

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Senate Committee on Finance and Planning  
Fall Retreat  
September 19, 1989**

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), David Biesboer, John Clark, James Coad, W. Andrew Collins, Gwain Davis, David Dittman, Virginia Gray, Norman Kerr, Cleon Melsa, Lynnette Mullins, Ed Nye (representing Arthur Erdman), J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Charles Speakes, Michael Steffes, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Walter Weyhmann

Guests: Mary Bilek, Nils Hasselmo, Clinton Hewitt, Richard Heydinger, Leonard Kuhl, Robert Kvavik, Nick LaFontaine, Geoffrey Maruyama, Barbara Muesing, Linda Seebach (Daily)

Professor Ibele called the group together at 12:30; he began by welcoming Senior Vice President and Provost Leonard Kuhl to the University.

**1. Comments from Associate Vice President Clinton Hewitt**

Professor Ibele told the Committees that because the campus environment was so important to the quality of the educational enterprise that he had asked Mr. Hewitt to talk with them about current projects and plans in Physical Planning. Mr. Hewitt explained to the Committees the principles<sup>1</sup> which guide planning and construction of facilities; he also showed a number of slides illustrating both work currently underway to make the campus more attractive as well as projects which might be undertaken if funds permit. Mr. Hewitt observed that in planning for the campus it was important to consider how the surroundings made people feel.

**2. Status and process, the capital request**

Vice President Heydinger distributed copies of the capital request which will be presented to the Board of Regents and, assuming they approve, to the legislature. It was, he said, based on a set of sound principles which had been carefully thought out. Assistant Vice President Kvavik related that problems had been brought to the President's Cabinet as well as to the deans, University Librarian, and Space Advisory Committee (the vice presidents plus some others). All projects were reviewed and that review led to the request before them. The beginning point had been the 89-91 priorities; Academic Affairs had developed the list and it had been accepted with only minor modifications.

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

<sup>1</sup>A copy of which will be distributed to Committee members.

Asked about the possible impact of the utility study being conducted, Dr. Kvavik said Vice President Donhowe sees as a big question whether the University should buy or build. Given the huge bonding bill being sought for academic buildings, it might make more sense to let somebody else make the capital investment. Dr. Heydinger added that the numbers are so big that the decision should not be made casually; it appears that the University will not run out of power, in the near term, which provides time to consider the choices.

The question was posed: Should there not be a comparable physical plan for the Arts and Sciences? If the University is committed to revitalizing the core programs, such a plan would seem wise. Mr. Hewitt agreed that a master physical plan was needed, and pointed out that the foundation of any physical plan is an academic plan--and the staff in Physical Planning had no interest in getting into the academic planning business. (There was no implication that an academic plan did not exist.)

It was suggested that the University always builds new space but never tears down any of the old--which then increases the demand for funds for janitors and maintenance. Dr. Heydinger responded that departments are never willing to retrench space; Mr. Hewitt observed that the University is continuously building but nonetheless is always short of space. Dr. Kvavik also mentioned that space for graduate students is never planned; they need to be taken into account and physical planning generally must accommodate an evolving University.

There was short discussion of possible revisions in the Minnesota Facilities Model; it was asserted that any review of the model should not be conducted solely by Morrill Hall and the deans. Mr. Hewitt told the Committees that there are three faculty members on the working group which will review it, faculty with particular expertise in physical planning and space. It was said that three--or 12 or more--faculty could not know about the changing nature of research in the many disciplines and that the plan needed wide review. Mr. Hewitt agreed; he also told the Committees that in all cases the model was a starting point for planning. If a department needed more space than the model would provide, and could make a reasonable case for that need, the planning would accommodate it. The model is not intended to be a rigid determinant of space needs.

There were brief exchanges about use of off-campus space (there are a couple of opportunities for rental, which can be used for long-term research grants; it was recognized that some kinds of research space would never be built unless done so by the University), recreational sports facilities (questions arose about the space available, and sought, given the numbers of students on the campus; it was agreed that the context in which the facilities are being planned and built should be provided to the Senate Finance and Planning Committee), and dormitories (should there be more, and is the University losing good students because of the lack of residential opportunities).

Vice President Heydinger concluded by reiterating that the capital request was predicated on three principles and that it was a building document, not a planning document. The University has not obtained a number of buildings, after a lot of planning. It is expected there will be a bonding bill of \$300-400 million; the University's capital request stands at \$129 million and every attempt will be made to obtain all of it.

What needs attention, Dr. Heydinger said, is strategy: What is the best way to present the

request? There should be many participants, but with a lead person on each project to whom the legislature could turn for information.

It is possible that the legislature might fund only the first 6 or 7 items--or it might pick and choose from the list. Requests for the coordinate campuses are on the bottom of the list; is it not true that those projects are less likely to be funded--especially since the 1991 and 1993 capital requests will be dominated by huge buildings? Vice President Heydinger responded by saying that the Minneapolis campus, in all honesty, needs the most funding for its physical plant; he also pointed out that all campuses are on the list and that projects traditionally work their way up the list once they're on it. He agreed, however, that the two large projects in the future will be a problem for advancing any which are not funded in this biennium.

