are ready, copies of the full set be sent to the chairpersons of the Consultative Committee, Finance, SCEP, and Planning? I think it would be useful if you sent copies of the Holt, Wallace/International Education, and Lilly materials to the SCFA and the Senate Research Committee as well.

Sincerely,



John Howe, Chairperson,
Senate Consultative Committee

JH:mp

c: 1984-85 Chairpersons of
Senate Finance Committee (to be named)
Senate Committee on Educational Policy - Jerry Kline
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs - Thomas Clayton
Senate Consultative Committee - Jack Merwin
Senate Committee on Research - John Sullivan
Senate Planning Committee (to be named)

bc - 1983-84 Chairpersons

Irwin Rubenstein
Michael Root
Mario Bognanno
Perry Blackshear
Mark Brenner

COPY



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

June 13, 1984

TO: Provosts, Deans, and Directors

FROM: Kenneth H. Keller, Vice President for Academic Affairs *Kenneth H. Keller*
Neal A. Vanselow, Vice President for Health Sciences *N. A. Vanselow*

SUBJECT: Distribution of Salary Reserve for 1984-85

The Budget Executive has included \$800,000 in the 1984-85 budget for distribution to address some critical faculty salary problems similar to the distribution during the current year. An additional \$100,000 will be added to this fund from the funds budgeted in 1983-84.

As we have discussed with you, this salary reserve will be divided into three components:

1. **Retention Fund** -- \$200,000 has been reserved to address faculty retention cases during 1984-85. We would expect that most of these problems will need to be addressed in the first six months of the new fiscal year and that adjustments should be made at the payroll date nearest the date the faculty member decides to stay at Minnesota. We do not plan to provide any retroactive pay increases from this fund. After about January 1, 1985 we would expect that you would make recommendations for salary adjustments which would begin on or after July 1, 1985 and that college and departmental matches would come from regular salary allocations for that year.

We ask that you present your cases for salary retention funds to our offices addressed to either Cherie Perlmutter or Al Linck. They will be responsible for handling these matters. You should present a plan for each salary retention case. Except in unusual circumstances, we would expect that the department and the college will each provide one-third of the total salary adjustment with one-third coming from this central fund.

2. **Anticipatory Retention Fund** -- \$300,000 (which includes \$100,000 carried forward from 1983-84) has been reserved to address potential future retention problems among the faculty. Some faculty clearly are or will soon be very mobile due to the quality of their work and their consequent stature in their field, the nature of their profession or the relative scarcity of their expertise at this time. Some of these faculty do not seek or receive offers, but they are nevertheless vulnerable to recruitment. We want to be able to make salary adjustments in these cases to keep these outstanding faculty at Minnesota.

We ask that you present your cases for anticipatory retention and special merit funds to our offices addressed to either Cherie Perlmutter or Al Linck.

COPY

Provosts, Deans, and Directors
June 13, 1984
Page 2

Please present a plan for each case in which the college and/or the department provides at least 50% of that part of the proposed increase in excess of the average increase in the college for 1984-85. We will only consider cases in which the minimum increase proposed (including the scheduled 1984-85 increase) is at least 12%. We will review all such requests at one time and we ask that you submit your requests by July 15, 1984. We plan to make allocations by August 1, 1984, committing the entire fund at that time. Since the number of requests is likely to exceed the funds available, we will be limited to funding the most meritworthy among them.

We realize that some units may have committed all salary funds and may not have sufficient discretionary money to meet the college match in 1984-85. In such cases, we will consider delaying the starting date of the increase so that the central funds available can cover the entire increase for this academic year only. However, the future, recurring commitment must be funded out of the college's 1985-86 salary allotment. For those colleges able to provide the matching funds immediately, the salary increase can be made effective July 1, 1984 for "A" appointees or September 16, 1984 for "B" appointees.

3. **Market Fund** -- \$400,000 has been reserved to address "market inequities" in salaries of groups of faculty members in a limited number of areas in the University. The data submitted by units last year have been updated through MPIS and have been used in large part in making judgments on the distribution of these funds. The President has approved the following distribution:

Biochemistry (including CBS and Medical School departments)	\$ 20,000
Crookston	20,000
Law	25,000
Morris	40,000
Pharmacy	15,000
Psychology	20,000
Statistics	20,000
Technology:	
Aeronautical Engineering and Mechanics	15,000
Chemical Engineering and Materials Science	25,000
Civil and Mineral Engineering	25,000
Electrical Engineering	15,000
Geology	15,000
Mathematics	40,000
Mechanical Engineering	30,000
Physics and Astronomy	35,000

Veterinary Medicine	40,000
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$400,000

Thank you for your particular attention to paragraph 2 above and its requests for your recommendations.

:trc

xc: President C. Peter Magrath
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Stephen S. Dunham, General Counsel
Dr. A. J. Linck, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Ms. Cherie R. Perlmutter, Associate Vice President for Health Sciences
Professor Jack Merwin, Chairperson, Senate Consultative Committee
(1984-85)
Professor Mario Bognanno, Chairperson, Senate Committee on Faculty
Affairs (1983-84)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

June 20, 1984

TO: Provosts, Deans, and Directors
FROM: C. Peter Magrath, President
SUBJECT: Cycle III of Planning

With the mailing of this packet the University is initiating Cycle III of institutional planning. I trust that you feel as we do that our efforts to tie budgeting and planning together have served us well over the past financially difficult years. Cycle III will be a somewhat abbreviated but nonetheless important cycle of planning. In this cycle we are asking you to continue your process of choice by building on existing program priorities. Specifically, as explained below, we are asking each unit to develop a small number of specific "strategies for improving quality." These strategies are intended to be an extension of the program choices already made by the unit.

To recapitulate, Cycle I of all-University planning was formally launched in April, 1979. All units submitted comprehensive plans including the mission, goals, and objectives for the decade of the 1980s.

Cycle II had two, somewhat distinct phases. First, there was the shortfall in state revenues which led to unprecedented retrenchments for the University. Using the already submitted plans as a foundation for discussion, each academic unit developed a detailed program priority statement which guided the difficult budgetary decisions that followed. An important outcome of these planning efforts was the development of specific criteria for guiding program decisions:

- Quality
- Connectedness
- Integration
- Uniqueness
- Demand
- Cost-effectiveness

This was an important point in the evolution of our planning and budgeting, for we were able to demonstrate to the State that indeed sound academic program planning could guide budgeting rather than follow it.

Unit planning and budgeting in Cycle II focused on integrating unit program priorities with short-range, two-year budget targets and longer range targets for those units so constrained that reductions could not be made in a shorter time period. Retrenchment and reallocation decisions for 1983-84 and for 1984-85 were based on these program plans. These activities were and should continue to be the most important element in planning at the University.

In the second phase of Cycle II, we also addressed all-University issues through six planning task forces:

- The Quality of Graduate Education
- The Economy of the State
- The Student Experience
- Our International Character
- Computer and Communications Technology
- Enhancing the Future Vitality of the Faculties

The recommendations of the six planning task forces are now complete. When taken together they provide an extremely useful, detailed planning guide for the University. They are rich with ideas which could take the University in a variety of directions. To facilitate your planning, the recommendations of these task forces along with administrative reaction to them will be distributed later this summer, as described in the next section.

CYCLE III: STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING QUALITY

There is little disagreement that the University is emerging from one of its most difficult periods in history. We have experienced retrenchments that were unthinkable a decade ago. Across the past three years, planning and budgeting have taken place in the context of extreme fiscal stress. Faculties, deans, and their colleges have had to make difficult program choices.

Yet we have emerged from this period with a set of academic priorities which provide guidance for the future. Cycle III has been designed to build on these priorities and to provide real incentives for responding to the directions the University must move. Thus, we are not asking units to rethink their fundamental direction. Instead, we are asking units to propose a few specific strategies or sets of activities which would reinforce the program priorities already in place.

In designing this next cycle of planning, we wanted to encompass a number of important factors:

- The major issues raised by the task force reports;
- The planning foundation which already exists in units;
- The 1985-87 Biennial Request for which we will be testifying in early 1985; and
- As necessary, an update of program priorities and budget targets for formulating the budget plan for 1985-86 and 1986-87.

A careful review of the task force reports manifests a common theme underlying the concerns facing the University. It is not a new theme for academe; yet given the challenges facing the University, the state of Minnesota, and the nation, it is more essential than ever. We are proposing that the theme, **Strategies for Improving Quality**, guide our third cycle of planning.

Thus, we are asking each unit, whether a college or support unit, to focus its planning and budgeting activities on STRATEGIES which will increase the QUALITY of your programs and services. We emphasize strategies because we want each unit to come forward with specific plans for improving its primary activities. We are not asking units to reformulate their mission or to rethink the fundamental objectives which they are pursuing. Questions such as these were addressed in the previous two cycles of planning; undoubtedly they will again be formally addressed in future cycles of planning.

Specifically, Cycle III is to concentrate on specific strategies which will reinforce existing program priorities. Certainly, if your unit feels that it should alter its program priorities, we are prepared to discuss them. Yet the Budget Executive and I want to be clear that we expect most units to build on their existing program priorities in developing a limited number of specific strategies for improving quality.

To focus the planning, we are suggesting that units address themselves to only one or a few of the six broad areas noted below. Whether academic or support, each unit must decide which area(s) it would like to emphasize in Cycle III of planning. Stated as questions:

Across the next two years, what strategies or specific activities will your unit pursue . . .

- 1) to build the program areas deemed most important, as determined by the six criteria rated on page 1?
- 2) to deal with the issues of faculty vitality?
- 3) to identify, attract, and provide appropriate learning opportunities for high achievement undergraduates while continuing our commitment to minorities and the handicapped?
- 4) to improve the educational experience for all students?
- 5) to maintain or improve the quality of our graduate programs?
- 6) to respond creatively to the needs of the State in ways consistent with the University's strengths and mission?

Two documents will aid each unit in addressing these areas:

1. **President's Institutional Planning Statement**--My views on the major planning issues facing the University and the proposed directions in which I would like to see the University move are presented in this document. Earlier this spring

I circulated an initial draft of this statement. After consultation with the deans and the University, I have modified this statement; the updated version is attached.

2. **Summary and Administrative Reaction to the Task Force Reports**--We are also preparing a detailed review of the recommendations from each of the planning task force reports. This report, which will be completed soon and distributed to all units, will contain my reactions and recommendations on the task force reports.

We hope that you will tie your strategies for improving quality to the context provided by these materials.

RELATING PLANNING TO RESOURCE ALLOCATION

For planning to be effective we must strike a delicate balance between creative thinking and the resource constraints which will face the University. The budget targets which were set last year will continue to guide our planning and budgeting decisions. Yet we do not expect that the level of retrenchment specified in these targets will need to be reached.

Over the summer we will be giving careful study to projections of expenditures and revenue flow; by early October we expect to report our projections for 1985-86 and 1986-87. While these projections will not drive our planning process, they will set a number of parameters within which we will have to operate. We anticipate that approximately 1% of the total operating budget will be identified to meet new program initiatives and support for high priority areas. When mandated expenditures and fixed costs are removed, this would provide a resource of approximately two million dollars. We are asking that all units continue to curtail, reduce, and/or reorganize according to the program choices specified for 1983-84 and 1984-85.

We do expect that most units will be able to reallocate one to two percent of their base budgets internally, as they shift funds to higher priority areas. In addition, funds from the creative retirements should begin to become available in 1985-86 for use within the unit generating those savings, according to individual agreements reached with central administration. Overall we expect only a small number of units (e.g., 4-5) to have a real increase in their budget base. Other units should expect "stable" budgets with no more than a flux of 1% over the next two years.

RESOURCE STRATEGY

We anticipate that the University will be able to begin a limited number of new initiatives in 1985-86. The magnitude of the resources available for these purposes cannot be estimated at this time. However, we are optimistic that from modest legislative increases in our base operating budget, from a possible increase in our portion of indirect cost recovery funds, and from reallocation within the University, we will be able to fund a select number of high priority needs and opportunities. Most of these activities will fall into the areas identified in my

Institutional Planning Statement and the task force recommendations we have proposed to support. As noted earlier, the Planning Statement is attached and a summary of task force recommendations will be distributed in July. Broadly stated, new initiatives should speak to faculty vitality, the quality of graduate education and research, or improving the learning climate for students and reinforce the unit's program priorities. We will look most favorably on those units which will match their request with internal reallocation.

We hope that the availability of these resources will provide an incentive for all units, even those who might experience a net real decrease in their budget base. It is our intention to target funds to sound strategies for quality improvement and to offer some flexibility where it otherwise might not be available.

SCHEDULE FOR CYCLE III

Because we are viewing this cycle as the development of specific strategies in the context of existing program priorities and because we are aiming to complete this cycle of planning in time to contribute to the testimony for the 1985-87 Appropriations Request, Cycle III has a shorter timeline than previous cycles of planning.

With this shorter timetable, we still anticipate that consultation will take place with appropriate unit faculty governance groups. We are asking each unit to present its plans to its respective Vice President in November, 1984. We are NOT asking units to prepare elaborate written plans. Instead we envision that these sessions in November will be oral presentations with necessary supplementary materials, submitted either in advance or distributed at the meeting--whichever you deem most appropriate. Your Vice President will contact you to spell out more details and set-up a schedule for these presentations.

Subsequently, each Vice President will prepare recommendations for the Budget Executive to review. By January 15, 1985, the Budget Executive will decide which strategies to pursue either through the appropriations process or reallocation. Precise budgetary decisions must await action of the 1985 Legislature and the formulation of the two-year budget plan by the Budget Executive. Materials necessary for the Budget Executive to develop the two-year budget (FY86 and FY87) will be requested as needed during winter and spring quarters, 1985.

After the decisions are made on strategies for improving quality, each unit will be asked to draft or update its program priority statement, as necessary. All of these statements will be submitted to the Budget Executive and President for final review.

This schedule may be summarized as follows:

June, 1984	Initiate Cycle III
October, 1984	Financial Flow Model Completed for FY86 and FY87

November, 1984	Each Unit Makes Presentation to President and VP on Proposed Strategies for Improving Quality
December, 1984	VP Presents Unit Recommendations to B.E.
January, 1985	Following Review and Approval by President, Units Notified by B.E. of Decisions on Strategies; Update Program Priority Statements
February-April, 1985	B.E. Prepares Two-Year Budget; Testimony for 1985-87 Appropriations Request with Legislature
May-July, 1985	Presentation to Board of Regents of Budget Plans with Final Board Action in July

Over the past four years, the University of Minnesota has experienced some of its most difficult times. Although the remainder of this decade will be filled with its unique set of challenges, the University is also faced with unparalleled opportunities. We continue to engender strong support from the State as it looks to us to assist in the continued development of Minnesota and the Upper Midwest.

We have initiated the difficult process of program choice and reallocation. This process must continue, for our future is in our own hands. In large measure it will be determined by our own capabilities of continuing this process of choice.

If you have any questions about this cycle of planning, please do not hesitate to contact me, your Vice President, or your representative on the President's Planning Staff.


CPM

xc: Board of Regents
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Stephen S. Dunham, General Counsel
Faculty Consultative Committee
Senate Committee on Planning
President's Planning Staff

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING STATEMENT: A 1984 UPDATE

C. PETER MAGRATH

INTRODUCTION

In 1981, after extensive University-wide consultation, an Institutional Planning Statement was issued. The Statement outlined selected priorities that would be pursued over the foreseeable future. The document also recommended a periodic reexamination of those priorities to insure compatibility between institutional plans and resources.

Such a reexamination is undertaken here. As part of the third planning cycle, this review seeks to update, not replace the existing Institutional Planning Statement. The purpose is to clarify further those general directions that the University will take during the next few years.

At the same time, this reexamination is only one piece of a larger planning mosaic. No single document can encompass all of the values we share as a scholarly community; no brief review can articulate all of our aspirations and responsibilities. In the months ahead, this analysis will be supplemented by a review of the University's Mission and Policy Statement and by a Presidential Report on University Task Forces. The former Statement will offer a broader examination of institutional directions; the latter report will articulate strategies for pursuing specific priorities. Together the three documents -- the updated Institutional Planning Statement, the revised Mission and Policy Statement, and the Presidential Report on Task Forces -- are designed to inform and facilitate community-wide discussion on the vital questions of where the University of Minnesota is heading and how it might attain its objectives.

UNIVERSITY CHARACTERISTICS AND GOALS

The University of Minnesota is a unique educational resource, not only within the State but across the nation. Few, if any, other institutions of higher learning share the same collective characteristics of comprehensiveness and size, of accessibility and selectivity, of diversity and quality. We are

land-grant, urban-grant, and sea-grant; we combine teaching, scholarship, and service. We are regionally preeminent and internationally respected. Virtually all of our programs are good, the majority are superior, and many are outstanding. We are, to a large extent, what we seek to be: a responsive as well as a leading national university.

Admittedly, the simultaneous pursuit of quality and responsiveness forces certain tensions. A delicate balance must be struck across and within units on such matters as access versus selectivity, programmatic breadth versus depth, undergraduate versus graduate and professional programs, teaching versus research versus service, and, of course, the relative funding of individual campuses, colleges, and departments. Historically, the University has been able to strike the necessary balance without compromising overall quality or responsiveness, but recent and continuing constraints on resources mean that we cannot continue to do so without setting priorities and making difficult choices.

Although a variety of factors affect the University's quality and responsiveness, the ultimate determinant is the caliber of individuals we are able to attract and retain. Excellence breeds excellence; mediocrity spawns mediocrity; and without a commitment to the former, the latter becomes inevitable. The pursuit of excellence, however, must be more than an administrative slogan or the commitment of only a part of the University. Rather, it must permeate the fabric of the entire institution, becoming a shared value that is reflected in decisions on promotion and tenure, admission and graduation standards, retrenchment and reallocation, salary and merit increases, as well as legislative and capital requests.

In terms of the immediate future, the quest of excellence will focus upon three priorities: 1) attracting and retaining first-rate members of the faculty and insuring their vitality, 2) recruiting a superior student body and improving the overall learning environment, and 3) maintaining programs of established quality and facilitating the development of those that might attain distinction.

ATTRACTING FIRST-RATE FACULTY MEMBERS AND ENHANCING THEIR VITALITY

The strength of any educational enterprise is, in large part, a measure of the quality of its faculty. By that standard, the University continues to be a leader in many fields. However, the loss of several outstanding faculty and shifts in funding have led to some deterioration in the quality of certain fields. This is a matter of concern because departmental quality is a fragile commodity. Often the critical difference between a top-ranked department and a good department depends upon the retention of one or two creative faculty members. Thus, we can ill-afford to be complacent or to assume that faculty excellence can be sustained without adequate resources, rewards, and incentives.

At a minimum, three challenges require attention. First, the nationwide erosion in faculty salaries that has taken place since 1970 must be reversed throughout the University of Minnesota. Second, we must seek to make academic careers more attractive to the most promising graduate students and young scholars. Third, we must provide additional faculty incentives for meritorious performance and contributions. In addressing these issues, the following steps will be taken:

-- We will continue to pursue the objective initiated last year of restoring real faculty purchasing power to its 1972 level by 1991. In advancing that priority, faculty salaries will remain the Number One priority in our Biennial Request and internal budgeting processes. We will again seek special retention funds from the Legislature, and we will continue the policy of merit-based salary distributions and special augmentations for outstanding individual merit.

-- We must increase efforts to promote the development of new scholars and teachers by expanding the number of graduate fellowships and by establishing a fellowship program for junior faculty.

-- We must insure adequate support services and incentives to further faculty vitality in the classroom and the laboratory. Included here will be special efforts to maintain the "tools" of scholarship -- the libraries, computing facilities, and laboratory equipment -- as well as the human resources that assist scholarly activities -- teaching and research assistants and secretarial and other support staff. Efforts to encourage the greater use of sabbaticals will also be maintained by providing special funds to continue the Bush Foundation initiative on sabbatical leaves. Finally, discussions will be initiated on whether and how to reduce the amount of time that faculty members must devote to administrative, committee, and governance matters.

RECRUITING STUDENTS AND IMPROVING THE STUDENT ENVIRONMENT

Historically, the University's record of recruiting students and providing a supportive learning environment is a mixed one. Our coordinate campuses receive high grades on both counts; each is effective in attracting students; each is perceived attentive to the needs of students once enrolled. The reputation of the Twin Cities Campus is somewhat different, and understandably so in light of its size, location, and commuter status.

Regardless of campus location and tradition, the next decade will demand greater sensitivity to attracting and retaining the best students possible. On the undergraduate level, this will require a more concerted recruitment effort, one that will not sacrifice academic standards, but rather one that

will actively seek to enroll more students who can benefit from the unique resources of an individual campus or a comprehensive university. On the graduate and professional level, the necessity to attract the highest caliber candidates is even more important and will require even greater attention if we are to remain competitive. On both levels, greater attention must be paid to changing student demographics, to an increasingly older student population, and to demands for continuing education. Finally, and quite aside from recruitment, we have a responsibility to broaden and enrich the educational experiences which students currently receive.

More specifically, the following actions will be taken:

-- Beginning in 1984-85, significant additional funding will be committed to recruiting activities. One emphasis will be upon attracting a higher proportion of Minnesota students who rank in the top twenty percent of their classes. A second emphasis will focus upon our Graduate School programs with increased funds being made available for the recruitment of the most talented graduate students. In addition to these efforts, we will continue to recruit minority and international students, as well as students with special needs, and to encourage community college students to continue their education in the University's colleges.

-- On the Twin Cities Campus, funds will be reallocated to improve the student environment and experience. These will include addressing persistent problems in administrative services (e.g., admissions, registration, financial aid, and academic records). A special study will be undertaken of the availability of library, registration, bookstore, study, counseling, and recreational services for part time, commuter and extension students. Finally, on any campus, reallocation funds will be made available to proposals that address the improvement of the student environment and experience.

MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING PROGRAMMATIC QUALITY

The development of programmatic quality is a long, difficult, and expensive process. In some cases, it is the result of constituency demand and support. In other instances, it can be traced to the uniqueness of a program, service, or faculty. At still other times, it is a fortunate coincidence, the unexpected collision of talent and opportunity. Whatever the origin, once established, excellence is inexpensive to maintain in comparison to the costs of restoring it.

The preservation of programmatic quality is especially critical in those areas where the University has unique responsibilities. One obvious area is research; another is graduate/professional education. These endeavors serve

as defining characteristics of the University; both are interdependent, and complementary; both contribute to the overall quality of our teaching and service activities as well. Accordingly, both research and graduate/professional education will remain among the University's highest priorities.

Preserving programmatic quality is one priority; facilitating its development is another. Where opportunities exist for enhancing quality, they should be pursued consistent with University policies and plans. Previous decades have offered unique opportunities for expanding and improving many programs in agriculture and the health sciences, business and education, and on the coordinate campuses. The current decade offers new prospects in the above areas as well as special opportunities in technology, human services, and other ventures that contribute to the welfare of the State.

Accordingly, to maintain and facilitate programmatic quality the following steps will be taken:

-- Adequate fiscal support, through State funding or reallocation, will continue to be provided to programs of established excellence. We should continue special salary distributions to units that demonstrate pressing marketplace problems. Finally, the quality of core programs will require special attention in unit planning and institutional budget making.

-- In terms of graduate education, special efforts will be taken to improve our national rankings. According to one survey cited by the Task Force on Graduate Education and Research, thirteen of the University's Ph.D. granting programs in the arts, sciences, and engineering are currently rated as being among the best in the nation. Comparatively, this places the University of Minnesota among the top sixteen public and private graduate institutions in the nation, among the top six public universities, and among the top four in the Big Ten. If the University were able to double -- from thirteen to twenty-six -- the number of such high-quality graduate programs, it would move into the top eight of all institutions, the top two of all publics, and be at the very top of the Big Ten. As an aspiration and long-term objective, the University should pursue such a course, seeking by 1991 to be in the top echelon of all graduate programs. Setting a difficult objective, of course, runs the risk of failure, yet the costs of falling short are outweighed by the prospects for advancement.

-- Efforts to promote technology development and transfer will be a priority in our legislative requests as well as in decisions involving reallocation, computing resources, laboratory equipment and supplies. The emphasis should include not only the Institute of Technology, but must include all areas -- human services, management, the biological sciences, and the health sciences and hospitals -- where advancing technologies provide unique educational and research opportunities.

-- Steps to further two of the basic missions of the University must be equally emphasized. One is agriculture, itself a "high technology" endeavor of vital significance to Minnesota and a key component of the University's land-grant mission and heritage; the other is the liberal arts, and especially the humanities, both vital to the life and spirit of a vibrant university.

-- Initiatives to improve the University's contributions to the State's quality of life will be encouraged and facilitated. These initiatives should include expanded communication between the University and the general public as well as with the business, industrial, and governmental sectors. They should also reflect a greater sensitivity to the University's responsibility of providing extension, continuing education, and other outreach services to all Minnesotans. Finally, in light of the increasing importance of international markets and needs, emphasis must be given to improving our international competencies and contributions.

CONCLUSION

Many academic values and aspirations are not contained in this brief examination, not because they are unimportant, but because the purpose of this Statement is deliberately focused upon expressing selected institutional priorities and submitting those objectives to community-wide review. Accordingly, this document must be read in the context of the 1981 Institutional Planning Statement, the University's Mission and Policy Statement, the Presidential Report on Task Forces, and the plans of individual campuses, colleges, and units.

Each of the emphases articulated here reflects a common theme: The University of Minnesota remains committed to the pursuit of quality. The fiscal setbacks of recent years temporarily slowed our progress, but there was no erosion in our commitment, no change in our direction. Just as that quest has defined much of the University's proud tradition, so, too, should it guide our future.

DRAFT V 5/30/84

To: (All Deans and Heads of Major Support Units)

With the mailing of this packet the University is initiating Cycle III of institutional planning. I trust that you feel as we do that our efforts to tie budgeting and planning together have served us well over the past financially difficult years. In Cycle III we are focusing on "strategies for improving quality" and asking each unit to come forward with a select number of proposals focused on this theme.

To recapitulate, Cycle I of all-University planning was formally launched in April, 1979. All units submitted comprehensive plans including the mission, goals, and objectives for the decade of the 1980s.

Cycle II had two, somewhat distinct phases. First, there was the shortfall in state revenues which led to unprecedented retrenchments for the University. Using the already submitted plans as a foundation for discussion, each academic unit developed a detailed program priority statement which guided the difficult budgetary decisions that followed. An important outcome of these planning efforts was the development of specific criteria for guiding program decisions:

Quality
Connectedness
Integration
Uniqueness
Demand
Cost-effectiveness

This was an important point in the evolution of our planning and budgeting, for we were able to demonstrate to the State that indeed sound academic program planning could guide budgeting rather than follow it.

In the second phase of Cycle II, all-University issues were addressed by six planning task forces:

The quality of graduate education
The economy of the state
The student experience
Our international character
Computer and communications technology
Enhancing the future vitality of the faculties

At the same time, unit planning and budgeting continued with a focus on integrating unit program priorities with short-range, two-year budget targets and longer range targets for those units so constrained that reductions could not be made in a shorter time period. Retrenchment and reallocation decisions for 1983-84 and for 1984-85 were based on these program plans.

The recommendations of these task forces are now complete. When taken together they provide an extremely useful, detailed planning guide for the University. They are rich with ideas which could take the University in a variety of directions. To facilitate your planning, the recommendations of these task forces along with administrative reaction to them will be distributed later this summer, as described in the next section.

CYCLE III: STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING QUALITY

There is little disagreement that the University is emerging from one of its most difficult periods in history. We have experienced retrenchments that were unthinkable a decade ago. Across the past three years, planning and budgeting have taken place in the context of extreme fiscal stress. Faculties, deans, and their colleges have had to make difficult program choices.

Yet we have emerged from this period with a set of academic priorities which provide guidance for the immediate future. Cycle III has been designed to build on these priorities and to provide real incentives for responding to the directions the University must move. Thus, we are not asking units to rethink their fundamental direction. Instead we are asking units to propose a few specific strategies which would reinforce the program priorities which are already in place.

In designing this next cycle of planning, we wanted to encompass a number of important factors:

- The major issues raised by the task force reports;
- The planning foundation which already exists in units;
- The 1985-87 Biennial Request for which we will be testifying in early 1985;
- As necessary, an update of program priorities and budget targets for formulating the budget plan for 1985-86 and 1986-87.

A careful review of the task force reports manifests a common theme underlying the concerns facing the University. It is not a new theme for academe; yet given the challenges facing the University, the state of Minnesota, and the nation, it is more essential than ever. We are proposing that the theme, "Strategies for Improving Quality," guide our third cycle of planning.

Thus, we are asking each unit, whether a college or support unit, to focus its planning and budgeting activities on STRATEGIES which will increase the QUALITY of your programs and services. We emphasize strategies because we want each unit to come forward with specific plans for improving its primary activities. We are not asking units to reformulate their mission or to rethink the fundamental objectives which they are pursuing. Questions such as these were addressed in the previous two cycles of planning; undoubtedly they will again be formally addressed in future cycles of planning.

Specifically, Cycle III is to concentrate on strategies for improving the activities of each unit, based on the already established program priorities. Certainly, if your unit feels that it should alter its program priorities, we are prepared to discuss it. Yet the Budget Executive and I want to be clear that we expect most units to build on their existing program priorities in developing a limited number of specific strategies for improving excellence.

To focus the planning, we are suggesting that units address themselves to some number of six broad areas noted below. We do not expect each unit to address all six areas. Instead each unit, whether academic or support, must decide for itself which area(s) it would like to emphasize in Cycle III of planning. Stated as questions:

Across the next two years, what strategies will your unit pursue . . .

1. to build the program areas deemed most important?
2. to deal with the issues of faculty vitality?
3. to identify, attract, and provide appropriate learning opportunities for high achievement undergraduates?
4. to improve the learning climate for all students?
5. to maintain or improve the quality of our graduate programs?
6. to respond creatively to the needs of the State in ways consistent with the University's strengths and mission?

To aid each unit in addressing these questions, two documents are being prepared:

1. **President's Institutional Planning Statement** - My views on the major planning issues facing the University and the proposed directions in which I would like to see the University move. A draft of this statement was circulated earlier this spring; the most recent draft is attached.
2. **Summary and Administrative Reaction to the Task Force Reports** - A detailed review of the recommendations from each task force report noted above is being prepared. This administrative document will also include the response which the B.E. has forwarded to me on each recommendation. This report will be completed in early July and distributed to all units at that time. After consultation, I will submit a comprehensive set of recommendations on the task force reports.

We hope that you will tie your strategies for excellence to the context provided by these materials.

RELATING PLANNING TO RESOURCE ALLOCATION

For planning to be effective we must strike a delicate balance between creative thinking and the resource constraints which will face the University. The budget targets which were set last year will continue to guide our planning and budgeting decisions. Yet we do not expect that the level of reallocations identified earlier will need to be reached.

Over the summer we will be giving careful study to projections of expenditures and revenue flow; by early October we expect to report our projections for 1985-86 and 1986-87. While these projections will not drive our planning process, they will set a number of parameters within which we will have to operate. We anticipate that approximately 1% of the total operating budget will be identified to meet new program initiatives and support for high priority areas. When mandated expenditures and fixed costs are removed, this would provide a resource of approximately two million dollars. We are asking that all units continue to make progress in identifying further programmatic areas for curtailment, reduction, and/or reorganization according to the plans made for 1983-84 and 1984-5.

We do expect that most units will be able to reallocate one to two percent of their base budgets internally, as they shift funds to higher priority areas. In addition, funds from the creative retirements should begin to become available in 1985-86 for use within the unit generating those savings, according to individual agreements

reached with central administration. Overall we expect only a small number of units (e.g. 4-5) to have a real increase in their budget base. Other units should expect "stable" budgets with no more than a flux of 1% over the next two years.

RESOURCE STRATEGY

We anticipate that the University will be able to begin a limited number of new initiatives in 1985-86. The magnitude of the resources available for these purposes cannot be estimated at this time. However, we are optimistic that from modest legislative increases in our base operating budget, from a possible increase in our portion of indirect cost recovery funds, and from reallocation within the University, we will be able to fund a select number of high priority needs and opportunities. Most of these activities will fall into the areas identified in my Institutional Planning Statement and the task force recommendations we have proposed to support. As noted earlier, the Planning Statement is attached and a summary of task force recommendations will be distributed in July. Broadly stated, new initiatives should speak to faculty vitality, the quality of graduate education and research, or improving the learning climate for students. We will look most favorably on those units which will match their request with internal reallocation.

We hope that the availability of these resources will provide an incentive for all units, even those who might experience a net real decrease in their budget base. It is our intention to target funds to sound strategies for quality improvement and to offer some flexibility where it otherwise might not be available.

SCHEDULE FOR CYCLE III

Because we are viewing this cycle as the development of specific strategies in the context of existing program priorities and because we are aiming to complete this cycle of planning in time to contribute to the testimony for the 1985-87 Appropriations Request, Cycle III has a shorter timeline than previous cycles of planning. We are asking each unit to present its plans to its respective Vice President in November, 1984. We are NOT asking units to prepare elaborate written plans. Instead we envision that these sessions in November will be oral presentations with necessary supplementary materials, submitted either in advance or distributed at the meeting--whichever you deem most appropriate. Your Vice President will contact you to spell out more details and set-up a schedule for these presentations.

Subsequently, each Vice President will prepare recommendations for the Budget Executive to review. By January 15, 1985, the Budget Executive will decide which strategies to pursue either through the appropriations process or the Strategy Fund. Precise budgetary decisions must await action of the 1985 Legislature and the formulation of the two-year budget plan by the Budget Executive. Materials necessary for the Budget Executive to develop the two-year budget (FY86 and FY87) will be requested as needed during winter and spring quarters, 1985.

After the general decisions are made, each unit will be asked to draft or update its program priority statement, if necessary. All of these statements will be submitted to the Budget Executive and President for final review.

This schedule may be summarized as follows:

June, 1984	Initiate Cycle III
October, 1984	Financial Flow Model Completed for FY86 and FY87
November, 1984	Each unit makes presentation to President and VP on proposed Strategies for Improving Quality
December, 1984	VP presents unit recommendations to B.E.
January, 1985	Following review and approval by President, units notified by B.E. of intentions regarding Strategy Fund; update program priority statements
February-April, 1985	B.E. prepares two-year budget; testimony for 1985-87 appropriations request with Legislature
May-July, 1985	Presentation to Board of Regents of budget plans with final Board action in July.

Over the past four years, the University of Minnesota has experienced some of its most difficult times. Although the remainder of this decade will be filled with its unique set of challenges, the University is also faced with unparalleled opportunities. We continue to engender strong support from the State as it looks to us to assist in the continued development of Minnesota and the Upper Midwest.

We have initiated the difficult process of program choice and reallocation. This process must continue, for our future is in our own hands. In large measure it will be determined by our own capabilities of continuing this process of choice.

If you have any questions about this cycle of planning, please do not hesitate to contact me, your Vice President, or your representative on the President's Planning Staff.

CPM

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION:

University colleagues, whether serving on faculty status or on professional/academic status, have interdependent responsibilities and concerns. The Faculty Senate wishes to reiterate and underscore its responsibility and its commitment to assuring full protection of academic freedom to all colleagues and its desire to help develop appropriate classifications, standards, and procedures for all colleagues.

Accordingly we direct:

1. The Library Committee and the Tenure Committee to study and to report to the faculty, no later than for 1985, patterns consistent with the tenure code allowing librarians^{no} with research and bibliographic commitments appropriate and flexible faculty status within departmental ranks.
2. The establishment in 1986 of a task force *special com* to evaluate the professional/academic classification with special attention to the following issues:
 - a. Any actual consequences for academic freedom for any segment of the professional/academic classification.
 - b. Effects on caliber of those hired under the professional/academic classification (including but not limited to librarians and those in cooperative extension) as well as those in faculty status in regular departments as a consequence of the new classification schemes.
 - c. Fairness and appropriateness of standards of evaluation developed by the professional/academic classification and new tenure code for such individuals. *for those covered*
 - d. Appropriateness of coverage under the professional/academic classification of various groups and of faculty groupings as well.

SAMUEL KRISLOV
Senator

Prepared May, 1984

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE, 1979-80

Sources: Student-Staff Directory of 1979-80, and Printed Budget for 1979-80.

NOTE: After each vice presidential office is given the departmental budget number. Where a staff member is on another budget, that departmental number and name are given in parentheses after the employee's name.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (1102)

Vice President (Koffler Linck (acting) Keller)

Associate Vice President (Linck)

Assistant Vice President (Robinett, first Acting, then selected)

Assistant to Vice President (Ann Bailly)

Assistant to Vice President (Richard Heydinger)

Assistant to Vice President (Sarah Wasserman)

Assistant to Vice President (Merrylees Mayer)

Assistant to Vice President (to be appointed)

Special Assistant to Vice President (Peter Roll)

ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING (1118)

Vice President (Stein; later, Hasselmo)

Assistant Vice President, Administration, and Director, Personnel
(William Thomas) (1132: University Personnel)

Assistant to Vice President (Gary Engstrand)

Assistant to Vice President (Ann Pflaum) (Budget - unknown; appears in staff
Emergency Prep. Coord. (Wallace Caryl) directory but not in budget index)

FINANCE (1103)

Vice President (Brown)

Associate Vice President for Finance, and Treasurer (Clinton Johnson)
(1104: The Business Office)

Associate Vice President, Development & Alumni Realitions (Robert Odegard)
(1121: Office of Development)

Assistant Vice President, Physical Planning (Clinton Hewitt) (1367: Office of
Physical Planning)

Assistant Vice President, Support Services and Operations (C. Luverne Carlson)
(1111: Support Services & Operations)

Special Assistant (Duane Scribner) (Budget unknown; appears in staff directory
but not in budget index)

Budget Officer (Chester Grygar)

Assistant Budget Officer (Otto Palmer)

HEALTH SCIENCES

Vice President (Lyle French)

Associate Vice President (David Preston)

Assistant Vice President (Cherie Perlmutter) (1923: Special Health Service Programs)

Assistant to Vice President (David C. Berg)

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

Vice President (Stan Kegler)

Assistant Vice President (George Robb)

Assistant to Vice President (Margaret Wipperman)

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Vice President (Frank Wilderson)

Associate Vice President (Donald Zander)

Assistant Vice President (Barbara Pillinger)

Assistant to Vice President (Forest Moore) (1226: International Student Adviser's Office)

Director, Presidential Scholars Program and Coordinator, Student Codes
(Mabelle McCullough)

Prepared May, 1984

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE, Current, and Proposed for Immediate Future

Sources: Student-Staff Directory of 1983-84, Printed Budget for 1983-84, and advertised current searches

NOTE: After each vice presidential office is given the departmental budget number. Where a staff member is on another budget, that departmental number and name are given after the employee's name.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (1102)

Vice President (Keller)

Associate Vice President (Linck)

Assistant Vice President (Robinett)

Assistant Vice President (Wallace)

Assistant to Vice President (Bruce Goodman)

Assistant to Vice President (Ann Bailly)

Assistant to Vice President (Richard Heydinger)

Assistant to Vice President - Undergraduate Education and Research (search underway)

Research Associate

Research Associate

FINANCE AND OPERATIONS (1103)

Vice President (Lilly)

Associate Vice President & Treasurer (Des Roches)

Associate Vice President, Administration & Personnel¹ (William Thomas) (1132: University Personnel)

Associate Vice President, Development & Alumni Relations (Robert Odegard) (1121: Office of Development)

Associate Vice President, Physical Planning (Clint Hewitt) (1367: Office of Physical Planning)

Assistant Vice President, Support Services & Operations (C. Luverne Carlson) (1111: Support Services & Operations)

Assistants to Vice President (three: Brian Gorman, Kent Jones, David Messick)²

Budget Officer (Grygar)

Assistant Budget Officer (Palmer)

1. Moved from Office of Administration & Planning when V. P. Hasselmo left.
2. Added under V. P. Bohen

HEALTH SCIENCES (1124)

Vice President (Vanselow)

Associate Vice President (Perlmutter)³

Assistant Vice President (search underway) (1923: Special Health Science Programs)

Assistant Vice President (Dr. John LaBree) (1923: Special Health Science Programs)

Assistant to Vice President (David Berg)

Special Assistant to the Vice President (Russell Farrell) (1923)

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS (1113)

Vice President (Kegler)

Associate Vice President (Robb)⁴

Assistant to Vice President (Val Vikmanis) (P/A)

Assistant to Vice President (Margaret Wipperman) (CS)

Assistant to Vice President and Director, Public Information (Elizabeth Petrangelo)⁵
(1402: University Relations)

PLANNING AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (1118 - ? same as Administration & Planning was?)

Vice President (search underway)

Assistant Vice President for Information Processing⁶ (search underway)

Assistant to Vice President (Ann Pflaum)

Assistant to Vice President (Gary Engstrand)⁷

Emergency Prep. Coord. (Wallace Caryl)

3. Perlmutter replaced Preston.

4. Robb now heads up University Relations, which had its own director until a year or so ago.

5. Petrangelo's former title was Head of U. News Services; the News Service was and is a division of U. Relations.

6. May result in no net gain in administrators, given reorganization of U's Computer Center/Computer Services administration.

7. Engstrand was moved administratively to Student Affairs in fall of '83.

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Vice President (Wilderson)

Associate Vice President (Zander)

Acting Assistant Vice President (Neil Bakkenist)⁸

Assistant to Vice President for Student Codes⁹ (Marion Freeman) (1234: Student Counseling Bureau)

Assistant to Vice President (Robert Barnett)

Assistant to Vice President (Gary Engstrand)¹⁰ (1118: Administration and Planning)

Assistant to Vice President (Paul Blake)¹¹ (1402: University Relations)

Program Director (Barbara Pillinger)

8. Bakkenist continues as Housing Director while taking on, part time, the job of Acting Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs.
9. Position formerly entitled "Director."
10. Moved administratively from old office of Administration and Planning - See also Planning and Academic Support Activities, p. 3. Budgetarily position is still in 1118.
11. Position moved from Institutional Relations where it was located for a while. Job is with U. Relations and the shift is part of an ongoing shuffle.

VICE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES plus DEPUTY VICE PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION

Search Committee for Vice President for Planning and Academic Support Activities
(January, 1984)

W. Phillips Shively, Chair of Committee, Political Science
Ellen Fahy, Dean, School of Nursing
Hamilton McCubbin, Prof. and Head, Family Social Sciences
Lisa McDonell, MSA Speaker
J. Bruce Overmier, Prof. of Psychology
Stanley D. Sahlstrom, Provost, UMC

Search Committee for Vice President for Finance and Operations (Spring, 1983)

Professor Donald Rasmusson, Search Committee Chair, Agronomy and Plant Genetics
Prof. Shirley Clark, Education
Assistant V. P. Clint Hewitt, Physical Planning
Provost John Imholte, UMM
Vice Pres. Neal Vanselow, Health Sciences
Ms. Kathy Watson, MSA

Search Committee for Vice President for Health Sciences (Summer, 1981)

Lee D. Stauffer, Chair of Committee, Dean, School of Public Health
Harry Atwood, Hospital Board of Governors
James Boulger, Acting Dean, School of Medicine, UMD
Prof. Shirley M. Clark, Education
Prof. Sandra Edwardson, Nursing
N. L. Gault, Jr., Dean, School of Medicine
Regents' Professor Robert Gorlin, Dentistry
Hugh Kabat, Assoc. Dean for Academic Affairs, Pharmacy
Vice President Stanley B. Kegler, Institutional Relations
Professor John Najarian, Chairman of Surgery
Cherie Perlmutter, Assistant V. P., Health Sciences
Prof. Richard Poppele, Physiology
Regents' Professor and Head, Microbiology
John Weis, Medical Student
Ms. Jerri Steele, Ass't. Administrator, Childbearing and Childrearing

Deputy Vice President for the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and
Home Economics was filled in the summer of 1983 without a search.

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENTS, and one ASSISTANT TO VICE PRESIDENT

Search Committee for Assistant Vice President for Information Processing
(Winter, 1984)

Dr. A. J. Linck, Associate V. P. for Academic Affairs, Chair
Ms. Mary Des Roches, Associate V. P. for Finance and Operations and Treasurer
Mr. Al Farrell, Student, CLA
Professor Stanley Finkelstein, Associate Director, Health Computer Science
Professor Andy Lopez, Director, Computer Center, UMM
Dr. V. Rama Murthy, Acting Dean, IT
Dr. David Nelson, Director, St. Paul Computer Center
Professor John L. Sullivan, Dept. of Political Science.
Mr. William C. Thomas, Associate V. P. for Personnel
Professor Alan Wassying, Dept. of Civil and Mineral Engineering

Search Committee, for Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
appointed late spring, 1982

Prof. Maynard C. Reynolds, Chr., Psychoeducational Studies
Prof. Andrew Ahlgren, Curr. & Instruc.
Prof. Mark L. Brenner, Hort. Sci. & Land. Arch.
Mr. Luther Darville, Administr., OMSA
Prof. Jo-Ida Hansen, Director, Interest Measurement Res. Ctr.
Prof. Wm. J. Hodapp, Health Sci. Cont. Ed.
Mr. David Lenander, Student Mem., SCC
Prof. Richard Leppert, Chr., Humanities
Prof. Gail D. McClure, Communic. Resources, Agr. Ext.
Prof. J. Bruce Overmier, Psych.
Prof. Vera Schletzer, CEE
Prof. W. Donald Spring, English, Morris
Prof. Edwin Steuben, Assoc. Dean, IT
Prof. Matthew V. Tirrell, Chem. Eng'g. & Mats. Sci.

Search Committee for Assistant to the Vice President for Institutional
Relations (Spring, 1983)

Jim Borgestad, chair, (Special Assistant to the President)
Patricia Mullen (Assistant Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity)
George Robb (Associate V.P. for Institutional Relations)
Professor Deon Stuthman, Agronomy

DEANS

Search Committee for the Dean of the School of Management (Summer, 1983)

Professor Robert T. Holt, Dean, Graduate School, Committee Chair
Ms. Margene Bauhs, President, The Business Board (undergraduate)
Professor Gordon Davis, Honeywell Prof. of Management Information Systems
Mr. Stephen F. Keating, Retired Vice Chr., Honeywell, Inc.
Mr. Stephen MacArthur, Vice Pres., Controller, B. Dalton
Professor Nancy Roberts, Assistant Prof., Strategic Management and Organization
Mr. Richard L. Schall, Vice Chr. and Chief Administrative Officer, Dayton Hudson Corp.
Prof. Patricia B. Swan, Food Science and Nutrition
Prof. Roger B. Upson, Director, MBA Program and Professor, Finance and Insurance
Prof. Andrew H. Van de Ven, 3M Professor of Human Systems Analysis, Strategic
Management and Organization
Plus One Civil Service Staf Rep to be named.

Search Committee for Dean of the Institute of Technology (Fall, 1983)

Professor David A. Storvick, Dept. of Mathematics, Chairman of Committee
Regents' Prof. Rutherford Aris, Chem. Eng'g. and Materials Science
Ms. Mary K. Bilek, Assistant to the Dean, CLA
Mr. Gerald Dineen, V. P., Honeywell Corp.
Prof. Charles Fairhurst, Head, Dept. of Civil and Mineral Eng'g.
Regents' Prof. Lawrence Markus, Mathematics
Professor Marvin L. Marshak, Physics
Prof. Essie K. Miller, Chemistry
Prof. Emil Pfender, Mechanical Engineering
Dr. John Rollwagen, CEO, Cray Research, Inc.
Prof. Patarasp R. Sethna, Head, Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics
Prof. Robert A. Stein, Dean, Law School
Prof. Raymond M. Warner, Electrical Engineering
Plus one Graduate Student and one Undergraduate Student to be named

Search Committee for Dean of the Medical School, appointed Spring, 1983 (tentative list as offered by telephone , V. P. Vanselow to Pat Swan)

Alfred Michael, Prof., Pediatrics, Committee Co-chair
David Hamilton, Chr. of Anatomy, Committee Co-chair
Donald Doughman, Chr. Opthmol.
Paula Clayton, Head, Psychiatry
Donald Asp, Assoc, Prof., Family Prac.
Eugene Gedgaudas, Chr. of Radiology
Harry Hogenkamp, Chr., Biochem.
Jack Miller, Prof., Pharmacol.
Paul Royce, Dean, UMD School of Med.
Sandra Edwardson, Act. Ass't. Dean, Nursing
Edward Schwartz, Dir., Hospitals
Frank Wilderson, V.P. S.A.
Margaret Davis, Regents Prof., EBB
Al Schultz, Chief of Medicine for Henn. Cty.
Dave Preston, Assoc. V.P. Health Sci.
Peggy Nass, 4th yr. student
Plus someone from the Minn. Medical Assoc.
Plus maybe someone from another dept. in School of Med. or Public Health.

Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Pharmacy (Winter, 1984)

Dean Richard C. Oliver, School of Dentistry, Chair
Mr. Lowell J. Anderson, Speaker of the House of Delegates, American
Pharmaceutical Association
Professor James C. Cloyd, Dept. of Pharmacy Practice
Mr. Donald A. Dee, Executive Director, Minnesota State Pharmaceutical
Association
Professor Nina Graves, Pharmacy Service, Hennepin Cty. Medical Center
Professor Donald B. Hunninghake, Dept. of Pharmacology
Assistant V. P. Cherie Perlmutter, Health Sciences Admin.
Prof. Philip S. Portoghese, Dept. of Medicinal Chemistry
Prof. Ronald J. Sawchuck, Dept. of Pharmaceutics
Prof. Albert I. Wertheimer, Dept. of Social and Administrative Pharmacy
Ms. Judy Shephard, Pharmacy Student

Search and Screening Committee for the Dean of the College of Agriculture and
Associate Director of the Agri-
cultural Experiment Station
Prof. Tom Pearsall, Head, Rhetoric, Chair.
Kathy Adelsheim, Administrator, College of Agric.
Professor Martha Gaudreau, Soil Science (September, 1983)
Prof. Sharon Desborough, Hort. Sci. & Landscape Arch.
Prof. Vern Eidman, Agric. & Applied Econ.
Prof. Jim Groth, Plant Pathology
Prof. Robert Gustafson, Agric. Engineering
Keith McFarland, Dean, College of Home Economics
Prof. Roger Moon, Entomology
Prof. Howard Morris, Food Science & Nutrition
Prof. William Boylan, Animal Science
Mr. Steve Scheffert, undergraduate College of Agric.
Prof. Steve Simmons, Agronomy & Plant Genetics
Mr. Oran Hesterman, Graduate Student, Agron. & Plant Gen.

Search Committee for Dean of the Graduate School (Constituted Spring, 1982)

Prof. Edward Foster, Chair.
Prof. James R. Boen, Biometry
Prof. David M. Brown, Lab. Med. & Pathology
Regents' Prof. Stanley Dagley, Biochemistry
Ms. Susan Danielson, Graduate Student, Art History
Prof. David F. Grigal, Soil Science
Prof. Janice M. Hogan, Family Social Science
Ms. Shirley A. Olson, Graduate School (Degree Program Advisor)
Prof. Anne D. Pick, Child Development
Mr. David J. Pogoff, President, COGS
Prof. W. Phillips Shively, Political Science
Prof. Neil T. Storch, History, UMD
Prof. Walter V. Weyhmann, Physics and Astronomy
Prof. George T. Wright, English
Ms. Suzanne T. Zorn, Assoc., Administrator, Graduate School

Search Committee for Dean, School of Public Health (1983-84)

Ellen Fahy, Dean, School of Nursing, Chr.
John LaBree, Assistant Vice President, Health Sciences
Prof. Donald Barber, Public Health
Prof. Stanley Diesch, Acting Director, Public Health Veterinary Medicine
Prof. Roger Feldman, Center for Health Services Research
Prof. Marcus Kjelsberg, Director, Biometry (in Public Health)
Prof. Lloyd Lofquist, Chr., Psychology
Prof. Russell Luepker, Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene (in Public Health)
Prof. Jack Mandell, Ass't. Director, Epidemiology (in Public Health)
Prof. James Moller, Pediatrics
Prof. Marla White, Program Director, Public Health Nursing
Prof. Theodor Litman, School of Public Health

ASSISTANT PROVOST SEARCH

Search Committee for Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs, UMD (1983)

Erik Ahlgren, student, UMDSA's v.p. for academic affairs
Gerald Allen, Director, Admissions and Records, & Registrar
Professor Paul Anderson, Head, Biochemistry
Professor Sabra Anderson, Head, Mathematical Sciences
Professor Phillip Coffman, Dean, School of Fine Arts
Ass't. Professor Susan Coltrap-McQuin, Director, Women's Studies
Professor Fawzi, Head, Accounting; Search Committee Chair
Professor John Hatten, Communication Disorders
George Himango, Project Director, American Indian Mental Health
Professor Joann Johnson, Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Denise Pederson, student, UMDSA president
Ass't. Professor John Skelton, Director, UMD Computer Center
Ass't. Professor Eileen Zeitz, Foreign Languages and Literature

GENERAL COUNSEL SEARCH

Search Committee for General Counsel (Winter, 1981)

Dr. Betty Robinett, Committee Chair, Assistant V. P. for Academic Affairs
Prof. Virginia Gray, Political Science
Vice President Nils Hasselmo, Administration and Planning
Provost John Imholte, UMM
Professor Donald Marshall, Law School
Mr. Joseph McLaughlin, Resident Fellow, Epidemiology
Ms. Cherie Perlmutter, Assistant V. P., Health Sciences
Prof. Richard Purple, Physiology

May, 1984

OTHER SEARCHES: SOME CURRENTLY ADVERTISED POSITIONSAcademic Affairs

1. Director of Educational Development. Officer works under the Assistant V.P. for Undergraduate Education and Research. Probably not a new position. Tom Benson seems to have been acting director for some time since former director left the post.
2. Assistant to the Vice President (Undergraduate Education and Research). (Apparently a slot which has been open for some time.)
3. Director of University College. (Newly advertised, 5/30/84 in Daily. "...will be cooperating closely with Assistant V.P. John Wallace in developing new directions for undergraduate education at the University.")

Finance and Operations

1. Director of Physical Plant Operations (Reports to Associate V.P., Physical Planning and Physical Plant.) Successor to Warren Soderberg.
2. Director of Administrative Data Processing (will report to Associate V.P. for Finance and Operations through the new Assistant V.P. for Information Processing).

Finance and Operations,
Academic Affairs,
Planning and Academic
Support Activities

1. Assistant Vice President for Information Processing.

PROPOSED NEW POSITIONS

1. Associate or Assistant Vice President for Research.
2. Assistant Vice President for Technology Transfer.
3. Assistant Vice President for International Education.