### **3. Discussion with President Hasselmo**

The President picked up on the conversation about the dormitories, telling the Committees that he considered this a major issue; the University must do more to bring commuters into its environment and make campus life more attractive. It was pointed out by one Committee member that students do not feel like they "own" the campus; study space is inadequate and they frequently feel pushed off the campus. The President reflected that a student's identification with the campus started at the initial interaction with prospective students. Undergraduate students in particular, he said, must be linked to the faculty; graduate students are more readily linked in their departments. At the top of the list of tasks for the new Vice President for Student Affairs, he reported, will be improvement of the intellectual and social climate of the campus for students.

He moved then to touch on three topics. First, he said, he wants to allay any concerns that Commitment to Focus is no longer guiding the plans of the University: It is on, he said, in full force, and will be the thrust of the University for the 1990s. It might require interpretation, he noted, saying that it means improving the environment for learning, for faculty research opportunities, and improving certain parts of the service mission. It also means matching tasks to the dollars available.

Second, the President said, on enrollments the legislature reconfirmed in 1989 the goals established in 1987, although future plans were left open. It is his intention to confirm the 1987 targets again. It was suggested that perhaps the University should consider appointing a public advisory group on enrollment, which could be educated about the principles guiding the University's position and which could then help inform the public. President Hasselmo agreed that this might not be a bad idea; he also related his conviction that he must have the understanding and full support of the Board of Regents; there appears to be a "commitment to openness" in some quarters--an openness which has never been a characteristic of the University.

The third topic is a "however," the President explained, because the assumptions behind the enrollment targets and Commitment to Focus have not held--the participation rates in higher education have changed. The enrollment targets should be adhered to, he said, but the recommendations of the M-SPAN report must be dealt with. The University must define what it can do, and what quality means, rather than continuing to stretch resources to meet ever-increasing needs. The legislature must then be told, he said, what can be done with the dollars available and what more will be required if additional

programs or responsibilities are to be shouldered.

The President was told by one Committee member that while there was virtually complete agreement with Commitment to Focus as he described it, a lot of people cringed at the term; he was asked if some other terminology could be developed. The President agreed that for some the blinders go on as soon as the phrase is used, and he must then explain that it means meeting the special responsibilities of the University and matching responsibilities to resources. It was argued that perhaps no slogan at all would be appropriate.

The President was asked what prospects there were for implementing the faculty development and vitality recommendations which SCFA had approved and which FCC had subsequently also endorsed; he replied that what could be done was limited, given the resources available.

An inquiry about a timetable for resolving questions about the structure of CLA led the President to tell the Committees that Vice President Kuhi was consulting on the matter. He said his personal view was that with the appointment of the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, CLA should be split up--because the Vice Provost will serve as the "Arts and Sciences Dean."

It was remarked that the President had perforce been spending much time at the legislature and on external relations; with relatively quieter times ahead, would he have more time to direct to the faculty? President Hasselmo expressed the hope that he would; he recalled that he had been dragged into external relations by virtue of the situation, and had found it useful, but hoped to reduce that sort of demand on his time. He is, he reported, scheduling meetings with all of the deans, and wishes to have department heads involved in those meetings. He expressed concern about his inability to get through to 3500 faculty and asked for the help of the Committees.

This discussion elicited from the President a question about how the faculty on the Committees communicate with their colleagues; Professor Ibele explained that it was primarily through Footnote and in their capacity as executive committee of the Senate. One Committee member said that colleagues did not care for the most part what occurred; they had no sense that what was done by the Consultative Committee had any impact on their lives. Unless they are told what the agenda is and how it affects them, they will not be interested. Another Committee member expressed concern about the notion of responsibility to constituents; FCC members are elected but have no sense of constituency or channels of communication with them. In her own case, she said, she had been elected by an identifiable constituency which she was in touch with and which she heard from, which was organized, vocal, interested, and knowledgeable.

The President said he thought it inevitable that the faculty would be uninterested in the grubby day-to-day details--that they would become active and interested only when major issues arise. He suggested that faculty members might consult with their units of origin.

[This discussion of representation and constituencies was, after the meeting, determined to be of sufficient importance to the operation and effectiveness of the Consultative Committee that it will be placed on an agenda in the near future for more extended examination.]

#### **4. Review of 1989-90 Budget**

Professor Ibele welcomed Nick LaFontaine, Director of Budget Management, and Assistant Vice President Mary Bilek to assist in the discussion of the budget. Mr. LaFontaine distributed a 2-page summary of the budget as it was finally set; Committee members spent some while asking questions of various items in the summary. Mr. LaFontaine told the Committee members that there has been a better communication of goals, allocations, and academic plans, in large part because of the excellent working relationship of Senior Vice Presidents Shirley Clark and Gus Donhowe.

One result of the discussion was that the Consultative Committee decided it must take up with Senior Vice President Donhowe the matter of budget decentralization. Several Committee members voiced profound reservations about the implications of decentralization and the impact it could have on the budgeting practices of the units.

The retreat adjourned at 4:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota