

1848

SHIPD SEP 7 1988

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
PLANNING REPORT
TO THE LEGISLATURE**

470

#11341

SEPTEMBER 1, 1988

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

PLANNING REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

SEPTEMBER 1, 1988

Prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs,
217 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S. E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455. 612-624-8333

NOTE: This Planning Report has been prepared for the Higher Education Coordinating Board for their subsequent submission to the Legislature. It is an administrative document which includes descriptions of policies and actions taken by the University Board of Regents, but has not yet been reviewed by the Regents.

Equal Opportunity

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation. In adhering to this policy, the University abides by the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; by Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; by Executive Order 11246, as amended: 38 U.S.C. 2012; by the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1972, as amended; and by other applicable statutes and regulations relating to equality of opportunity.

Inquiries regarding compliance may be directed to Patricia A. Mullen, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, 419 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455 (612-624-9547); or to the Director of the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202; or to the Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210.

CONTENTS

Guide to the Document.....1

Introduction and mission statement.....2

 The Mission of the University of Minnesota3

Section I: Programmatic Planning.....4

 Commitment to Focus.....4

 Outline of Recommendations.....4

 Actions on Specific Recommendations.....5

 Other Actions based on Commitment to Focus.....7

 Strategy for Focus8

 Assumptions underlying the plan9

 The Process.....11

 Review of Campus Plans13

 University of Minnesota, Crookston13

 University of Minnesota, Duluth.....14

 University of Minnesota, Morris.....16

 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.....17

 University of Minnesota, Waseca.....29

 Administrative Actions and Regents' Action30

 Future Actions.....33

 Next Two Years.....33

 Next Five Years.....37

 Next Ten Years.....37

 Relations to other systems37

 Community College System.....37

 Relations with Secondary Schools: Preparation Standards40

| | |
|---|----|
| Other cooperative programs | 41 |
| Section II: Financial and Administrative Planning | 43 |
| Planning for Academic Programs..... | 43 |
| Internal Reallocations..... | 43 |
| Minnesota Campaign | 45 |
| Requested Support from Legislature | 45 |
| Planning for Management of the Institution | 45 |
| System-Wide Administration..... | 45 |
| System-Wide Financial Management..... | 46 |
| Section III: Physical Planning | 48 |
| Introduction..... | 48 |
| Mission..... | 48 |
| Goals and Objectives | 49 |
| Function..... | 49 |
| Context..... | 50 |
| Physical Context | 50 |
| Organizational Context | 51 |
| Management Context | 52 |
| Campus Planning | 53 |
| Physical Planning Activities | 54 |
| Comprehensive Physical Planning..... | 54 |
| Project Implementation..... | 56 |
| Major Facilities Needs for Academic Programs..... | 59 |
| Restoration of the Arts and Sciences | 59 |
| Libraries..... | 60 |
| Graduate and Professional Education | 60 |
| Undergraduate Studies | 60 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Research and Technology Transfer..... | 61 |
| International Education..... | 61 |
| Infrastructure..... | 61 |
| Appendix I: Appendix I to <i>Academic Priorities: Next Steps</i> (Summary of Regents' Action)..... | 62 |
| Appendix II: Letter from Arthur Andersen & Co. outlining scope of review of minority programs..... | 68 |
| Appendix III: Implementation Calendar..... | 70 |
| Appendix IV: October 24, 1986, Memorandum from President Keller on University organization, and Administrative Reorganization Update..... | 77 |
| Appendix V: Tables..... | 90 |
| Table 1. Average class size by college and level of instruction, Fall, 1987..... | 90 |
| Table 2. Past and projected headcount enrollment levels, 1980 - 1992..... | 91 |
| Table 3. University enrollment projections compared to HECB, 1980 - 2004..... | 98 |
| Table 4. Instructional cost by college and level of instruction, Academic year 1986..... | 99 |
| Table 5. Instructional cost from state funds by college, in constant dollars, 1977 - 1986..... | 104 |

GUIDE TO THE DOCUMENT

Instructions from the Legislature specify certain components for this report ((Laws of Minnesota for 1985, 135A.06). This guide shows where those components are to be found.

"Each planning report shall consider at least the following elements:

(a) A statement of program priorities for undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. [Programmatic plans are reviewed on pp. 4 - 37, and appendices].

Program plans shall also include data about program cost and average class size within each institution. [See Appendix V, tables 1, 4, 5].

(b) A review of plans for adjusting the number of facilities, staff, and programs to projected level of demand. Plans for adjustments shall consider campus and program mergers, campus and program closings, new governance structures, the relationship between fixed costs and projected enrollment changes, and other methods including consolidation of institutions, services, and programs that serve the same geographic area under different governing boards. [The entire *Commitment to Focus* plan is predicated on a specific reallocation of resources to projected levels of demand. Alternatives have not yet been developed. Regarding the request in the legislation for information on the relationship between fixed costs and projected enrollment changes, the Average Cost Funding Task Force has this subject on its agenda for the coming year. The University requests that it be allowed to develop this information in conjunction with the other systems, using methods agreed to by that Task Force].

(c) Enrollment projections for two, five, and ten years....[See Appendix V, tables 2, 3].

(d) Estimated financial costs and savings of alternative plans for adjusting facilities, staff, and programs to declining enrollments and fiscal resources. [See comment regarding the Average Cost Funding Task Force under (b), above].

(e) Opportunities for providing services cooperatively with other public and private institutions in the same geographic area. [See pp. 37 - 42, below].

(f) Differentiating and coordinating missions to reduce or eliminate duplication of services and offerings". (Subd. 3). [See pp. 4 - 7, and 37 - 42, below].

INTRODUCTION AND MISSION STATEMENT

The University is pleased to submit its 1988 - 89 Planning Report to the Minnesota Legislature and Higher Education Coordinating Board. The University's plans and implementation in the biennium since the 1986 - 87 report have continued to be based on President Keller's February, 1985, report to the Board of Regents, *Commitment to Focus*. That document echoes the main theme of the legislation that mandates planning by the state's public post-secondary education systems: System missions should be differentiated in such a way that the combined system best achieves the state's overall objectives. The past biennium has seen continuing progress to carry out the initiatives presented by *Commitment to Focus*, and a major extension of the University's planning effort, *Strategy for Focus*. This effort was designed to assure that:

- the plans of each individual unit in the University would be restructured in accordance with the directions laid out in *Commitment to Focus*,
- important issues not addressed by the plans of individual departments and colleges would be addressed centrally,
- interested members of the University community and residents of the state would have full opportunity to express their opinions on the plans before final adoption, and
- budget allocations would be made consistent with the priorities developed in the planning effort.

Fundamental as the University's re-examination of its goals and objectives in this planning process has been, it has not given rise to any questioning of the mission statement adopted by the Board of Regents in 1980. This introduction concludes with a summary of that mission statement. Then Section 1 provides:

- a review of *Commitment to Focus*, a report on further steps taken toward its implementation during the past two years, and a description of steps yet to be taken; and
- a description of *Strategy for Focus*, a report on steps already taken toward its implementation, and a description of steps yet to be taken.

Subsequent sections provide a description of the financial plans that are a part of *Commitment to Focus* and *Strategy for Focus*, and of the physical planning process intended to support the programmatic plans.

THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

"The mission of the University is to serve the people of the state, wherever they may be, through teaching, research, and public service. It also has an additional obligation -- to contribute as fully as resources permit to the meeting of national and international needs.

"Three aspects of [the unique role of the University] need special emphasis: *integration, access, and excellence*. First, the University is committed to the integration of all uses of knowledge: research, teaching, and service are inseparable. Second, citizens and agencies of the state must have broad access to the University's wide range of programs and services. This requirement implies that programs will be widely available throughout the state, that tuition will be kept as low as possible, that financial aid will be given to those in need, that admissions policies will be flexible, that it should be reasonably easy to transfer within, from or to this institution, and that there should be extensive reciprocity agreements with other states. It implies, further, that physical barriers to attendance should be reduced as much as possible and barriers of sex, culture, and race eliminated. Third, the University is committed to a high level of excellence in all its endeavors. This commitment implies that in all the fields in which it offers programs the University will assume a leading role in the development of knowledge and curricula."¹

The University's present plans grow out of that mission statement.

¹A *Mission and Policy Statement for the University of Minnesota*, adopted by the Board of Regents July 11, 1980, p. 3.

SECTION I: PROGRAMMATIC PLANNING

COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

Outline of Recommendations

Commitment to Focus represents a turning point in the development of the University. The initial report from President Keller proposed that the University work toward a significant improvement in the quality of the institution. This would require that the University accommodate its programs and plans to the ecology of the state's higher education system and its changing population, both because this would serve the state well and because it would permit the University to focus its resources on those programs which it does best. The report went on to observe, with respect to improving quality:

"To achieve that goal, it must maintain the quality of its best programs and improve the quality of those programs which most directly serve to enhance its role as an international research university, a land-grant institution and a metropolitan university. That multifaceted role requires a balance; a balance among graduate, undergraduate, and professional education and a balance among teaching, research, and service activities.

"With respect to its educational program, ... the University is seriously out of balance. The ratio of undergraduates to graduates students is so high that our resources cannot support high quality comprehensively at either level. Since it is unlikely that our graduate student numbers can grow, ... [we should] allow our undergraduate enrollments to decrease ... [W]e should then focus on:

- improving the financial support of graduate students ...;
- recruiting high-ability undergraduates who can best benefit from the University's programs; and
- improving the quality of our undergraduate programs."¹

¹A *Commitment to Focus*: Report of Interim President Kenneth H. Keller to the Board of Regents, February 8, 1985, p. 2.

Actions on Specific Recommendations

The proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollment has been approved by the Regents, and explicit enrollment targets to 1992 have been incorporated into state law (though we will learn whether or not the planned reduction in student numbers continues to be appropriate only as we observe changes in demand). The financial support of graduate students has been substantially improved, with the help of both legislative and private funds, so that the University of Minnesota is now competitive with other major research universities in the financial aspect of graduate student recruitment. Internal reallocation of funds has provided a \$1 million program for recruitment of high ability students. And a series of actions, described below, has been taken to begin the job of improving the quality of undergraduate programs.

In support of the general change of direction outlined above, *Commitment to Focus* proposed specific initiatives in four areas; here are the proposals and accomplishments to date in carrying them out:

I. Undergraduate education

- *Eliminate two-year degree programs, except at Crookston and Waseca.* This has been carried out, except that some formerly enrolled students may still complete their programs.
- *Eliminate degree and certificate programs from General College.* This, too, has been carried out, except that some formerly enrolled students may still complete their programs, to 1991.
- *Eliminate University Without Walls Program.* The recommendation was modified; the program has been renamed the Program for Individualized Learning, and both the scope and the size of the program has been reduced: Only those students are admitted to the program who cannot be served through similar programs either within the University or in other institutions of higher education (with special attention to the programs of Metropolitan State University).
- *Unify and increase entrance standards across all Twin Cities undergraduate colleges (except General College), Duluth, and Morris.* New preparation standards for courses which well-prepared students would complete in secondary school (not required for

admission, but required for upper division work) are to be put into effect starting in 1991; planning toward these new standards, in cooperation with the state's secondary schools, is continuing. A common entry point for admission to the Twin Cities campus has been approved by the Regents, which we expect to be implemented in 1991.

- *Coordinate lower division education across Twin Cities units.* The Regents have approved appointment of a Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering who will, among other responsibilities, oversee lower division education.

II. Professional education

- *Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Management.* An initial recommendation and action in July, 1986, was to reduce enrollment from approximately 1,500 to 1,175; further action in July, 1988 reduced the target level of enrollment to 750.
- *Reduce undergraduate class size in College of Education.* The target undergraduate and special student enrollment for 1992 has been tentatively set at 1,090, compared to a total of almost 2,000 in 1986; the final result will depend on progress in transforming professional programs to the post-baccalaureate level.
- *Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Nursing.* The Regents acted in January, 1986, to reduce the class size from 150 to 90.
- *Cap undergraduate Institute of Technology engineering enrollments.* The Regents acted in March, 1985, to cap enrollments. The target undergraduate enrollment for 1992 has been tentatively set at 5,200, about 500 below the 1986 enrollment.
- *Reduce DVM program in College of Veterinary Medicine.* The Regents acted in January, 1986, to reduce the class size from 80 to 64.
- *Consider reductions in other professional school class sizes.* The Regents approved a shift from the Pharm D to the BS program in Pharmacy, in June, 1986, reduction in the entering class size from 200 to 175 for the MD program in the Medical School, and reductions in enrollment in Dentistry from approximately 400 to 300 in July, 1988.
- *Consider reductions in size and scope of medical residency programs.* The target enrollment for 1992 has been tentatively set at 1,000, 36 below the 1986 enrollment, with an expected further decline in later years.

III. Coordinate Campuses

The Regents' actions were all reported in the 1986 - 87 Planning Report (p. 20b). Implementation of the plans developed there has continued, as outlined further below.

IV. Continuing Education and Extension.

- *Increase utilization of University expertise in Agricultural Extension.* The change in title from Agricultural Extension to the Minnesota Extension Service (MES) reflects a broadened mission that the Regents have approved. Steps have been taken to better integrate the faculty of Crookston and Waseca into MES, and proposals will be before the 1989 Legislature to support a further integration of the Minneapolis faculty into programs to meet community needs throughout the state.

The remaining specific proposals under this heading relate to a more focussed mission for the extension programs of Continuing Education and Extension, and to take better advantage of modern technology for state-wide delivery of programs. Progress has been made in these areas, and further actions are planned for the coming biennium.

Other Actions based on *Commitment to Focus*

The most regrettable feature of the *Commitment to Focus* report was its omission of any clear statement of the role that the University must play in providing programs for students of color, both in its Twin Cities campus role as the state's major metropolitan university, and throughout the state in serving the needs of minority populations. This omission was corrected by the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus (Taborn report). The final report of this committee provided 22 interdependent recommendations relating to undergraduate recruiting and admissions, undergraduate retention and graduation, minority graduate and professional programs, a minority student data base, minority faculty, facilities for minority programs, and administration of minority programs. In June, 1987, the Regents adopted the following resolution in support of the report and its recommendations:

WHEREAS, the University is committed to expanding its racial and cultural diversity as it implements *Commitment to Focus*;

WHEREAS, an essential element in measuring the success of *Commitment to Focus* will be an increase in the proportion of minority students successfully educated at the University;

WHEREAS, the report from the Special Committee on Minority Programs in support of *Commitment to Focus* (Taborn Report) sets the context for improving opportunities and climate for minorities throughout the University;

WHEREAS, the Taborn Report contains an interdependent set of 22 recommendations, some of which require further study as well as integration with the University's ongoing planning initiatives (*Strategy for Focus*);

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents endorses enthusiastically the overall principles, intent and context of the Taborn Report.

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents asks the Administration to prepare a detailed plan with measurable goals and a timetable and to take necessary actions to ensure that the principles and intent of the Taborn Report are achieved.

The most important action taken to date in implementation of those recommendations has been the appointment in August, 1988, of an Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs with special responsibility for the University's minority programs. The future focus of planning efforts from that office is discussed further, below.

STRATEGY FOR FOCUS

Commitment to Focus set a goal for improving the quality of the University's programs, but it did not give detailed guidance on specific steps that should be taken in order to accomplish that goal. University Task Force reports both before and after the publication of that document provided recommendations on University-wide and campus-wide actions that should be taken, but they did not provide guidance on concrete steps for implementation, and there was no analysis of how individual colleges should respond to the new initiative.

A *Strategy for Focus* was intended to respond to those needs. It gave each academic department and college in the university an opportunity to review its most recent plans and formulate new goals in the light of *Commitment to Focus* and of recommendations from the

University Task Forces, assess the barriers that must be overcome, and decide on a course of action designed to accomplish its goals. By focusing energies and resources on a limited number of programs consistent with its mission, it was intended that each academic unit work to achieve the high level of overall performance to which the University aspires.

Assumptions underlying the plan

Principles to inform the analysis

The following excerpt from instructions to the colleges gives the assumptions that the colleges were asked to use in formulating their individual plans.

- "1. *A Strategy for Focus* represents a shift in orientation for program development at the University of Minnesota. *Growth* in resources is not the primary means to improvement of our programs; *change* is the primary means to improvement. Development of better programs need not require increases in size, and our analysis of the opportunities that face us must recognize that *redirection* of resources, rather than *increased* resources, provides our best opportunity to achieve excellence. We need to focus on quality rather than quantity.
- "2. Analysis must encompass entire programs, addressing the possible advantages of completely eliminating some in order to create or strengthen others, when major changes are required to attain a threshold of excellence. *Incremental changes that do not lead to clear improvement in quality of the high priority programs will not accomplish our goals.*
- "3. For each program, faculty development, both for the present faculty and by means of new hires as opportunities occur, must have the highest priority. The quality of the university can be no better than that of its faculty.
- "4. Research is central to the mission of each academic department at the university. From a base of strong departments with active research programs, attention must be paid to interdisciplinary research. This requires that programs seek opportunities for synergism; they cannot be satisfied with insular activities, and they cannot succeed with strategies that sustain academic enclaves. Each program must consider the opportunities to improve its own quality and strengthen the institution as a whole by looking beyond the boundaries of its own department and college.

- "5. With regard to enrollments, analysis should proceed on the assumption that the premise of *Commitment to Focus* will hold: undergraduate enrollment will decline by eight thousand, and relatively, there will be a shift of enrollment from lower division to upper division and graduate education. Planning assumptions for individual college enrollments are proposed [updated projections are shown in Appendix V, Table 2]. With regard to financial resources, analysis should proceed on the assumption that state funding (0100 budget and state specials) will remain unchanged.
- "6. The nature of this university -- research-based, international, metropolitan (Twin Cities campus), land grant, committed to equal opportunity and affirmative action -- should permeate our programs.
- "• The university will maintain and strengthen its commitment to improve the lives of Minnesota residents through its research, teaching and service mission, including analysis of pressing social problems, enrichment of the state's cultural environment, and effective transfer of technology to provide intellectual, cultural and economic returns for the investment made in our programs by the State.
 - "• The kind of student who chooses to come to the university depends on the kind of program we offer: to attract those students who can benefit most from an environment of research and scholarship, we must tailor our instructional programs to them. Especially undergraduate programs should emphasize intellectual engagement, social awareness, ethical involvement and participation in an intellectual community. The idea that education is a continuum should underlie each college plan. Education must be cumulative; programs need to be coordinated with those of secondary schools and community colleges, and among colleges within the university; professional programs must have a foundation on strong programs in the basic arts and sciences.
 - "• The university is committed to serve the international community and to assist our local community as it becomes more actively engaged with the world outside our borders. International activities and objectives must be identified in the strategy.
 - "• All adjustments to our programs brought about by changing priorities, especially shifts of enrollment, must be undertaken with full attention to the importance of

maintaining the institution's commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action."

Program Statistics and projections

The tables of Appendix V show program statistics and enrollment statistics currently used for planning purposes; in some cases these have been updated from the information used in the *Strategy for Focus* planning process last year.

Table 1 shows Average Class Size by college and level of instruction, for Fall, 1987.

Table 2 gives the projected headcount enrollment levels currently used for planning purposes. In some cases these represent unconstrained forecasts (no notation in the margin); in others they represent objectives which the college Admissions Office is attempting to achieve (C for planned ceiling, M for jointly managed objective). The Board of Regents will be reviewing these objectives annually for possible modification. Enrollments are shown from 1980 to 1992.

Table 3 compares the University's projected headcount enrollment with those of HECB, with a footnote to explain the basis for the divergences, 1980 to 2004.

Table 4 shows instructional costs, by college and level of instruction, for academic year 1986.

Table 5 shows instructional cost from state funds by college, in constant dollars, from 1977 to 1986.

The Process

The process was described as follows in the instructions to colleges¹

"Criteria considered in setting priorities

"a. Quality: Inevitably subjective, this measure includes the quality of the faculty (in teaching, research and service as reflected in peer national ratings, publications, outside funding), the quality of students, library collections, and other indices.

¹*Strategy for Focus*, p., 3 ff.

- "b. **Centrality:** Each program should be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the mission of the University of Minnesota. Centrality of research, instruction and service represents a program's contribution to a coherent whole which helps to sustain and stimulate related work elsewhere in the university. With respect to instruction, centrality also addresses the degree to which a program is an essential component of a challenging education that taken as a whole is intended at the undergraduate level to communicate an understanding of the major ideas and achievements of humankind and a sense of the values of different cultures and ages; at the graduate and professional levels, centrality in instructional programs extends this commitment beyond communicating the major ideas and achievements of humankind, to an expansion and deepening of knowledge, and to furthering its utilization for society's welfare.
- "c. **Comparative Advantage:** What are the unique characteristics of each program that make it particularly appropriate to this university? It is not sufficient that programs meet an important local or national need, or that they be unique within the state. Many important programs can and should be the responsibility of others, in Minnesota or elsewhere. What is the rationale for the program at the *University of Minnesota*?
- "d. **Demand:** The direction of change in demand for each program in both the short and long term will be considered [based on enrollment projections in appendix table]... Other indicators you might wish to consider include number of applications, quality of acceptances, services performed in support of other programs, degrees awarded, instruction of students or research undertaken for the solution of pressing problems of society.
- "e. **Efficiency and Effectiveness:** Because aspirations are always limited by the resources available, programs must be continually examined to see if more economical or more efficient ways are possible to accomplish the same ends. Yet, cost alone must not govern the decision; the effectiveness of the program must also be weighed. When taken together, efficiency and effectiveness provide an important measure of whether funds are being put to the best use.

"Instructions for formulating the college strategy

"To ensure success of this process, broad participation is of the utmost importance; each department is encouraged to design its own future within the context established by its

college administration. Each department and college will, of course, follow normal University policies to assure consultation with students and staff; beyond that normal consultation, each department is asked to make sure that there is opportunity for students to be informed and to comment on its proposals, and to involve *every* interested faculty member in the planning process. Each college, too, should develop procedures that allow for significant involvement by faculty and students in the preparation of its own planning document which integrates those of the individual departments.

"Each college will submit a document which shows its preliminary decisions on program priorities for the next five years. These submissions will be reviewed by an Advisory Task Force and will later form the basis of discussions between each unit and the appropriate Vice President. The purpose of these discussions is to reach agreement on a set of goals and objectives, as well as measures to be used in assessing progress towards them. It is anticipated that the outcomes of these discussions and agreements will be reviewed every two years and extended to the following five-year planning period."

Differences among campuses

The instructions given above were written for the Twin Cities Campus; chancellors of the other campuses were invited to modify the details to suit their circumstances, but the process was essentially the same, with broad consultation and review by an appropriate campus-wide body in each case.

Review of Campus Plans

University of Minnesota, Crookston

The plan reaffirms that UMC's primary focus is on programs in agriculture, business, home economics, and hospitality leading to the Associate in Applied Science degree (designed for employment) and the Associate in Science degree (designed for transfer to baccalaureate programs).

The plan identifies three major components which seek to:

- Expand interaction and cooperative linkages within the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics (IAFHE) and with other postsecondary institutions.
- Strengthen educational programs and students experiences for students on campus.

- Provide educational programs and services to individuals within the region.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

The UMD *Strategy for Focus* document identified considerable redirection of resources and new programmatic emphases as the campus develops its own unique application of *Commitment to Focus*. The process has been worthwhile. The product will contribute increased vitality and quality education not only in Duluth, but to the University and the State.

The heart of our design is to place our undergraduate students in the best possible position to succeed. The emphasis in this plan is on the enhancement of the academic components of the student experience. This effort is complemented by the plans of the campus support units. The highest priority is to improve the coordination and quality of our programs in assessment and advisement. The development of a student Achievement Center and a major cooperative effort by the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration and the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Student Life through the Center director will maximize the use of the limited resources available.

The reallocation of funds to essential courses in composition, mathematics, and communication should also result in greater levels of student success and satisfaction. An additional component of an improved student experience will be new initiatives in leadership training, internships, international experiences, and opportunities for research and creative activity. It is anticipated that there will be higher levels of student retention because of this overall effort.

Major programmatic and structural changes are proposed in three of the five collegiate units. A reorganized College of Liberal Arts (CLA) will develop and evaluate a core curriculum for two years beginning in fall, 1988. Based upon the success of the program, further development may occur across the campus. Over the same two-year period the College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP) will be emphasizing faculty development, selective buyouts, and resource reallocation. A final decision about a shift to the graduate degree requirement (Master of Arts in Teaching, M.A.T.) for teacher licensure will be made at the end of the period. The School of Fine Arts (SFA) will reduce the size of its unit by three FTE over the planning period, while actively promoting a nationally recognized theatre program and focusing on selected areas of strength in art and music.

Enhancement of our professional and graduate offerings also is a major goal. Accreditation of the engineering programs (computer engineering, materials processing engineering, and industrial engineering), computer science, theatre, and the graduate program in social work will proceed. Additional resources should be directed toward the School of Business and Economics (SBE) so that the business and accounting programs can gain formal accreditation.

We will strengthen our graduate offerings through new program development and through cooperative ventures with the Twin Cities campus. Graduate programs in Applied Mathematics, in Computer Science, and a restructured Master of Social Work program accepted their first students for fall, 1987. Other initiatives include participation in an all-University program to develop a graduate minor in Aquatic Science and the potential development of new graduate programs that might arise out of "center" activities (e.g., Chemical Toxicology, Urban and Regional Studies, Northern Circle/Canadian Studies, etc.). The development of positive new relationships between the UMD graduate faculty and their colleagues on the Twin Cities campus will occur through participation in "cooperative" Ph.D. programs. This mechanism for having Ph.D. students on the UMD campus has already been used successfully by faculty in the Chemistry Department and in Ancient Studies. Similar opportunities are anticipated for other programs.

The importance of UMD to Northern Minnesota is undeniable and the planning document attempts to enhance this status. Specific outreach components through Women's Studies, American Indian Studies, Continuing Education, Sea Grant, and through cooperative programs in business development (SBE/Natural Resources Research Institute [NRRI]), and resource management (NRRI/Geography/Geology/Biology) will be further developed during the period described by the planning document. The focus of the cultural community in the region will continue to be the School of Fine Arts. In addition, the plan places the campus in an improved position to provide skilled leadership for our region. This will occur through improved educational and leadership opportunities that will be realized through the baccalaureate program.

A major emphasis will be placed on the development of an improved capability to strategically manage the resources available to the UMD campus. Administrative reorganization (September 1987) has provided a focal point (the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations and a campus Budget Committee) for fiscal reporting and for budget planning. The success in blending the functions of administrative and academic data processing will be

used as a possible management model for the current and future operations of the Information Services and the Library. Moreover, a Director of Institutional Research was hired (July 1987) to assist in the development and analysis of the information necessary for informed decision making. The current and emerging programmatic needs will be related in documented fashion to requirements for equipment and space. The overall goal is the formulation of a coordinated approach to information management and decision making.

The *Strategy for Focus* process was a timely, yet arduous, exercise. At the present stage in the development of the UMD campus the document should be considered the first of a series of strategy statements to position UMD among the best of the mid-sized comprehensive universities.

University of Minnesota, Morris

The Five Year (1987-92) Academic Plan for the University of Minnesota, Morris consists of three major parts: 1) revision of the general education program, 2) establishment of an honors program, and 3) overcoming funding deficiencies. The final version of the academic plan will be available this fall, 1988.

The plan to revise general education in the liberal arts at UMM is called Project Prosper ("Pros" is a reference to the process portion of the new General Education Requirement; "Per" refers to the Perspectives portion). It has two important goals. The first is to become familiar with the *process* of liberal learning, to acquire 1) the intellectual skills, 2) the communication skills, and 3) the framework of knowledge needed for successful advanced work. The second is to *expand one's intellectual perspectives*, gaining enough understanding of the principal areas of human endeavor to be able to learn more when necessary in the future and to have a sense of the limits of one's knowledge.

The process part of liberal learning includes the Fall Course, "Inquiry: Values in a Changing World", a required course for all freshmen during their first quarter at UMM. The purpose of the course is to provide an introduction to liberal education. Additional new process requirements include two freshmen composition courses, one year of a foreign language, an introductory speech communication course plus at least one course that applies the principles of oral communication, at least two courses which require expository writing skills, a course that discusses the fundamental principles of computing devices and algorithmic solutions plus at least one course which includes the application of computing principles, and at least one advanced course outside of the student's major.

Expanding perspectives are grouped under three headings. Under "The Self and Others" there are four categories from which students must take at least one course each. They are The Self, Historical Perspectives, Different Cultures, and Social Institutions. Under "The Arts", there are three categories from which students must also take at least one course. They are Analysis and Interpretation, Performance, and Arts and Culture. The Physical and Abstract Worlds includes two categories: The Natural World, from which students must take at least two courses, and Abstract Systems, from which they must take at least one course. At least one of the courses meeting the expanding perspectives requirements must have a non-Western focus. Finally, a health/fitness requirement is also included.

Any UMM student is eligible to participate in the Honors Program. To graduate with honors, a student must earn "A" grades in at least half of the credits earned at UMM; complete at least one honors course per year of participation; engage in a number of co- and extra-curricular activities; and complete an honors project.

Underfunding of the academic program includes the need for a number of new faculty and staff positions. Other academic needs in the plan include library automation, additional student employment support, funds for new equipment, and support for faculty development, research, and travel.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Collegiate Plans

The expected contents for college documents were described as follows in the instructions to colleges¹

"Issues to address in the college strategy document"

- "As part of its document, each college will evaluate and rank in groups its present and proposed new programs as they relate to the structure of the university as a whole. Programs central to the university's mission should be given relatively high priority. Inasmuch as overall needs of society are often greater than any single institution's capacity to fulfill them, special weight should be given to those programs that not only

¹Strategy for Focus, p., 5 ff.

fulfill needs of society but are appropriate to the University's academic strengths, resources, and mission.

- "The document should be based on an assumed steady state budget at current levels and should include a supplement which shows how, after appropriate internal reallocation, additional resources would be used to strengthen existing programs and to support new programs of highest priority. One purpose of this effort is to develop agreed-upon academic priorities so that requests for funding and reallocations can be considered in the context of university-wide needs."

The college-specific issues have been addressed by central administration in a series of meetings with college deans, and, where necessary, by the Board of Regents.

Campus-wide issues

The planning process was designed to raise issues not addressed by the individual colleges, through the review carried out by the Advisory Task Force on Planning. These include the following:

Academic Policy

Equal opportunity and affirmative action: The campus needs to establish numerical goals for recruitment and retention of female and minority faculty members, and for minority students. These goals need to be specific to the individual college, with collegiate administrators held accountable for their achievement.

Educational policy: Over the past several years, the length of the class period has been reduced on the Twin Cities campus, and at least in some cases the academic effort and accomplishment represented by a course credit may have been reduced. The plan calls for review of this issue, in order to decide whether or not changes are necessary. Further review is also called for regarding the possible advantages of moving to a semester system, and regarding possible adoption of campus-wide standards in assigning course grades.

Faculty policy: The graduate faculty is asked to review current policies for initial appointment and continuing membership in the graduate faculty. Tenure regulations are to be reviewed, to determine whether the present maximum probationary period of 6 years best serves the interests of the faculty and of the University. Changes in laws relating to mandatory retirement call for review of University retirement policies. A more flexible

program of sabbatical leaves will be considered. Finally, the campus-wide review led to the conclusion that department chairs, directors of research institutes and centers, and other managers within the University would benefit from more formal educational programs in University management, and from a more formal, systematized review and evaluation process. (It should be noted that, while these initiatives come forward from the Twin Cities planning process, they are system-wide issues).

Academic Organization

Organization of the Arts, Sciences and Engineering: A major finding of the Advisory Task Force on Planning last summer was to call attention to the erosion of quality of the arts and science programs at the University, and to the impact of that erosion on the quality of its professional programs. When combined with the central role of the arts and sciences in undergraduate education, and the priority given by *Commitment to Focus* to improvement in that program, this finding led to a recommendation for major administrative attention to the arts and sciences. Because of the unique linking between the natural sciences and engineering programs, both intellectually and administratively in the Institute of Technology, engineering was included with the arts and sciences. A proposal was made to appoint a Vice Provost for the Arts, Sciences and Engineering, to whom the deans of the College of Biological Science, the College of Liberal Arts (or its successor colleges, if divided), General College, and the Institute of Technology would report.¹ The main responsibility of the position is to provide leadership for the colleges reporting to it, to improve the academic quality and reputation of the constituent programs, both graduate and undergraduate. A major responsibility of the Vice Provost would be to make sure that the University's overall priorities are kept at the forefront in the attention of each college. The Vice Provost should be in the President's cabinet to assure that central administration keeps the problems of these colleges in mind.

Freshman admission, entering counseling and lower division advising will all be coordinated through the office of the Vice Provost. In particular, the Twin Cities campus will shift from an admission process in which the potential student applies to a specific college

¹In addition, a new School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture would report both to this vice provost and to the Vice President for Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, the latter because of the close link between landscape architecture and horticulture. The School of Architecture is now administratively located in the Institute of Technology.

to one with a single entry point for freshmen, preserving separate paths for students with specialized interests, with central advising and counseling services that are coordinated with the colleges. A continuing objective for the program will be to permit undergraduate students to move easily among majors.

Undergraduate education: Administrative coordination of the arts, sciences and engineering under the Vice Provost provides an opportunity to make concrete improvements in undergraduate education, the need for most of which have been identified by previous task forces. Among the more important are these two:

- Active learning opportunities: *Commitment to Focus* states that we should "fashion a role to fit our strengths" in undergraduate education. This means to emphasize active understanding of modes of inquiry and participation in artistic expression, consistent with our role as a research university; it means to take advantage of opportunities offered by the metropolitan area for internships, field learning and community service; it means to accept the University's international role by making it an integral part of the undergraduate educational experience; and it means to encourage activities that support academic programs, and that foster understanding of and respect for the broad range of backgrounds and viewpoints that are found in the University community. A coordinated revision of curriculum will be needed to accomplish these changes.
- The role of professional schools: Our present organization precludes extensive involvement by the faculties of post-baccalaureate professional schools in undergraduate education, and limits participation in that education by the faculties of professional schools in the broader education programs of the University. More flexible liberal education electives that include courses offered by professional school faculty in the arts and sciences curriculum will give uncommitted students greater access to the faculty of professional schools and *vice versa*, and will provide general education courses that link the arts and sciences to important issues of public policy and other professional concerns. Faculty in the professional schools will, in some cases, transfer instructional effort to courses in underlying core arts, sciences and engineering, helping to sever the tight link between the focus of research activity and the focus of instruction in a department or college.

Organization of the Biological Sciences: The Provost will appoint a Policy Council of Biological Sciences consisting of the Deans of the College of Biological Sciences, the College

of Agriculture, the Graduate School and the Medical School, with a faculty advisory committee. There has been a perception for several years that the biological sciences program at the University of Minnesota is less than the sum of its parts. Large sums of money are received from granting agencies for biological research, but there does not appear to be corresponding national recognition. There has also been a recurring perception that fragmented programs, divided between the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses and among colleges reporting to three vice presidents, have caused at least part of the problem. This administrative structure is intended to address those issues.

Organization for Research Policy: The President will appoint the Provost, the Vice Provosts for Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, for Arts, Sciences and Engineering, and for Health Sciences, and the Dean of the Graduate School as the Research Executive Council for the Twin Cities campus with the Provost as chair, to resolve questions of research policy, with a faculty Council of Research Scholars to provide advice on matters of research policy. This new organization responds to the finding by the Advisory Task Force on Planning that the previous system for formulation of campus-wide and system-wide research policy is inadequate.

Funding Priorities

The priorities of the Twin Cities campus presented in *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993*, are classified under four heads: the general health of the institution, core programs, land grant related programs, and specific opportunities for building quality. These are listed below, and summarized in Table 1, p. 22.

General Health of the Institution

Computing Services: The need is for \$2.1 million, primarily for networking; this will permit communication by personal computer from the University, and from the entire region by going through the University, to central data resources and experts in universities and research centers throughout the country, via communications channels being established by the National Science Foundation (NSF NET) and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC NET).

| TABLE 1. PRIORITIES FOR FUNDING | |
|--|------------------|
| | New Public |
| | Funds |
| | Thousands of \$s |
| GENERAL HEALTH OF THE INSTITUTION | |
| Computing services | \$2,100 |
| Instructional equipment and support | 5,000 |
| International education | 400 |
| Library | 5,000 |
| Minority programs | 1,000 |
| Undergraduate advising | 1,000 |
| Subtotal | \$14,500 |
| CORE PROGRAMS | |
| Biological Sciences | \$2,250 |
| Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences | 2,700 |
| Humanities | 1,500 |
| Lower division education | 750 |
| Social Sciences | 1,500 |
| Subtotal | \$8,700 |
| LAND GRANT-RELATED PROGRAMS | |
| Agricultural Experiment Station Multidisciplinary Research | \$1,500 |
| Biomedical engineering | 500 |
| Biomedical ethics | 300 |
| Computer Science and Electrical Engineering | 1,000 |
| Outreach | 2,000 |
| Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration | 350 |
| Pharmacy | 750 |
| Public Health | 1,250 |
| Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory | 300 |
| Subtotal | \$7,950 |
| SPECIFIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR BUILDING QUALITY | |
| Architecture and Landscape Architecture | \$250 |
| Humphrey Institute | 350 |
| Institute for Mathematics and Its Applications | 400 |
| Management Information Systems | 300 |
| New interdisciplinary programs | 350 |
| Theoretical Physics Institute | 400 |
| Other research centers | 2,000 |
| Subtotal | \$4,050 |
| TOTAL | \$35,200 |

Instructional equipment and support: The need is for \$5 million, primarily for annual replacement and maintenance of scientific equipment in instructional laboratories, but also for audio and audio-visual equipment, and for technicians to assist in setting up laboratory demonstrations, etc. Five years ago, the annual expenditure for instructional equipment on the Twin Cities campus was under \$12 per student, the lowest in the Big Ten; the next lowest level of expenditure was over \$30 per student.

International education: The need is for \$400,000. The University is committed to internationalizing undergraduate education. It seeks to develop competence among the undergraduate student body in foreign languages, an understanding of and ability to work in foreign cultures and an interdependent world, and comparative perspectives and insight within academic disciplines and the professions. It expects to graduate a cadre of undergraduates with skills that enhance their capacity to be competitive in the world community and an increasingly internationalized economy.

To attain these goals, the administration proposes the formation of an efficient and accessible study abroad program. An estimated 800 undergraduates now study abroad each year. We expect at least to double the figure in three to four years and quadruple participation in the program in ten years. Special attention will be paid to establishing opportunities in the developing world and in world areas which are academic priorities at the University.

Libraries: The need is for \$5 million. Demands on the libraries have increased substantially in the last decade without a commensurate expansion of resources. Need analyses indicate a staff shortfall of approximately 100 and an acquisition budget which is 15% below that of peer institutions. The Libraries' emerging role, via Minitex and other interlibrary loan systems, as the central information resource for the entire state and region, new and innovative teaching and research programs, the need for automation, deterioration of the physical condition of existing collections, as well as staggering increases in the cost of acquiring materials due to a weakened dollar, all demand a substantial increase in funding for the Libraries.

Minority Programs: The need is for an annual appropriation building to \$1 million over the next five years, as follows: \$350,000 for minority faculty recruitment, retention and associated programs; \$150,000 to expand recruitment efforts for minority students; \$400,000 for increased financial aid and other student support; and \$100,000 for maintenance of a tracking system to monitor the performance of minority students and associated research to

improve minority retention using that data base. The expenditures are all in response to initiatives recommended by the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus (the Taborn Committee).

Undergraduate advising: The need is for \$1 million, for funds that would be allocated by the Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences to reorganize and improve the undergraduate advising system. The ability to explore the wide variety of intellectual and artistic disciplines in the University, to make informed decisions about courses and programs, and to move efficiently and with distinction through the undergraduate curriculum requires a sophisticated and high-quality advising system. We recognize the need to bring student adviser/advisee ratios and services into conformity with national standards, and to adjust the organization of the advising system to improve coordination and leadership. Particular attention must be given to the advising system for lower division students; this system will include an improved communication network between the lower division student and the upper division professional schools.

Core Programs

Biological Sciences: The need is for \$2.25 million for the biological programs for the institution. This area is unique in the combination of rapid scientific development, exploding future career opportunities, and impact on the state economy and society (agricultural and health science applications).

Engineering, mathematics and physical sciences: Within engineering, among the most pressing needs are for instructional equipment and support staff, and for the seriously understaffed electrical engineering program, each discussed separately. Apart from those urgent needs, however, the engineering programs are of high priority, with exceedingly high student demand, high national distinction and inadequate resources. Mathematics and the physical sciences are central to research and instructional programs throughout the University; particularly urgent needs here are for permanent funds to replace temporary instructional support that has been provided year by year, and funds for research equipment matching grants, responding to the National Science Foundation's increasing insistence on a University contribution to match their own funds for laboratory equipment. The total combined need is for \$2.7 million that will help ease resource constraints in order to protect present high quality and correct weaknesses across the engineering, mathematical and physical sciences.

Humanities: \$1.5 million is needed, primarily for the college's support budget (supplies, equipment and expenses, and teaching assistants). In addition, the administration will be prepared to provide substantial short-term funding for new faculty hires, with the funding to be phased out as resignations and retirements permit.

Lower Division Education: The need is for \$750,000, to be provided after a Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering has been appointed. Many aspects of lower division education at the University are now unsatisfactory due to crowding and inadequate resources. These funds would be directed to those aspects of the program where, in the judgment of the Vice Provost, they would have the largest impact to improve the lower division education experience.

Social Sciences: The request is for \$1.5 million, primarily for the college's support budget (supplies, equipment and expenses, and teaching assistants), although part of the funding might be awarded to other colleges, particularly for an intercollegiate program in the cognitive sciences. The need for further support in the social sciences is particularly urgent because this group of departments includes areas of the University's greatest academic strengths, and retrenchments of the College of Liberal Arts over the past several years have threatened the continued existence of that center of excellence.

Land Grant-Related Programs

Agricultural Experiment Station Multidisciplinary Research: The need is for \$1.5 million. The Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) has built and sustained strong disciplinary science in the traditional disciplines and departments. Some of the departments and programs, and the AES as a whole, are ranked among the top 5 or 10 in the country. However, many of today's problems in agriculture, forestry and related natural resource economies and in rural families and communities can be addressed only by a team of faculty from several disciplines, each contributing their unique expertise towards the solution of the problem. In accelerating such multidisciplinary efforts, the AES also needs to tap additional scientific expertise in units outside of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics. Additional state resources are needed to fund research in some non-traditional units and to facilitate faculty interaction and collaboration across disciplinary lines on addressing major issues and problems of society.

Center for Biomedical Engineering: The need is for \$500,000 to provide core support for a new interdisciplinary program involving the Medical School and the Institute of Technol-

ogy. Start-up funding for the center and an endowed chair for the director or a senior faculty member have been obtained from private sources. This program is of particular importance to the state because of the large concentration of medically-related industry in the Twin Cities.

Center for Biomedical Ethics: The need is for \$300,000 to provide core support for the center which is currently funded by a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation. The center, of the first of its kind in the nation, will develop teaching, research and service programs to assist society in resolving the numerous ethical dilemmas created by new technology in health care.

Computer Science and Electrical Engineering: The need is for \$1 million, to include new faculty positions and substantial increases in expenditures for teaching assistants, technical assistance, supplies, equipment and expenses for the Computer Science and Electrical Engineering departments. The fields are important to the economy of the state; the departments has very strong student demand, and inadequate resources: the ratio of undergraduate and graduate majors to faculty is approximately 50:1 in Computer Science, and 36:1 in Electrical Engineering. This increase in resources, coupled with a slight planned reduction in the number of undergraduate majors, will permit a significant improvement in the quality of the education offered, which will better serve the needs of industry than do the present programs.

Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration: The need is for \$350,000 to provide greater administrative support to the acquiring and implementation of sponsored research, to obtain a clearer profile of trends in sponsored research at the University, and to staff the Executive Research Policy Council.

Outreach: The need is for \$2 million. As a land grant university, the University of Minnesota has a responsibility to help the people of Minnesota live and make a living through research and education. Traditional program emphases and resource constraints have limited the Minnesota Extension Service (MES) from fulfilling a broader role as the major outreach arm of the University. The University will support a broadened mission and capability of the MES as it seeks through nonformal education to enable people to foster full development of youth, adults, families and communities; to improve our economy; and to provide effective natural resource management. Greater flexibility will be achieved with current funding, to secure the involvement of more faculty and staff outside of the

traditional departments and colleges in MES programs. New resources will be sought to enhance this broader role and expand the University's outreach with MES educational programs.

With regard to formal education at the undergraduate and graduate levels, accessibility to the University's programs is sometimes limited because potential students cannot attend classes in the Twin Cities; many are older students who must remain employed while furthering their education. In curricula unique to the University, such as agriculture, and where demand warrants, additional course offerings will be scheduled at off-campus locations to allow students to progress towards degrees without relocation.

Pharmacy: The need is for \$750,000, for laboratory equipment and support for the college. Rank funding comparisons show that Pharmacy is at the bottom of its peer group in direct expenditures per full year equivalent student. It is evident that the college will be unable to maintain its current enrollment without additional state funds.

Public Health: The need is for \$1,250,000. The School of Public Health has been extraordinarily successful in attracting sponsored research and training support, primarily from the federal government. It ranks second among academic units at the University in this regard. A special problem which it faces, however, is an unusually low level of state support, whether measured by the fraction of its budget provided by the state (17%) or direct expenditures per student (last in its peer group). This creates instability and forces the school to adjust its priorities to those of external funding agencies. That fact, coupled with the importance of its programs for the state and significant opportunities now before the University to build a program of national distinction, justify identifying this school as a target for new funding support.

Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratories: The need is for \$300,000 to provide additional core support. The laboratory delivers essential animal health services to the state's livestock and poultry industries and serves as the official laboratory of the Minnesota Board of Animal Health. Although its primary function is service, the laboratory makes a major contribution to the teaching and research program of the College of Veterinary Medicine. The laboratory is currently underfunded and a request for additional support is part of the University's 1988 state legislative request.

Specific Opportunities for Building Quality

Architecture and Landscape Architecture: The need is for an additional \$250,000 which, together with new chairs provided through the Minnesota Campaign, will support the development of a school of national excellence under the leadership of the current director.

Humphrey Institute: The need is for \$350,000, primarily for the development of interdisciplinary programs linked to colleges throughout the University where research and instruction relevant to important issues of public policy arise; examples include policy with regard to agriculture, health, and the uses and consequences of new technologies in industry.

Institute for Mathematics:and Its Applications: The need is for approximately \$400,000 to maintain current efforts that help develop the linkages between mathematics and the fields in which it can lead to new understanding, from ecological systems to economics and from molecular biology to astrophysics.

Management of Information Systems: \$300,000 is needed for the program in management of information systems, to replace temporary funding that will help maintain Minnesota's program at the forefront of this field nationally; the underlying program in Management Information Systems is not only of central importance to the Carlson School of Management, but it is one of the anchors of the computer and information science thrust at the University.

New Interdisciplinary Programs: The need is for \$350,000, to be used under the direction of the Research Executive Council, to support entrepreneurial initiatives for new program development. *Plan for Focus* pointed out that the University of Minnesota has not been at the forefront in development of new areas of research, and that we have no ready mechanism for starting new initiatives and stopping old ones which have been less than completely successful. (The most recent example of a new interdisciplinary program that appears to be succeeding, with the help of the initiatives of several deans, has been the neuroscience program; biomedical engineering offers another successful example.) This fund, administered through the Graduate School, would be used to offer start-up help to new programs, with funding from this source for up to five years; after that, the initiatives would have to obtain regular funding from other sources, or be terminated.

Theoretical Physics Institute: The need is for \$400,000, to be combined with internally re-allocated funds that will provide total University funds of \$650,000 to match external pri-

vate funds for a new initiative in an area in which Minnesota has an opportunity to build a center of national excellence, and at the same time add to the scientific infrastructure of the University.

Research Centers: The need is for \$2 million, to provide required matching funds for new research centers. By mid-January, 1988, 16 proposals for center funding were pending before Federal agencies, 7 were under preparation for submission in the near future, and several others were being developed. Clearly, the University submits many more applications for such centers than it receives funding for, so the exact initiatives to be pursued are not known with certainty. The University offers commitments of matching funds only for those which fit with high programmatic priorities.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

This planning process identified that UMW is already a highly focused college with the single mission to provide technical, collegiate level education preparing individuals for employment at the middle management/semiprofessional level in the broad fields relating to the agricultural industry, as well as services to rural homes and communities. This plan refines this focus so resources at the college can be directed toward developing an excellent technical college.

The plan may be summarized through the following points:

- To set a goal of becoming the top technical college for agriculture in the country.
- To refine the college program offerings through elimination of some majors and combination of other majors. The program will be focused in the areas of new uses of agricultural products and new technologies related to agriculture. Leadership, political awareness and communications skills will be strengthened in the curriculum.
- To strengthen student support services for the traditional, as well as the non-traditional students, with emphasis on support for the academically poorly prepared student, the handicapped, and those students who achieve honors.
- To expand professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.
- To move toward becoming a University of Minnesota Center for southern Minnesota, delivering programs, coursework through units of the Institute of Agriculture,

Forestry and Home Economics, and as an information referral center for other units of the University and to providing customized education for agricultural businesses and industries in the area.

- To develop a program of uniform growth in student numbers by providing programs for the traditional, re-entry and business and industry student.
- To increase the numbers graduating to assist in meeting the needs in agribusiness and industry for graduates of our programs.

Administrative Actions and Regents' Action

University of Minnesota, Crookston

- *Expand interaction and cooperative linkages within the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics and with other postsecondary institutions.*

UMC shifted priorities in 1985 when a programmatic linkage was formally established with the IAFHE. Some joint appointments have been achieved in natural resources, soils, and community resource development; the college is presently working to achieve joint admissions programs. Joint admissions program enrollment between UMC and the College of Agriculture will be implemented in the fall of 1988. A joint publication has been developed and is in the final stage before printing.

Cooperative associate degree health programs with East Grand Forks Technical Institute (TI) are in place and efforts are being made to include other programs. One new program in Radiologic Technology will be implemented in September 1988.

Interaction has been substantially expanded by the creation of a consortium of fourteen educational institutions formed to provide technology transfer on behalf of regional economic development. This consortium is housed on the Crookston campus.

- *Strengthen educational programs and student experiences for students on campus.*

In strengthening educational programs and student experiences, UMC has encouraged faculty professional development and monies were shifted to increase staff participation in professional development activities both on and off campus. Another shift provided funds to divisions to enable students to participate in outside of classroom

academic club related activities such as workshops, industry visits, undergraduate research projects, and other leadership activities.

Equipment has been a priority and UMC has begun to interconnect existing microcomputers for instructional and administrative purposes with a local area network (LAN).

The Ingersoll Group, Inc. was hired in 1987 as a consultant to conduct an audit of and provide recommendations for the student enrollment program.

UMC has increased interaction with units in the IAFHE.

- *Provide educational programs and services to individuals within the region.*

Telecommunications capabilities have been enhanced by the installation of satellite downlink capability on the campus. UMC is working with the University of North Dakota, Thief River Falls TI, and the East Grand Forks TI to establish a fiber optic network which will enable them to disseminate education and information among the four campuses.

Outreach is a key element in UMC's plan to provide educational programs and services to the region. As a first step, the college recently received funding in the Title III Strengthening Institutions Program for \$596,734 over the next three years to: (a) create a center for rural initiatives; (b) develop new courses and programming for nontraditional students; (c) design innovative delivery systems; (d) develop a system of rural needs assessment; and, (e) develop customized educational and training programming for area businesses, industries, agencies, and special interest groups.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

A significant number of elements of the campus plan have already been initiated. Major components include:

- The formation of the Achievement Center with its goal of improving student retention through the coordinated delivery of academic support services.
- The initiation of enhanced leadership training opportunities (e.g., Leadership UMD and the Student Volunteer Leadership Program).

- The improvement of International Education through new faculty hires, a new exchange program with Sweden, and the formation of the Royal D. Alworth Institute for International Studies (including an endowed chair).
- The institution of enrollment management practices which have significantly improved the quality of our student body.
- The pilot CLA core curriculum program will begin fall 1988 with 280 students.
- The Department of Geography has become an independent unit within CLA.
- The Computer Center, Administrative Data Processing, and the telephone and communication system was combined into Information Services. The director of this unit was designated the Chief Information Officer and reports to Academic Administration.
- The newly formed Office of Institutional Research is playing an important role in campus planning and assessment.
- The directing of resources to be able to *require* freshmen to take English composition within the first year.

University of Minnesota, Morris

A number of administrative decisions have been made to carry out the plan. A Director of General Education and a Fall Course Coordinator have been appointed. The Fall Course, composition courses, designation of writing courses, and designation of expanding perspectives courses have been accomplished and will go into effect starting with the 1988-89 academic year. Seven honors courses and eight honors sections of the Fall Course will also be initiated in 1988-89. During the 1987-89 biennium, six additional academic positions were added to help overcome the underfunding problem. Library automation should be in operation by the start of fall quarter, 1988.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

The central administration prepared an overall set of recommendations for the Twin Cities campus to the Board of Regents, *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993*, (February, 1988), which included some recommendations for immediate action and others deferred for further

consideration by the University's governance system. Revised recommendations for immediate action were then published in *Academic Priorities: Next Steps*, approved by the Regents in July, 1988. Appendix I to that document, showing a summary of the recommendations approved by the Regents, is attached as an appendix. A separate implementation calendar, also attached, shows those proposals that have already been acted upon, and those yet to be implemented, with an indication of who is responsible and when action should be expected.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

Administrative action taken includes:

- Five majors in Agricultural Industries and Services have been combined into three majors: Animal Technology, Agronomy Technology, Soils Technology.
- The college has approved the establishment of a Rural Services to the Elderly major.
- The Rural Youth and Recreation major has been eliminated.
- Golf course, turf management and interior landscape emphasis areas are being developed in horticulture.
- The Agricultural Business program area is in the process of evaluating and improving the entire curriculum.
- A leadership skill development education plan for the college is being put into place.
- The Animal Health Technology program has been expanded to meet student and industry needs.

Future Actions

Next Two Years

The Board of Regents has reviewed in detail only the Twin Cities campus planning document. The schedule for review of the other campuses will include a presentation of the plan for each campus over four months from September to December, 1988, with action by the board the following month, ending in January, 1989.

An important part of the system-wide planning effort over the next biennium will be overseen by the newly appointed Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs who has responsibility for minority affairs. Her office will oversee the development and implementation of plans, system-wide, to expand, coordinate and support activities to improve the recruitment, retention and graduation of students of color, and to facilitate recruitment, promotion and tenure of minority faculty. A consulting firm is about to complete (in September, 1988) a project to identify, profile and catalog the minority student and faculty programs now in place, and to assess their effectiveness (see Appendix II). Their report will serve as the basis for increased precision in planning for improvement of the University's overall minority program efforts.

University of Minnesota, Crookston

Major items in the *Strategy for Focus* document yet to be implemented include the following:

- Joint admissions procedures need to be developed with other units within the University.
- Facilitate additional joint appointments and expand cooperative programs with other educational institutions.
- Revise curriculum to reflect student outcomes.
- Develop articulation agreements which enhance transferability to baccalaureate level programs.
- Acquire and maintain appropriate equipment to support teaching and research.
- Expand partnerships with area businesses, agriculture, and government to help develop economic opportunities in rural Minnesota.
- Provide learning opportunities to workers needing career related training and retraining.
- Complete the development of a needs assessment system.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Major items in the *Strategy for Focus* document yet to be implemented include:

- The conversion of Industrial and Technical Studies to Engineering Technology will require the identification of funding sources beyond those available from internal re-allocation.
- The certification of teachers at the graduate level.
- The accreditation of programs in Computer Science, Industrial Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Materials Processing Engineering (expected fall 1988).
- Expansion of some components (e.g., honors) of the undergraduate academic experience.
- Further development of Master's and cooperative Ph.D. programs.
- Significant increase in scholarly and creative activity.

University of Minnesota, Morris

Speaking, computing, and health/fitness requirements will begin during the 1990-91 academic year. The foreign language requirement will start in 1991-92. Additional courses will be added over the next two years to the Honors Program. It is also anticipated that additional faculty will be hired during the 1989-91 biennium to reduce further the underfunding total.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

It will take two years, or more, to complete the organizational changes already approved by the Regents, and to complete consideration and action to implement those administrative recommendations. The Twin Cities campus planning calendar, submitted to the Regents in August, is attached as Appendix III.

According to the original schedule, colleges will be due to review their plans submitted in March, 1987 in Winter, 1989. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has not yet been able to consult with Twin Cities deans to learn whether or not a review during

the coming academic year would represent the best use of collegiate resources, in light of the many organizational changes that will be forthcoming.

One issue that has not yet been fully integrated into the collegiate plans, but will be in the next review, is the expansion of graduate programs in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science to the Rochester community, following an initiative funded by the 1988 Legislature, and possible future development of that initiative.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

Future action to be taken in implementation of the plan includes the following:

- Approval by the University Board of Regents of the Rural Services to the Elderly major.
- Completion of the curriculum changes in Horticultural Technology and Agricultural Business.
- Elimination of merchandising from the Home and Family Services program area, food marketing from the Food Industry and Technology area and combining these areas under Sales and Marketing in the Agricultural Business area.
- Obtaining additional funding base commensurate with a college recognized as the top technical college in the country.
- Further focus summer quarter to develop efficiency in use of resources.
- Increase computer hardware, software, and staff providing for computerization in communications, mathematics, and drafting.
- Expand the faculty and staff development program.
- Further develop the "center" concept with the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics.

*Next Five Years*Twin Cities

The objectives presented in *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993*, are five-year objectives. The anticipated decline in undergraduate enrollment will take that long, and the internal budgetary transfers to be discussed below will take that long, due to tenure and other contractual relations that cannot be terminated immediately. Moreover, the basic objectives of improving quality of undergraduate programs, of strengthening the arts and sciences, and of improving University outreach through a strengthened Minnesota Extension Service, are long-run programs that will not be accomplished even within a five-year period.

Coordinate Campuses

Each campus has continuing objectives for program improvement that will require continuing attention over the next five years, and more. Internal resource shifts identified in campus plans will in some cases also take that long to carry out.

Next Ten Years

A major challenge for the University, and for all of Minnesota's higher education systems, will be to respond appropriately to the expected increase in the number of students from the low enrollment levels of the early 1990s. With current and expected levels of funding, the argument for balance between undergraduate and graduate students within the University would call for most of those new students to be directed to other higher education systems. However this issue has not been formally addressed within the University; it represents an important item for the planning agenda over the next several years.

As mentioned above, the programmatic initiatives currently being addressed by the University are continuing ones that will not be fully achieved over the next five years; those initiatives will remain on our agenda in the future.

RELATIONS TO OTHER SYSTEMS**Community College System**

The University and the Minnesota Community College System in April, 1987, signed an enabling agreement to simplify transfers and improve educational options for Minnesota

college students. That agreement provides for joint admission, concurrent enrollment, and transfer to a community college from the University to pursue an associate degree.

Joint admission means that a student eligible for admission to the University may enter a community college and, pending completion of designated courses and maintenance of required grade average, will have the same opportunity to enter upper division University programs as students who enter the University as freshmen. Concurrent enrollment means that a student eligible for University admission under this program may enroll for a University course not available in their community college curriculum .

Individual College Agreements

Under the enabling agreement, the Colleges of Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics and Liberal Arts on the Twin Cities campus have joint admission and concurrent enrollment agreements with all colleges in the system; the engineering programs in the College of Science and Engineering at Duluth have a joint admission agreement with all colleges in the system; and the Twin Cities campus has agreements for transfer to pursue an associate degree with Lakewood, Minneapolis, and North Hennepin Community Colleges.

The Lakewood transfer agreements took effect July 1, 1988; all of the others took effect on July 1, 1987. They are subject to annual review and renewal.

Relation to University Planning Objectives

The agreement to allow transfer to the community colleges to pursue an associate degree is particularly important to students in light of the decision under *Commitment to Focus* to eliminate associate degree programs at the Twin Cities campus. The agreements for joint admission are also in support of a *Commitment to Focus* goal for the University, to shift resources toward upper division and graduate programs. The extra flexibility provided by the concurrent registration both promotes initial registration at one of the community colleges, and helps to avoid course duplication between those colleges and the University. Table 2, below, shows how many University's Twin Cities campus graduating seniors are transfers from Community Colleges and other systems; it is expected that the percentage will increase over time as a result of this agreement.

TABLE 2

 Scholastic Origin and UM GPA of Spring 1988 Twin Cities Campus Seniors

| | N | % of total | Ave. UM GPA |
|--------------------------------|------|---------------|----------------|
| UM System Natives | 4646 | 53.3% | 2.94 |
| MN Community College Transfers | 1246 | 14.3% | 2.91 |
| MN State University Transfers | 508 | 5.8% | 2.94 |
| Other Transfers | 2314 | 26.6% | 3.05 |

Defintions

UM System Natives: Those who had no transfer credits prior to their first UM term. Includes those who transferred from UM Coordinate Campuses.

MN Community College Transfers: Those who had transfer work before their first UM term and whose most recent non-UM school was a MN community college.

MN State University Transfers: Those who had transfer work before their first UM term and whose most recent non-UM school was a MN state university.

Other Transfers: Those who had transfer work before their first UM term and whose most recent non-UM school was not a MN community college or state university.

Relations with Secondary Schools: Preparation Standards

The University's new preparation standards, to take effect in 1991, has imposed new requirements on the University to communicate with the state's secondary schools, with potential applicants and with their parents. This section reviews both the University's implementation and present planning in this area.

Communication

Communication with interested parties (counselors, students, parents) has been through printed materials and meetings. The printed materials include:

- A brochure, *High School Preparation Requirements*, distributed to all high schools in the state and available to anyone who requests information.
- Detailed information to high school counselors in *Counselors' Quarterly* and the *Counselors' Handbook*.

University officials meet with high school counselors in conferences coordinated through the Prospective Student Service unit (about 600 counselors have participated in these meetings over the past two years), meetings with counselors' associations and various high school prospective student information sessions (parents' nights). They also participate in discussions with the State Board of Education about the availability of courses in the high schools of the state.

During the past year questions from high schools regarding the status of specific courses have been answered by Admissions Office staff. This year Admissions Office staff will visit high schools, gather course information, and provide information to high schools on how each course will be counted toward the preparation requirements.

Project Inform

In July, 1988, \$100,000 was made available to mount programs to provide information about post-secondary education options to the students in Minnesota high schools, especially those that do not have guidance counselors (approximately 30% of Minnesota high schools do not have guidance counselors). A plan for staff visits to high schools throughout the state has been developed and will now be implemented.

Other cooperative programs

University of Minnesota, Crookston

UMC has established cooperative health programs with the East Grand Forks Technical Institute in four areas, with the latest being added in the fall of 1988. UMC provides arts and sciences courses and access to resources that otherwise would not be available to students at the TI. UMC faculty and staff participate in accreditation evaluation visits, and the faculties meet once each quarter to coordinate curriculum and to better meet student needs.

Fourteen northwest Minnesota educational institutions (Alexandria TI, Bemidji State University, Bemidji TI, Detroit Lakes TI, East Grand Forks TI, Fergus Falls community College, Moorhead State University, Moorhead TI, Northland Community College, Staples TI, Thief River Falls TI, University of Minnesota-Crookston, University of Minnesota-Morris, Wadena TI) have formed a consortium to provide technology transfer on behalf of regional economic development. The consortium, housed on the Crookston campus, will: foster community based economic development by working with the Greater Minnesota corporation, Rural Development board, and other agencies; (b) facilitate applied research to existing markets; (c) coordinate the development and utilization of technological innovation and adaptation; (d) promote contract research for individuals and businesses; and, (e) establish a coordinating mechanism to cooperatively promote product and resource development.

UMC is working with the University of North Dakota, Thief River Falls TI, and East Grand forks TI to establish a fiber optic network which will enable them to disseminate education and information among the four campuses. The technology will provide for two-way audio and video communication enabling teachers and students to see and hear each other at all participating campuses.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Besides the community college agreement identified above, the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) has a joint admission agreement with the University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Institute of Technology; UMD undergraduate students have the opportunity to register concurrently at the College of St. Scholastica and at the University of Wisconsin-Superior (UWS).

University of Minnesota, Morris

UMM participates in the 14-member consortium for technology transfer described above for UMC, and has a joint admission agreement with the Institute of Technology similar to that described above for Duluth.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

- The college has agreements with Rochester Community College to provide agriculture courses at RCC on a regular basis.
- Faribault Technical Institute has terminated its agriculture programs and is cooperating with UMW to provide agricultural course offerings in the area.
- Austin Community College has terminated its agriculture offerings and has asked UMW to offer courses in cooperation with ACC.
- UMW is an active participant in the consortium of the post-secondary institutions in the south central and south eastern Minnesota area.
- The college has an active agreement with the College of Veterinary Medicine providing for one quarter of experience within the CVM hospital for UMW students.
- The college has cooperated with the technical institutes of the area, providing marketing and management courses for agricultural business and industry.

SECTION II: FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING

PLANNING FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Internal Reallocations

Administrative Actions and Regents' Action

University of Minnesota, Crookston

As a result of A Strategy for Focus, UMC has carefully reviewed positions and shifted responsibilities among directors. Joint faculty appointments between Minnesota Extension Service, Northwest Experiment Station, and UMC have been increased and some faculty positions shifted from twelve months to nine months. UMC is taking its technical programs out into the region to provide learning opportunities to workers needing career related training.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Reallocation of funds have, to this point, been within the collegiate units.

University of Minnesota, Morris

Internal reallocations estimated at almost \$500,000 will occur during the 1988-89 academic year. Included are faculty assignments to teach both the Fall Quarter and in the Honors Program, support for the Director of General Education and the Coordinator of the Fall Course, library automation, and a position in institutional research.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

The *Strategy for Focus* plans identified approximately \$16 million of internal program reductions, with proposals for internal reallocations to higher priorities. *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993*, proposed that approximately \$12 million of those funds be left with the units for reallocation, with another \$4 million to be reallocated across units, over the five year period. The Administration requested action by the Regents on slightly more than half of that reallocation across units at the July, 1988 meeting, and it was approved. Other parts of the proposal will come forward for action later.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

The college shifts internal dollars during each budget planning period. The *Strategy for Focus* document has been used as a guide in this reallocation this past year as some positions were eliminated and other areas, such as Animal Health Technology, expanded.

*Future Actions*University of Minnesota, Crookston

Joint appointments will be pursued with units in the IAFHE. Additional partnerships with other postsecondary educational institutions will be explored. Programming within present partnerships will be reviewed for possible expansion as computers and telecommunications present new opportunities for access to education.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

The major reduction of resources yet to be implemented is in the School of Fine Arts where three faculty positions are to be reallocated toward the enhancement of our program in liberal arts. Subject to Regents' approval, this reallocation will be phased over the five-year planning period.

University of Minnesota, Morris

Future reallocations from fall, 1989 to spring, 1992 are estimated at \$650,000. They include faculty assignments to teach the Fall Course and in the Honors Program, support for the health/fitness general education requirement, and a library staff position.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Internal reallocations will continue to be reviewed annually, as the annual budget is formed, with biennial review of potential further shifts of funds across units, through the planning process.

University of Minnesota, Waseca

The college will continue to make annual reallocations during each budget planning process using the *Strategy* plan as a guide.

Minnesota Campaign

Private donors made a major contribution to the University's ability to improve the quality of its programs through the Minnesota Campaign. Apart from funds contributed by the State in freeing the Permanent University Fund for use in matching private gifts, this campaign has to date raised \$305 million dollars in contributions and pledges, and has provided 127 endowed academic positions for different departments at the University. In addition to academic positions, contributions have gone to improve undergraduate instruction in composition, computer-aided instruction across the University, the University's minority recruitment program, and to strengthen individual departments throughout the University. University faculty and staff members donated over \$11 million to the programs with which they are associated.

Requested Support from Legislature

Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993, identified approximately \$25 million of funds that would be needed over the biennium in order to meet important goals for program improvement on the Twin Cities campus. That document did not include some essential elements required for the support of academic programs (backlogs of needs for instructional equipment and for academic computing, for example, and funds needed to improve the facilities in support of student life, maintain administrative services and physical plant), and it did not include the needs of the coordinate campuses, of the statewide experiment station program, or of the needs for new graduate initiatives being provided for the Rochester community. The University is now in the process of formulating its biennial request to the Legislature, based on academic planning priorities for all of the campuses, integrating these other elements.

PLANNING FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE INSTITUTION

System-wide Administration

A series of reports by a management consulting firm, in 1986, recommended system-wide re-organization that would give more independence of action to the coordinate campuses. Many of the recommendations were accepted and implemented over the past biennium. An October 24, 1986, memorandum from President Keller and an August, 1988, Administrative Reorganization Update (Appendix IV) shows the outcome to date. Further changes to provide more effective integration of chancellors of coordinate campuses into the Univer-

sity's system-wide decision-making, and to integrate system-wide budgetary decisions with individual campus academic plans, have been made on a temporary basis by President Sauer, but await the appointment of a new president for final organizational decisions.

System-Wide Financial Management

Financial management is at the heart of current planning for improved administration of the University. Recent events have delayed completion of projects, many of them initiated eighteen months or more ago; but overall, the University has benefited from the scrutiny and heightened awareness of the need for improvement in this area that external review provides.

Financial Records

At the heart of financial management is a sound accounting system. The need to replace the accounting system at the University has been recognized for some time but the funding has not been available. The priority of this project has been elevated and work is beginning on it. Because this system is so central to financial management, it is necessary to start here; hundreds of interfaces will be affected.

The accounting system is supported by other financial processing systems. The University is currently engaged in the development of a comprehensive accounts receivable system, which will not only improve financial control but will greatly enhance service to students. An accounts payable, purchasing package has recently been acquired and is being installed; it will improve the University's procurement and vendor relations but, more importantly, provide better service to University departments. Property accounting practices must be upgraded to provide for depreciation accounting, due to financial reporting requirements; this system is also being worked on now. Personnel/payroll processes also require upgrade, but the lack of resources has prevented any improvement beyond accommodating regulatory changes.

The Budget Process

The budget process is another component of financial management that the University is upgrading. The University has recently improved its programmatic planning. Its budget planning abilities have not kept pace and thus the budget is not as responsive to plans as we would like. The University's goal in this area is for a budget development process that

recognizes plans, matches resources to requirements, and rewards performance, with budget administration capabilities that enable managers to monitor the application of resources available to them, and reporting mechanisms that permit timely, comprehensive and relevant budget reporting.

Management of Financial Assets and Liabilities

Another aspect of financial management merits mention. The University is able to point with pride to its cash and debt management and investment program. This area has provided the University with above average return on its investments and maintained a very low cost of money on its debt. While the operations of this area will be affected by the various financial systems discussed earlier, no major changes are planned here.

SECTION III: PHYSICAL PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

Institutional planning at the University of Minnesota integrates academic, financial, and physical planning. The objective of physical planning is to develop facilities needed for academic programs in a timely, efficient, and cost effective manner. Physical planning must be effectively integrated with the other elements of institutional planning because physical development directly affects the delivery of academic programs; the University is now putting in place a planning framework that will assure the needed integration..

One outcome of the planning framework will be a method for project planning and development designed to minimize the cost of replacement, renovation and relocation of facilities required by changes in academic priorities. Physical planning is a medium for achieving the enriched academic environment needed to meet the University's goals in teaching, research and public service.

MISSION

Physical planning promotes cost-effective development decisions that best serve academic and administrative goals. The process operates on the premise that the construction and management of facilities can best serve specific program needs if University standards of space planning, facility programming, design, and construction management are closely linked.

The essential purpose of physical planning is to maintain an environment that allows the University community to address and define its facilities needs and their underlying capital requirements. To be effective, physical planning must be thoroughly integrated into the decision-making framework of the institution.

Commitment to Focus provides the framework and requires a more structured approach to the integration of academic, fiscal and physical planning. The mission of planning in support of *Commitment to Focus* can be fully achieved if policies and guidelines are developed that promote a dynamic relationship among all three planning components.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Flexibility and interaction are critical to reconciling physical planning goals with the plans of academic units. Better consultation will allow these goals to best support the academic departments. The planning process must be sufficiently flexible to make appropriate changes as academic units change directions.

In response to *Commitment to Focus*, the Office of Physical Planning has established the following goals:

- Establish a framework in which Physical Planning serves as the primary catalyst for implementation planning activities.
- Establish and institutionalize procedures to initiate, justify, review and document the Legislative Request for Capital Improvements to obtain the optimum match between program needs and project development.
- Expedite physical changes that offer the most timely and fiscally responsible accommodation of program needs.
- Establish and strengthen an institutional perspective on the use of physical resources, both space and land, by developing and periodically documenting and updating a master plan for the allocation of space and real property assets.
- Enhance the capability of institutional planners and decision-makers to make well-informed and justified plans and decisions based on a valid, current and easily-retrieved information base of space status, property status, and a facilities condition inventory status.

FUNCTION

The physical planning function consist of three interrelated elements. The first, *land use planning*, involves the organization and allocation of land resources for University use. The second, *circulation planning*, involves establishment of the infrastructure for convenient, efficient access to and movement within the institution, including people, vehicle, materials, and services. The third, *facilities utilization*, addresses the use, design, placement, and quality of buildings and support facilities. Combined, these three aspects of

physical planning provide long range guidance and facilitate short range implementation of campus development.

A collaborative planning method will be applied to all physical planning issues at the University of Minnesota to define realistic, attainable goals and objectives, to establish commitment to the achievement of these goals and objectives, and to resolve conflicts between commitments. Effective physical planning will insure that every action is as efficient as possible in utilizing the scarce resources of the University.

CONTEXT

Physical Context

At the University of Minnesota, physical planning addresses a complex array of elements involving multiple campuses, numerous and disparate building types, land holdings statewide, and supporting road and utility infrastructure. The following information illustrates the magnitude of what must be addressed.

The University of Minnesota consists of five campuses, four dispersed throughout Greater Minnesota and a metropolitan campus composed of three separate segments--Minneapolis East Bank, Minneapolis West Bank, and St. Paul. In addition to the five campuses, the University has six Agricultural Experiment Stations, approximately twenty special research facilities (including the 12 square mile, 8,000 acres of research center at Rosemount), and more than 30 miscellaneous properties, as well as the Permanent University Fund lands granted to the University by Congress. The total land holdings exceed 37,500 acres.

The total floor area of all buildings within the University system exceeds 20 million gross square feet, containing more than 35,000 classrooms, laboratories, and support facilities, and having a 1987 book value of \$984 million. The Twin Cities campus alone contains more than 250 buildings.

At the Twin Cities campus there are over 14,000 existing parking spaces and a parking deficiency of some 4,000 spaces. Over one million trips per year are made on the intercampus transit system. The 52 series bus service which brings students within the Metropolitan area directly into the Minneapolis campus handles an average of 860,000 yearly person trips.

From a development perspective, the planning office is currently managing 52 building projects valued at over \$212 million. They are in various stages of planning, design, or construction. Health Sciences Planning currently involves the handling of eleven projects valued at \$120 million.

The Building Official's Office has conducted over 6,500 inspections and has issued an average of 315 building permits. Within the last 12 years they have inspected projects valued at \$620 million.

Presently there are 104 projects for alterations to campus facilities which are in the design period that will cost in excess of \$10 million. There are 84 projects of alteration work under construction worth another \$10.3 million.

Since 1970, 7.2 million square feet of space, which represents nearly one-third of the University's present total building space inventory, has been constructed.

Organizational Context

The Office of Physical Planning must maintain close working relationships with other academic support and service units. Examples of these units and the activities to be coordinated for the Twin Cities include:

- Analysis of space needs and formulation of Legislative Request items for Capital Improvements involves most of the Vice Presidents' and Chancellors' offices.
- Preparation of individual Facilities Program Documents requires leadership at the Deans' offices.
- Upgrading and maintaining information systems on facilities involves Administrative Information Services.
- To establish operating standards for buildings, to plan for infrastructure needs, and design waste management systems, dialogue must include the Physical Plant department.
- To develop parking plans consistent with the campus Long Range Development Plan, and in responding to transportation planning issues, Parking and Transit Services are looked to for their definition of operating needs.

- The preparation of specifications and bid documents for furnishings and equipment requires a close working relationship with the Purchasing Office.
- Compliance with occupational standards rests on frequent interaction with the Environmental Health and Safety Office.

Physical planning also includes consultation with and the support of academic and service units on the coordinate campuses and research and experiment stations.

Management Context

The Physical Planning organization is shaped to support the academic mission of the University. The authority for both policy and program decision rests with the Regents, guided by the President and the Central Officers. Management of physical planning thus includes both management within the Office of Physical Planning and the staff function required to support the central officers whose decisions set the University's physical planning priorities.

The management of physical planning will include the following two key elements:

Formulation of a management protocol

This protocol will guide the central officers and their staff in setting priorities; it will include clarification of criteria and procedures for space allocation, remodelling, and replacement of facilities. A decision making mechanism will be established that can complement the quality of staff work currently provided by Space Programming and Management. The protocol will include the following elements:

- A mandatory consultation process involving relevant areas of administration and the faculty - student governance system.
- Establishment of a committee that would be advisory to the President and Vice Presidents, with responsibility for:
 - the preparation of the capital request,
 - evaluation of requests for remodelling, and
 - allocation of space.

The committee should include, among others, representatives from Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, and Physical Planning.

- Development of an updated long range development plan (LRDP) and establishment of an implementation program which identifies time schedules and costs for development.
- Preparation of a long-range budget plan for new construction, renovation, and upgrading/replacement of infrastructure over a predetermined period of time.

Strengthening the role of the Office of Physical Planning

The role of the Office of Physical Planning should be strengthened, as the office responsible for:

- the preparation of the capital request in accordance with the established implementation plan,
- working with user groups to define project needs within the established physical framework of the University,
- review of all projects and space allocations against the development strategies and criteria of the LRDP.

CAMPUS PLANNING

The planning process at the University of Minnesota is two-tiered. The first tier, *policy planning*, establishes the basic direction and goals of the University. Characterized as the continuous evaluation of academic, financial, and physical needs, policy planning reflects the attitudes and objectives of the institution as a whole.

Long range development planning (LRDP) is a tool of policy planning which establishes specific strategies for successfully achieving the institution's objectives. The LRDP has concentrated on the physical framework of the University, identifying areas for potential expansion and change, in response to anticipated academic and operational needs. To be effective in guiding the growth of the University, the LRDP must be continually updated to integrate academic needs, financial capabilities, and physical constraints into development strategies. In this way the LRDP will become a plan which directs a clearly defined

program of academic and facility development. Without this integration, it merely documents opportunities and desires without defining a vehicle for achieving them.

The second tier of the planning process, *implementation planning*, occurs as specific facilities, responding to established academic needs, are matched with funding opportunities and become a project. It also occurs on a day to day basis as operational and environmental conditions require modifications to the infrastructure of the University. In order for the two-tiered process to be effective, operations and project planning must respond to policy planning. Each major operational area (physical, fiscal, and academic) must execute its programs with the strategies established in the Institutional Plan of which the LRDP is a major component.

PHYSICAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Following is a description of major activities recently completed or ongoing which support or implement the University's planning. These activities are listed under two categories: *comprehensive physical planning* illustrates the variety of problem areas being addressed; and *project development* chronicles the status of representative projects.

Comprehensive Physical Planning

System-wide

- Prepared a comprehensive computer based Real Estate Inventory for University land holdings state-wide.
- Initiated a University system-wide survey of building condition status as part of a state-wide "Inventory" of Post Secondary Education facilities.

Crookston Campus

- Completed the initial phase of a long range academic and physical plan in response to objectives of *Commitment to Focus*.
- Developed a comprehensive informational signage system identifying individual buildings and building groups so as to facilitate easier visitor access.

Duluth Campus

- Updated the 1975 Concept Plan Report for the UMD Central Entrance.
- Initiated efforts to determine objectives for a new library facility and prepared a summary report.

Morris Campus

- Studied steam and electrical distribution systems to provide a basis for future capital requests.
- Made a preliminary study of alternatives for placement of the future addition to the Science complex, new classroom building, and a combination bookstore and post office.

Twin Cities Campus

- Participation in the planning and evaluation of multimodal transportation systems serving the Twin Cities campus, including light rail transit for Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, a bypass traffic plan with the City of Minneapolis, and re-construction of I-94 University exit.
- Developed a Twin Cities campus-wide signage program.
- Developed a survey and strategy for a multilevel service approach to improve transportation access for the handicapped.
- Improved accessibility for visitors to the campus by completing a 230-car parking garage adjacent to Northrop Auditorium on the East Bank campus.
- Implemented plan for a transitway to link the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses and provide access to remote/intercept parking (2,500 spaces).
- Codified the broad Landscape planning principles for the Twin Cities campus with the Committee on Improving the Twin Cities Campus Environment.

- Initiated a major engineering evaluation of over-taxed and aged steam and electrical utility distribution for the Twin Cities campus and to look at options for capacity and reliability improvements deemed necessary for the heating plant.
- Implemented a plan to monitor bicycle use on the Minneapolis campus for compliance with safety and restrictions on designated bikeway routes, trained monitors and added 101 new bike racks to rectify bike parking deficiencies.
- Initiated development of a traffic simulation model for the Minneapolis campus as a tool to evaluate future options for development of parking structures, assess transit routing, and test impact of adjusting roadways in response to future land development plans.
- Began the investigation of conserving scarce land resources in undertaking future development by utilizing, as an alternative, the mined space below the Minneapolis East and West Bank campuses.
- Completed Support Groups Facility Study.

Waseca Campus

- Completed roadway access and parking improvements that re-focus the primary campus entry at the Waseca campus, shifting traffic away from neighborhood streets and better relating parking to facility access.

Project Implementation

Crookston Campus

- Construction of new brick facing and re-roofing for the Owen Hall Annex has been initiated.
- Construction contracts have been awarded through the City of Crookston for the rehabilitation of both a water main and a sanitary sewer.

Duluth Campus

- Construction of the Physical Education Recreational Sports Complex including both indoor and outdoor facilities is substantially completed.

- Construction of the Tweed Museum Sculpture Conservatory Addition, including Environmental Control improvements within the Museum are nearing completion. Occupancy is expected before September 1.
- New Student Housing which replaces the Capehart Housing leased from the Federal Government is in the construction phase. Several of the units will be completed in time for fall quarter occupancy.
- Construction of Phases I and II of the Heating Plant Expansion has begun.

Morris Campus

- Construction has begun on replacement for the Spooner Hall Heating Plant.
- Construction providing a new stair tower to Blakely Hall is 35% complete.
- Design drawings for renovation and roof repair for the old Music Building have been initiated.

Rosemount Agricultural Experiment, Rosemount, Minnesota

- Schematic designs for the Beef Feedlot Resource Laboratory project are completed. Funding for construction has not been authorized.

Twin Cities Campus:

- Construction of the new facility to house the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Departments is 93% complete with substantial occupancy expected by the start of fall quarter of 1988. The Microelectronics component, which will provide state-of-the-art class 10 research clean rooms, will be completed by year end.
- Construction of the addition to and remodeling of Appleby Hall, which will be the new home for General College is 55% complete.
- Schematic plans for both the Minneapolis and St. Paul components of the Twin Cities Recreational Sports Facilities Phase IA project are completed. A first of three bid packages for the Minneapolis facility was released for bidding. A critical path schedule has been established to deliver the swimming pool component in time for the Olympic Festival which will be held in the Twin Cities in the spring of 1990.

- Two floors of the Amundson Hall Mines and Metallurgy Remodeling have been completed and a construction contract has been awarded for the completion of the remaining floors in these buildings.
- Ventilation system upgradings for Coffman Union are complete. The Food Service serving and dining area improvements have been completed. The Student Union study area and food service satellite facilities construction is 30% complete.
- The air conditioning, heating, and code upgrading improvements for Comstock Hall are completed; its food service renovation construction is 50% complete. The design is nearing completion for stair replacement and handicapped ramp improvements.
- The condensate tank modifications to the University Heating Plant are complete. The design for the Plant makeup air system replacement and installation of dividers in the coal bunkers is also complete. Improvements to the men's and women's locker and shower facilities are being designed and deferred maintenance projects for the Plant are in the design stage.
- Bids have been received for Phase IA replacement of electrical equipment containing PCBs.
- Architect selection has been completed and design will start this fall for a Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Research facility.
- The first phase of construction for the Upgrading of General Purpose Classrooms is under construction. The remaining Phase of Classroom Improvements is in the design development phase.
- Land acquisition has been completed for the satellite community University Health Care Center and schematic design has begun.
- Deferred maintenance repairs to University Parking structures have begun with Phase I construction initiated and Phase II and Phase III contracts awarded for construction.
- Design drawings for the replacement of wood siding on several of the buildings at the Como Student Community Housing have been initiated.

- The addition to Green Hall construction has been completed and the construction drawings for the remodeling of the existing Green Hall building are being reviewed prior to their issuance for bidding.
- Construction of the Minnesota Antilymphoblast Globulin (MALG) Laboratory and Animal Facility has begun.
- Construction of the Raptor Research and Rehabilitation Facility is nearing completion with occupancy planned for September of 1988.

Waseca Campus

- Schematic design drawings for the Agricultural Laboratories Renovation are completed.

MAJOR FACILITIES NEEDS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The University's program for renewal outlines the physical facilities needed to support academic programs. Initially, the most dramatic need for renewal expresses itself on the Twin Cities campus. As the planning process shifts emphasis from programmatic changes to the implications for buildings and equipment, the University will establish a more complete list, and a priority order, to integrate the needs of all campuses.

Restoration for the Arts and Sciences

- *Facilities for the Humanities:* Facilities for Humanities are scattered all over the campus and are of uniformly poor quality. The Humanities require the establishment of a sense of place on the East Bank with the construction of a new humanities building and upgrading of older buildings (Folwell, Jones, and Scott Halls). The Fine Arts and Performing Arts require an addition to Ferguson Hall and a new building for the visual arts on the West Bank.
- *Laboratory Facilities:* Laboratories for instruction and research are woefully outdated and in short supply. Major additions to resolve this problem are centered on the construction of the Earth Sciences Building, an enlargement of the Biological Sciences facilities on the St. Paul campus, and a new basic sciences building on the Minneapolis East Bank campus.

- *Faculty of Arts, Science and Engineering (FASE)*: FASE will require administrative space currently not available in the University's inventory of space.

Libraries

New library facilities are required which will support the University's activities through the middle of the 21st century. Current facilities will be overwhelmed in 10 years. Elements of the libraries plan include the renovation of Walter Library as a Science and Engineering Library, the construction of a new archives facility, and the remodeling of Wilson and St. Paul Libraries.

Graduate and Professional Education

The Minnesota Facilities Model does not allocate space for graduate fellowship holders. In recent years, a large percentage of our graduate students are funded by means of fellowships and scholarships. Opportunities to work as teaching assistants will decline with the decreasing size of the undergraduate body. The changing nature of graduate education demands active participation in all departmental activities; all graduate students need desk space, not just those who are funded with research and teaching assistantships. For this group of students, there is a potential space shortfall of up to 100,000 asf.

Professional education requires state-of-the-art classroom facilities. Competitiveness of professional programs is related to the quality of space serving the instructional components of professional programs. The problem is particularly acute for the Carlson School of Management and the College of Education. Major remodeling of classroom and laboratory facilities is required for these programs.

Undergraduate Studies

The University intends to establish a one-stop student service facility in the Williamson-Nolte-Nicholson-Pillsbury area. In addition to the remodeling of Nolte, realization of a one-stop student service requires the construction of a new facility on the Nicholson site, an alternate site, or a major renovation of an existing building.

Enhanced advising facilities are also needed. Academic Priorities places greater emphasis on advising at all levels of undergraduate education. We expect to add staff and we expect to involve faculty to a greater degree than at present. Facilities must be constructed to support the added emphasis and changing division of labor in the area of student advising.

Study space, many more laboratories for student access to microcomputers, an environment for active learning, and classroom facilities that allow the use of modern communication technology, are also required. These needs should be part of an ongoing remodeling process which can be supported by recurring Operations and Maintenance funds.

Research and Technology Transfer

The demands of a changing collection of research centers call for flexible and modular space or a generic research facility. More and more sponsored research is multidisciplinary and demanding of highly specialized and flexible space. Aside from Shepherd Labs there are few facilities which can satisfy the technical requirements of the centers, and none which can readily be made available in a timely fashion to programs that cut across collegiate units. The University is constantly placed at a disadvantage in national competitions for centers because of the absence of this special type of research space. Many centers are directly tied to technology transfer opportunities, serving as incubator facilities for consumers of both basic and applied research.

International Education

The International Center requires remodeling of the YMCA and space for the Institute for International Studies to accommodate research, area centers, and an active study abroad program.

Infrastructure

The changing academic program of the University carries with it increased demands for electricity and water, for distribution of heating and cooling capacity, and for disposal of hazardous wastes. Such hazards as transformers containing PCBs with the attendant risk to life in case of fire, and asbestos used in construction which may be released to the environment, place urgent demands on the University's budget for capital expenditures. Normal and deferred maintenance of the heating plant, steam tunnels and other aspects of the utility distribution network, of the campus circulation system, and of general University buildings must also be adequately funded.

APPENDIX I. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM *ACADEMIC PRIORITIES: NEXT STEPS*

SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS APPROVED AT JULY, 1988 MEETING

"The mission of the University is to serve the people of the state, wherever they may be, through teaching, research, and public service. It also has an additional obligation -- to contribute as fully as resources permit to the meeting of national and international needs".¹

The following recommendations to the Regents are based on, and consistent with, this statement of mission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ARTS, SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

Faculty of arts, sciences and engineering

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the combined faculties of the colleges of arts, sciences and engineering form the faculty of arts, sciences and engineering.

Administrative structure

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends to the Regents the appointment of a Vice Provost for the Arts, Sciences and Engineering, with responsibilities that include the academic administration of the colleges of arts, sciences and engineering.

The organization of freshman admission and entering counseling and advising

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the Provost be instructed, in consultation with the freshman-admitting colleges, to reorganize freshman admission and entering counseling and advising on the Twin Cities campus by Fall, 1991, to

¹A *Mission and Policy Statement for the University of Minnesota, adopted by the Board of Regents July 11, 1980*, p. 3.

provide a single entry point for freshmen, preserving separate paths for students with specialized interests, with central advising and counseling services that are coordinated with the colleges.

The organization of undergraduate education

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that, as part of the re-organized undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus, the position of Vice Provost be given responsibility to work toward:

- expanded opportunities for professional school faculty to participate in undergraduate education;
- increased attention to unit responsibility for advising;
- providing a humane environment for the student; and
- the crucially important improvement in the quality of the classroom experience that is at the core of improvement in undergraduate education.

Colleges to be included in the arts, sciences and engineering

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that colleges reporting to the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering include the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Liberal Arts, General College, the Institute of Technology, and University College; in addition a School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (now in the Institute of Technology) should report both to this Vice Provost and to the Vice Provost for Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics. The Vice Provost will also be named as Dean of University College, with a program director to manage the day-to-day affairs of the college.

BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

Priorities for funding increase

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the Regents endorse the following funding priorities for planning purposes (to be confirmed or modified in biennial requests and annual budgets before implementation):

General Health of the Institution

Computing Services: The recommended increase is for \$2.1 million, primarily for networking.

Instructional equipment and support: The recommended increase is for \$5 million, primarily for annual replacement and maintenance of scientific equipment in instructional laboratories, but also for audio and audio-visual equipment, and for technicians to assist in setting up laboratory demonstrations and for user services in all of these emerging technologies.

International education: The recommended increase is for \$400 thousand

Libraries: The recommended increase is for \$4.85 million, for staff and acquisitions (in addition to the \$150 thousand of Operations and Maintenance funds provided in 1988 - 89).

Minority Programs: The recommended increase is for an annual appropriation building to \$1 million over the next five years, as follows: \$350,000 for minority faculty recruitment, retention and associated programs; \$150,000 to expand recruitment efforts for minority students; \$400,000 for increased financial aid and other student support; and \$100,000 for maintenance of a tracking system to monitor the performance of minority students and associated research to improve minority retention using that data base.

Undergraduate advising: The recommended increase is for \$900 thousand, for funds that would be allocated by the Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences to reorganize and improve the undergraduate advising system (in addition to the \$100 thousand provided in 1988 - 89).

Core Programs

Biological Sciences: The recommended increase is for \$1.75 million for the biological programs for the institution. \$1 million would be dedicated for laboratory equipment and support for the College of Biological Sciences (in addition to the \$0.5 million provided in 1988 - 89), and \$750,000 would be made available to the Policy Council of Biological Sciences.

Engineering, mathematics and physical sciences: The total combined recommended increase is for \$1.2 million that will help ease resource constraints in order to protect present

high quality and correct weaknesses across the engineering, mathematical and physical sciences (in addition to the \$1.5 million provided in 1988 - 89).

Humanities and Social Sciences: \$2.5 million is the recommended increase (in addition to the \$0.5 million provided in 1988 - 89), to be provided after a decision on whether CLA is to be split into two colleges; if so, funds would go to the deans of the new College of Humanities and Fine Arts and the new College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, after the deans have been appointed and the colleges' programmatic plans approved, primarily for support budget (supplies, equipment and expenses, and teaching assistants).

Lower Division Education: The recommended increase is for \$750 thousand, to be provided after a Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering has been appointed and plans for use of the money have been approved.

Land Grant-Related Programs

Agricultural Experiment Station Multidisciplinary Research: The recommended increase is for \$1.5 million.

Center for Biomedical Engineering: The recommended increase is for \$500 thousand, to provide core support for a new interdisciplinary program involving the Medical School and the Institute of Technology.

Center for Biomedical Ethics: The recommended increase is for \$300 thousand, to provide core support for the center which is currently funded by a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation.

Computer Science and Electrical Engineering: The recommended increase is for \$1 million, to include new faculty positions and substantial increases in expenditures for teaching assistants, technical assistance, supplies, equipment and expenses for the Computer Science and Electrical Engineering departments.

Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration: The recommended increase is for \$350 thousand.

Outreach: The recommended increase is for \$2 million for the Minnesota Extension Service, to expand its ability to serve the needs of the state in areas outside narrow questions of production agriculture.

Pharmacy: The recommended increase is for \$750 thousand for laboratory equipment and support for the college.

Public Health: The recommended increase is for \$1.25 million.

Specific Opportunities for Building Quality

Architecture and Landscape Architecture: The recommended increase is for an additional \$250 thousand.

Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratories: The recommended increase is for \$300 thousand, to provide additional core support.

Humphrey Institute: The recommended increase is for \$350 thousand, primarily for the development of interdisciplinary programs

Institute for Mathematics and Its Applications: The recommended increase is for approximately \$400 thousand, to maintain current efforts that help develop the linkages between mathematics and the fields in which it can lead to new understanding.

Management of Information Systems: The recommended increase is for \$300 thousand, to replace temporary funding for the program in management of information systems.

New Interdisciplinary Programs: The recommended increase is for \$350 thousand, to be used under the direction of the Research Executive Council, to support entrepreneurial initiatives for new program development.

Theoretical Physics Institute: The recommended increase is for \$400 thousand, to be combined with internally reallocated funds that will provide total University funds of \$650,000 to match external private funds

Research Centers: The recommended increase is for \$2 million, to provide required matching funds for new research centers.

Recommendations for funding decrease

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the Regents endorse the following reallocations for planning purposes, to be confirmed or modified in annual budgets before implementation:

Instructional Programs in the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics: Reduction of \$700 thousand, to be accomplished to the extent possible by transfer of effort.

Dentistry: Reduction of \$500 thousand, to be accomplished to the extent possible by substitution of research funding for operations and maintenance support.

Nursing Reduction of \$75 thousand, to be accomplished to the extent possible by substitution of research funding for operations and maintenance support.

College of Education: Reduction of \$500 thousand, to be accomplished to the extent possible by transfer of effort and by substitution of research funding for operations and maintenance support.

Continuing Education and Extension: Reduction of \$550 thousand as the MacPhail Center is made independent of continued University funding, with the funds freed retained by the Office of the Provost for reassignment to high campus priorities.

General College: Reduction of \$500 thousand, to be accomplished to the extent possible by transfer of effort as faculty in the college either move to other colleges or begin to participate in teaching in other colleges.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Professional program enrollment reductions

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the Regents endorse these 1992 target enrollment in selected professional programs: Dentistry, 296; Medical School: M. D., entering class of 175, Residents, 1,000; Management (under graduate) 750.

Area studies in the College of Liberal Arts:

Recommendation to regents: The administration recommends that the Regents endorse the CLA plan to close the Department of South and Southwest Asian Studies.

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO.

45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55402
(612) 332-1111

July 18, 1988

Dr. Dolores E. Cross
Associate Provost and Associate
Vice President for Academic Affairs
With Responsibility for Minority Programs
University of Minnesota
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street Southeast
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Dr. Cross:

We are pleased to submit this proposal to identify, profile and catalog the minority student and faculty programs within the University of Minnesota system in order to provide a basis for improving their overall effectiveness. We will also assist in the development of plans to coordinate, monitor and improve the effectiveness of these programs. The plans to manage these programs on a centralized basis is a significant undertaking and we are excited about the opportunity to be a part of it.

Purpose of Project

We understand the purpose of this project to be the establishment of an information and idea baseline for your newly established office. That office has been established by the University in recognition of its commitment to strengthening minority participation and success within the University of Minnesota system. Partially due to the decentralized nature of the University organization, no centralized pool of complete, consistent or organized information currently exists regarding the scope or effectiveness of University related minority programs. The absence of such data will hamper the start-up of your office and the effective development of the improvements which are your responsibility. The University's concerns include the recruiting, development, retention and success of minority students (undergraduate and advanced) and faculty, and the efficient and effective administration and coordination of all minority programs. Specifically, in this project we will identify each of the existing minority programs within or otherwise related to the various colleges and other departments at the University of Minnesota, including outside sources and support from the community, independent organizations and corporations. This will provide the groundwork necessary to effectively develop a plan regarding the administration and coordination of these programs. A preliminary evaluation has indicated that the number and type of minority programs currently in existence is not known. Further, it is very difficult for minority students to be aware of the full range of resources which are available.

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & Co.

Dr. Dolores E. Cross
University of Minnesota

- 2 -

July 18, 1988

Scope of Project

Minority student programs exist within each of the University's colleges and some of the other departments and special service offices at each of the campus locations. The programs include academic, financial, counseling, socialization and cultural resources for minority students to assist them in completing their course work. In connection with this project, interviews will be held with personnel from the various colleges and departments in order to determine what programs currently are available to minority students. Each program will be further analyzed to determine its organization, program objectives, scope of services, sources of funds, use of funds, planning process, reporting system and accountability. In addition, we would inquire as to the existence of other programs or organizations that are not directly related to or funded by the University, but that nevertheless provide support to minority students. The scope of support offered and the relationship to University programs would also be analyzed.

Project Results

There will be several end products of this study. The key deliverable will be an inventory of all minority student and faculty support programs at the University. This inventory will include the key characteristics of each program. We would also assess the objectives of each program, risks associated with the program and its current method of operation, and historical weaknesses of the program. Any redundancy between programs would also be identified.

The inventory will assist you and your staff in assessing the needs of each program in relation to the needs of minorities and the University as a whole. This assessment will be the basis for establishing the organization required to coordinate all of the programs and to developing a reporting and accountability mechanism. We will also prepare and submit a report incorporating our comments and suggestions as to the organization, administration and reporting systems needed to maximize the effectiveness of the programs.

Our Firm and Project Team

We at Arthur Andersen & Co. feel we are well qualified to provide these services to you. Our consulting experience gives us the expertise as well as the resources required to carry out an extensive investigation of this type. We have carefully selected and propose a project team whose experience will meet the needs of this project.

GUIDE TO DISPOSITION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND CALENDAR FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following list includes all administrative recommendations from *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993*, in the order given in the Table of Contents of that book. The first two columns are reprinted from Appendix II of *Academic Priorities: Next Steps*.

"Administrative action" means that the administration has already acted, or intends to act, without requesting formal Regents' action.

"Deferred" means that the item is not now ready for Regents' action, but is expected to be after further steps by the administration or internal governance structure.

"Adopted" items were approved by the Regents at the July, 1988, meeting.

"Adopted with modification" means that the action recommended by the administration and adopted by the Regents has been modified since *Academic Priorities, 1988 - 1993* was first published.

ABBREVIATION KEY

AA - Academic Affairs

AA/Student Aff - Academic Affairs/Student Affairs

CLA - College of Liberal Arts

Dean's Annual Rpt. - Dean's Annual Report

F '89 - Fall Quarter, 1989

NA - Not applicable

S '89 - Spring Quarter, 1989

VP: HS - Vice President for Health Sciences

VP: IAFHE - Vice President for Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics

V Prov - Vice Provost

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Academic Policy | | | |
| EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION | | | |
| For Students | | AA | F '89 |
| For Faculty | | AA/EEO | S '89 |
| EDUCATIONAL POLICY | | | |
| Length of class period | Deferred | U Senate | W '89 |
| Academic effort represented by the credit | Deferred | U Senate | W '89 |
| The Semester System | Deferred | U Senate | W '89 |
| Grading Policy | Administrative action | AA | W '90 |
| FACULTY POLICY | | | |
| Membership in the Graduate Faculty | Deferred | Grad School | S '90 |
| Tenure | Deferred | Faculty Senate | S '89 |
| Retirement | Deferred | Faculty Senate | S '89 |
| Sabbatical Leaves | Deferred | Faculty Senate | S '89 |
| Management Training and Management Reviews | Administrative action | AA | NA |

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|---|
| Academic Organization | | | |
| ORGANIZATION OF THE ARTS, SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING | | | |
| Administrative Structure: Appoint Vice Provost | Adopted | AA/President | F '89 |
| Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering | Adopted | AA | Follows appt of Vice Provost |
| The Organization of Freshman Admission and Entering Counseling and Advising | Adopted | AA/Student Aff | F '89 |
| The Organization of Undergraduate Education | Adopted | Vice Provost | Follows appt of Vice Provost |
| Colleges to be included in the Arts, Sciences and Engineering with modification (Split of CLA deferred) | Adopt | AA AA | Implemented Pending availability of resources |
| Interdisciplinary Units in the Arts, Sciences and Engineering: Institute for International Study | Deferred | AA | S '89 |
| ORGANIZATION OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES | Administrative action | AA | Implemented |
| ORGANIZATION FOR RESEARCH POLICY | Administrative action | AA | Implemented |

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Academic Units | | | |
| Note: In this section, changes in enrollment were adopted by the Regents; funding priorities were accepted by the Regents, subject to later review in annual budgets; they are not explicitly mentioned below. Other issues were dealt with by administrative action, or deferred. | | | |
| AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND HOME ECONOMICS | | | |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | Administrative action | VP: IAFHE | Implemented |
| College of Agriculture | Administrative action | VP: IAFHE | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| College of Forestry | Administrative action (part); name change recommended for separate action. | VP: IAFHE VP: IAFHE | Dean's Annual Rpt Aug '88 |
| College of Home Economics | Administrative action (part); name change recommended for separate action. | VP: IAFHE VP: IAFHE | Dean's Annual Rpt F '89 |
| Minnesota Extension Service | Administrative action | VP: IAFHE | Annual |
| ARTS, SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING | | | |
| College of Biological Sciences | Administrative action | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| College of Liberal Arts | | | |
| Social and Behavioral Sciences | Deferred | AA | Pending availability of resources |
| Humanities and Fine Arts | Deferred | AA | Pending availability of resources |

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|---|--|----------------------|---|
| ARTS, SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING (cont.) | | | |
| College of Liberal Arts (cont) | | | |
| The Arts | Deferred | AA | Pending availability of resources |
| Ethnic Studies | Administrative action | CLA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Area Studies | Adopted | CLA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Comparative Literature and Humanities | Administrative action | CLA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Linguistics | Administrative action | CLA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Research Centers | Administrative action | CLA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| General College | Adopted | AA | Implemented |
| Institute of Technology | Administrative action (part); separation of Architecture adopted | AA AA | Dean's Annual Rpt S '89 |
| University College | Administrative action (part); Vice Provost as dean adopted | AA | S '89 |

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| HEALTH SCIENCES | | | |
| College of Pharmacy | Administrative action (part); | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| College of Veterinary Medicine | Administrative action | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Department of Mortuary Science | Administrative action | VP: HS | Annual Rpt |
| Medical School | Administrative action (part); enrollment reduction adopted | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| School of Dentistry | Administrative action (part); enrollment reduction adopted | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| School of Nursing | Administrative action | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| School of Public Health | Administrative action | VP: HS | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| OTHER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS | | | |
| Carlson School of Management | Administrative action (part); enrollment reduction adopted | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| College of Education | Administrative action | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Continuing Education and Extension | Administrative action (part); independence of MacPhail center accepted, KUOM future deferred. | AA NA AA | Dean's Annual Rpt NA S '90 |
| Graduate School | Administrative action | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs | Administrative action | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |
| Law School | Administrative action | AA | Dean's Annual Rpt |

Implementation Calendar

July 29, 1988

| Recommendation | Disposition | Who takes next step? | Expected date of recommendation to administration |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS | | | |
| Center for Urban and Regional Affairs | Administrative action | AA Director's Annual Rpt | |
| Computer Services | Administrative action | AA Director's Annual Rpt | |
| Concerts and Lectures | Administrative action | AA Implemented | |
| Educational Development Programs | Deferred | AA After appt of V Prov | |
| Office of International Education | Administrative action | AA Implemented | |
| Office of Student Development | Administrative action | AA/Student Aff After appt of V Prov | |
| University Art Museum | Deferred | AA Pending availability of resources | |
| University Libraries | Administrative action | AA Pending availability of resources | |
| University Press | Administrative action | AA Pending appointment of Director | |



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

October 24, 1986

TO: University Vice Presidents
 FROM: Kenneth H. Keller 
 SUBJECT: Administrative Reorganization

In May, 1985, I appointed a task force under the leadership of Vice President Lilly to review the University's organizational and operational structure. Task force members included Acting Vice President Murthy, Vice President Wilderson, and all of our Coordinate Campus Chancellors. The task force was assisted by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company.

This project arose from the perceived need for changes within the administrative structure of the University to support the implementation of Commitment to Focus. Specific objectives of the study were summarized in a letter which I sent to the Board of Regents on May 6, 1985. Briefly stated, these were:

System-Based Objectives

- to develop a structure which assures effective management of a \$1 billion organization
- to integrate planning and budgeting
- to ensure that policies and decisions reflect academic priorities
- to establish clear lines of authority and accountability
- to develop a clearer structure of system-wide administration without proliferation of central administrators

Campus-Based Objectives

- to ensure individual campuses develop in a way which emphasizes connection to the University in:
 - . program development
 - . standards of quality
 - . cost effectiveness
- to increase autonomy for campuses to manage their own affairs

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 2

From May, 1985, through May, 1986, the task force and Peat Marwick's Higher Education Consulting Group worked with hundreds of people throughout the University. Their analyses and recommendations were summarized in a series of nine reports which were then forwarded to me. Based on my review of these reports, as well as further discussions with you and others throughout the University, I am asking that specific recommendations be acted on at this time. These recommendations are outlined in the following pages. Detailed reports are available through Vice President Lilly's office. In the months ahead, we will want to take action on other recommendations in these reports, as well. Brian Gorman, Assistant to Vice President Lilly, provided the primary staff support on this project, and is also available to discuss specific issues with you.

It is intended that implementation take place immediately. In cases where additional work is required, I ask that this start now. If the recommended changes cannot be completed by January 1, 1987, please provide a time line for completion.

At this time we have not reached a decision on certain recommendations. Responsibility for continuing work in each of these areas is outlined below. I will keep you apprised of our progress on these issues.

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND PURCHASING

The Peat, Marwick study made a number of recommendations on decentralization of accounts payable and purchasing functions. The financial vice chancellors on the coordinate campuses supplied preliminary data which was analyzed centrally. It is estimated that full implementation of these recommendations would involve \$19,000 in non-recurring and \$130,924 in recurring costs. Therefore, I do not believe it is advisable to implement these changes.

BUDGETING AND PLANNING

-- Planning will be more comprehensive (including non-academic units), based on academic objectives, and will drive the budget process. All Vice Presidents will be responsible for implementing this change.

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 3

- Coordination of planning, budgeting, and institutional research will be integrated into one unit reporting to the President. I have approved this recommendation and will proceed with the staffing thereof. I will notify you of the effective transfer date(s) as they affect your units.
- Complete base budgeting will be implemented for the 1987-1988 fiscal year. The budgeting process will be based upon responsibility centers and will include:
 - . anticipated expenditures and contingency funds required to support the activities of each responsibility center for the coming year;
 - . currently available resources, estimated future revenues, and allotments needed to meet the planned expenditures and contingency funds;
 - . the exercise of budgetary control at the responsibility center level;
 - . the assignment of fiscal authority commensurate with responsibility; and
 - . an evaluation process whereby managers are held accountable for financial performance within their units.
- The budget process will establish better use of automation.
- Budget policies and procedures will be documented.

CASH MANAGEMENT

- Cash management will remain centralized, except that central administration will explore opportunities for unit participation in short-term investment earnings. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 4

CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL

- The central personnel office will retain responsibility for overall personnel program planning, development, monitoring and control. This includes, but is not limited to: employee benefits; job classification; and contract negotiation, administration, and interpretation.
- The responsibility for hiring new personnel will be shifted entirely to the campus level. The central personnel office will still retain responsibility for compilation and processing of employee statistics based on information generated by campuses. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.
- Campuses rather than the central personnel office will review performance ratings. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this change.
- Campuses will execute all job evaluation procedures, utilizing approved instruments. The central personnel office will continue participation in the appeal process. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.
- Campuses will retain all official, active personnel files. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this change.
- The central personnel office will continue to provide the repository for inactive files.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

- Campuses will assume responsibility for Civil Service affirmative action programs. This includes the establishment of campus goals utilizing a system which incorporates local demographic data. Patricia Mullen, Director of EEO, will coordinate this change.
- The EEO Office will retain responsibility for institutional reporting.

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 5

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND PHYSICAL PLANT

- Design-related services will continue to be provided at the system level.
- System-wide policies and standards for operations and maintenance will be developed. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.
- Real estate services will continue to be provided at the system level, except that campuses will have ability to negotiate directly and to enter into low exposure leases. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this change.
- Real estate will be more aggressively managed as part of an overall asset management program. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.
- Continued consideration is being given to the reporting lines for the Twin Cities plant operations and maintenance (Physical Plant). This is a part of the overall organizational structure I am continuing to review.

PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FACULTY PERSONNEL

- Campuses will assume responsibility for review of the search process. Vice President Benjamin will coordinate this effort.
- Campuses will assume personnel system functions including review, data entry, and records maintenance for current employees. Vice President Benjamin will coordinate this effort.
- Further study is needed regarding the appropriate role for central administration in tenure decisions. Furthermore, additional consultation is needed prior to a final decision. Vice President Benjamin will coordinate this effort.

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 6

STUDENT FEES

- Student services fees will be established at the campus level. Vice President Wilderson will continue the work he has begun in this area.
- Administrative fees will be set at the campus level for those fees which are for campus-based activities or services. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.
- Administrative fees will be set at the system level when the fees are for system-wide activities or services. Vice President Lilly will coordinate this effort.

STUDENT SERVICES

- Central Systems should be absorbed by AIS with responsibility and budget allocated to campuses and to AIS. The MIS Steering Committee will coordinate this change.
- Access to data for research and reports should be granted to campuses for campus specific needs. The MIS Steering Committee will coordinate this change.
- Student Financial Aid (Twin Cities Campus) will report to the Twin Cities Provost. Vice President Wilderson will coordinate this change.
- Completion of the FISAP Report for campus-based Title IV programs will be done at the campus level. Vice President Wilderson will coordinate this effort.
- Tuition assistance funds will be allocated directly to campuses. Vice President Wilderson will coordinate this effort.
- Campuses will assume direct responsibility for administration of foundation scholarship programs. Vice President Wilderson will coordinate this effort.
- Multi-campus and University reporting will be handled centrally. The MIS Steering Committee will coordinate this effort.

University Vice President
October 24, 1986
Page 7

- Budget allocations in support of publications and miscellaneous services will be made directly to individual campuses. Vice President Wilderson will coordinate this effort after review of existing budget levels.

STUDENT WAGE RATES

- It was recommended that campuses have autonomy to tailor student employment in terms of both position classification and wage rates. I have asked Vice President Dunham to provide me with a legal opinion on this issue, before taking final action.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

- To ensure the maximum utilization of our MIS resources, priorities for the development of administrative information systems will be established centrally. The MIS Steering Committee will fulfill this function.

KHK:kb

- c: Edward C. Frederick, Chancellor, University of Minnesota-Waseca
Robert L. Heller, Chancellor, University of Minnesota-Duluth
John Q. Imholte, Chancellor, University of Minnesota-Morris
Donald G. Sargeant, Chancellor, University of Minnesota-Crookston
David J. Berg, Associate Vice President, Management Planning and Information Services
Patricia A. Mullen, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action
H. Peter Pyclik, Director, Administrative Information Services
Richard B. Heydinger, Senior Assistant to the President

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION UPDATE
(Reference President Keller's Memo of 10/24/86)

BUDGETING AND PLANNING

1. Planning will be more comprehensive (including non-academic units), based on academic objectives, and will drive the budget process.

STATUS: Some progress in initiating comprehensive planning through the Strategy for Focus process. The priorities identified in Academic Priorities: Next Steps guide the 1989-91 biennial request currently underway.

2. Coordination of planning, budgeting, and institutional research will be integrated into one unit reporting to the President.

STATUS: Limited progress. MPIS was relocated from Finance to the President's Office.

3. Complete base budgeting based upon responsibility will be implemented for the 1987-88 fiscal year.

STATUS: No progress, although newly hired Director of Budget Management has identified needs to begin implementing complete base budgeting within the next few years.

4. The budget process will establish better use of automation.

STATUS: No progress.

5. Budget policies and procedures will be documented.

STATUS: No progress.

-2-

CASH MANAGEMENT

6. Cash management will remain centralized, except that central administration will explore opportunities for unit participation in short-term investment earnings.

STATUS: Not implemented. Acting Vice President for Finance and Physical Planning recommends no change.

CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL

7. The responsibility for hiring new personnel will be shifted entirely to the campus level. The central personnel office will still retain responsibility for compilation and processing of employee statistics.

STATUS: Completed.

8. Campuses rather than the central personnel office will review performance ratings.

STATUS: Completed.

9. Campuses will execute all job evaluation procedures, utilizing approved instruments. The central personnel office will continue participation in the process.

STATUS: Completed for all campuses except UMD, for which plans are currently underway.

10. Campuses will retain all official, active personnel files.

STATUS: No progress.

-3-

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

11. Campuses will assume responsibility for Civil Service affirmative action programs. This includes the establishment of campus goals utilizing a system which incorporates local demographic data.

STATUS: Some progress. Responsibility for Form 18 processing shifted to campuses.

PHYSICAL PLANNING AND PHYSICAL PLANT

12. System-wide policies and standards for operations and maintenance will be developed.

STATUS: No progress.

13. Real estate services will continue to be provided at the system level, except that campuses will have ability to negotiate directly and to enter into low exposure leases.

STATUS: Some progress. Campuses may initiate low-exposure leases to be processed/approved at the system-level.

14. Real estate will be more aggressively managed as part of an overall asset management program.

STATUS: Some progress. Inventory records have been created. Real estate disposal is being recommended, and oversight committees are being formed.

15. Continued consideration is being given to the reporting lines for the Twin Cities plant operations and maintenance (Physical Plant).

STATUS: Completed. Physical Plant shifted to Twin Cities Provost's area of responsibility with continued consideration given to reporting lines.

-4-

PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FACULTY PERSONNEL

16. Campuses will assume responsibility for review of the search process.

STATUS: No progress.

17. Campuses will assume personnel system functions including review, data entry, and records maintenance for current employees.

STATUS: No progress. Availability of funds limits progress.

18. Further study is needed regarding the appropriate role for central administration in tenure decisions.

STATUS: Some progress. Review process continues in accord with 1985 Tenure Regulations. Under the 1987-88 Agreement with University Educational Association (UEA), Duluth and Waseca have more autonomy.

STUDENT FEES

19. Student services fees will be established at the campus level.

STATUS: Completed. Chancellors approve the fee structure which is submitted to the President.

20. Administrative fees will be set at the campus level for those fees which are for campus-based activities or services.

STATUS: Completed.

-5-

STUDENT SERVICES

21. Central Systems should be absorbed by AIS with responsibility and budget allocated to campuses and to AIS.
STATUS: No progress.

22. Access to data for research and reports should be granted to campuses for campus specific needs.
STATUS: Some progress. Administrative Information Service's Information Center has system capabilities to facilitate data access. Added support about privacy and security issues is available from Student Support Services.

23. Student Financial Aid (Twin Cities Campus) will report to the Twin Cities Provost.
STATUS: Not implemented. President Keller and Vice President Wilderson agreed to defining and coordinating responsibility within the existing structure.

24. Completion of the FISAP Report for campus-based Title IV programs will be done at the campus level.
STATUS: Partially implemented. Duluth and Morris complete the FISAP report. Twin Cities complete Waseca's and Crookston's at their request.

25. Tuition assistance funds will be allocated directly to campuses.
STATUS: Completed.

-6-

26. Campuses will assume direct responsibility for administration of foundation scholarship programs.

STATUS: Partially completed. Some merit award programs continue to be administered centrally as required by the programs (e.g. National Merit).

27. Budget allocations in support of publications and miscellaneous services will be made directly to individual campuses.

STATUS: Not completed. Coordinate campuses want to continue the service provided in Twin Cities Student Support Services.

STUDENT WAGE RATES

28. It was recommended that campuses have autonomy to tailor student employment in terms of both position classification and wage rates.

STATUS: Some progress. Being advanced through the all-University Student Employment Committee recommendations currently being reviewed by Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, President, and Vice President.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

29. To ensure the maximum utilization of our MIS resources, priorities for the development of administrative information systems will be established centrally.

STATUS: Little progress. MIS staff assist collegiate units in setting priorities within departments/colleges. No effective central prioritization mechanism exists.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE
Fall Quarter, 1987
College and Level of Instruction

| | <u>Lower Division</u> 1XXX | <u>Upper Division</u> 3XXX | <u>Professional</u> <u>Upper D. & Grad</u> 5XXX | <u>Graduate</u> 8XXX |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Agriculture | 24.1 | 16.7 | 10.4 | 6.4 |
| Biological Sciences | 53.8 | 26.3 | 26.5 | 7.1 |
| Dentistry | 22.1 | 21.5 | 60.6 | 5.1 |
| Education | 21.1 | 25.4 | 13.8 | 7.0 |
| Forestry | 22.5 | 33.5 | 9.9 | 4.1 |
| General College | 32.4 | 16.2 | ---- | ---- |
| Home Economics | 34.5 | 18.9 | 18.7 | 10.4 |
| Law | ---- | ---- | 39.7 | ---- |
| Liberal Arts | 36.2 | 23.4 | 15.4 | 6.9 |
| Management | 33.7 | 39.0 | 23.3 | 23.1 |
| Medicine | 51.0 | 45.2 | 30.4 | 24.2 |
| Nursing | ---- | ---- | 12.4 | 6.4 |
| Pharmacy | ---- | ---- | 35.8 | 5.7 |
| Public Affairs | ---- | ---- | 18.1 | 10.0 |
| Public Health | ---- | 182.7 | 15.0 | 5.6 |
| Technology | 52.0 | 34.6 | 23.6 | 11.5 |
| Veterinary Medicine | 20.5 | 28.0 | 37.4 | 1.9 |
| Duluth - Business and Economics | 43.1 | 15.5 | 14.0 | 12.3 |
| Duluth - Education and Human Service Prof. | 20.8 | 19.5 | 14.7 | 9.2 |
| Duluth - Fine Arts | 20.6 | 7.0 | 3.6 | 2.0 |
| Duluth - Liberal Arts | 32.1 | 21.6 | 7.3 | 6.7 |
| Duluth - Medicine | ---- | 1.0 | 31.8 | ---- |
| Duluth - Science and Engineering | 53.9 | 17.3 | 11.5 | 4.8 |
| Morris | 30.3 | 13.5 | ---- | ---- |
| Crookston | 17.5 | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Waseca | 19.3 | ---- | ---- | ---- |

Appendix - Table 2

| | UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA | | | | | C=Planned Ceiling | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| | Headcount Enrollments-Fall Term | | | | | M=Jointly Managed Objective | | | | |
| | Actual and Current Planning Assumptions | | | | | Others=Unconstrained Forecast | | | | |
| | Fall 1980 | Fall 1985 | Fall 1986 | Fall 1987 | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 | |
| | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,516 | 991 | 865 | 740 | 732 | 724 | 716 | 708 | 700 | M |
| Masters | 5 | 13 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | |
| Specials | 142 | 65 | 48 | 17 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | M |
| Collegiate | 1,661 | 1,275 | 932 | 774 | 792 | 784 | 776 | 768 | 760 | |
| Grad School | 522 | 472 | 499 | 508 | 495 | 490 | 490 | 490 | 490 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 2,183 | 1,547 | 1,431 | 1,282 | 1,287 | 1,274 | 1,266 | 1,258 | 1,250 | |
| Biological Sciences | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 356 | 333 | 304 | 312 | 316 | 319 | 322 | 324 | 324 | |
| Specials | 83 | 35 | 28 | 18 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | |
| Collegiate | 439 | 368 | 332 | 330 | 343 | 346 | 349 | 351 | 351 | M |
| Grad School | 196 | 195 | 200 | 177 | 206 | 206 | 206 | 206 | 206 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 635 | 563 | 532 | 507 | 549 | 552 | 555 | 557 | 557 | |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,386 | 1,319 | 1,373 | 1,455 | 1,240 | 940 | 790 | 740 | 620 | M |
| Masters (M.Ed) | 283 | 401 | 358 | 387 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 400 | 450 | |
| Other Postbaccalaureate | | | | 27 | 40 | 190 | 275 | 375 | 475 | |
| Specials | 577 | 591 | 622 | 228 | 440 | 440 | 480 | 480 | 490 | M |
| Collegiate | 2,246 | 2,311 | 2,353 | 2,097 | 2,120 | 1,950 | 1,925 | 1,995 | 2,015 | |
| Grad School | 1,181 | 959 | 965 | 1,049 | 1,020 | 1,020 | 1,020 | 1,020 | 1,020 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 3,147 | 3,272 | 3,338 | 3,146 | 3,100 | 2,950 | 2,925 | 3,015 | 3,035 | |
| Forestry | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 324 | 293 | 301 | 278 | 262 | 246 | 230 | 212 | 194 | |
| Specials | 13 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | |
| Collegiate | 337 | 308 | 314 | 284 | 273 | 257 | 241 | 223 | 205 | M |
| Grad School | 91 | 91 | 113 | 103 | 121 | 121 | 121 | 121 | 121 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 428 | 399 | 427 | 387 | 394 | 378 | 362 | 344 | 326 | |
| General College | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 3,321 | 3,240 | 2,976 | 2,742 | 2,620 | 2,520 | 2,400 | 2,290 | 1,960 | |
| Variance from Model | | | | -46 | -143 | -221 | -299 | -377 | -455 | |
| Specials | 47 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | |
| Collegiate | 3,346 | 3,250 | 2,988 | 2,750 | 2,465 | 2,288 | 2,110 | 1,922 | 1,514 | M |
| Dental Hygiene | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 215 | 49 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 48 | 72 | 72 | 72 | |
| Specials | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 215 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 72 | 72 | 72 | C |

| | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 Actual | Fall 1988 Actual | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 Actual | Fall 1989 Actual | Fall 1990 Actual | Fall 1991 Actual | Fall 1992 Actual | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Dentistry | | | | | | | | | | |
| D.D.S. | 586 | 494 | 485 | 494 | 494 | 494 | 494 | 494 | 494 | |
| Variance from Model | | -65 | -85 | -126 | -134 | -158 | -183 | -203 | -198 | |
| Specials | 6 | 9 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 41 | 51 | 61 | 61 | |
| Collegiate | 582 | 438 | 461 | 468 | 391 | 377 | 362 | 352 | 357 | C |
| Grad School | 51 | 54 | 50 | 52 | 61 | 68 | 71 | 75 | 72 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 643 | 492 | 471 | 460 | 452 | 445 | 433 | 427 | 429 | |
| Medical School | | | | | | | | | | |
| M.D. | 1,073 | 1,022 | 943 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | C |
| Variance from Model | | -22 | -67 | -142 | -137 | -157 | -157 | -157 | -157 | C |
| M.D. Contract | 34 | | | | | | | | | |
| Post-M.D. Fellows | 859 | 544 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | C |
| Variance from Model | | | -14 | -72 | -95 | -127 | -127 | -127 | -127 | C |
| Nurse Anesthetists | 10 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | C |
| M.D. Not Registered | | *52 | *109 | *49 | | | | | | |
| Post-MD Fellows Not Reg. | *61 | *105 | | *75 | | | | | | |
| Nurse Anesth. Not Reg. | *17 | | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 1,975 | 1,949 | 1,934 | 1,912 | 1,895 | 1,843 | 1,843 | 1,843 | 1,843 | |
| Grad School | 398 | 286 | 310 | 268 | 317 | 318 | 321 | 322 | 322 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 2,374 | 2,235 | 2,244 | 2,180 | 2,212 | 2,161 | 2,164 | 2,165 | 2,165 | |
| Medical Technology | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 89 | 53 | 49 | 50 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | |
| Specials | 22 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| Collegiate | 111 | 57 | 53 | 52 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | C |
| Montuany Science | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 77 | 64 | 64 | 50 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | |
| Specials | | | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 77 | 64 | 64 | 50 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | C |
| Nursing | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 495 | 345 | 467 | 467 | 467 | 467 | 467 | 467 | 467 | |
| Variance from Model | | | -138 | -159 | -176 | -271 | -271 | -271 | -271 | |
| Specials | 7 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| Collegiate | 503 | 345 | 332 | 309 | 293 | 198 | 198 | 198 | 196 | C |
| Grad School | 223 | 153 | 186 | 136 | 185 | 185 | 185 | 185 | 185 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 726 | 499 | 518 | 445 | 478 | 383 | 383 | 383 | 383 | |
| Occupational Therapy | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 76 | 69 | 66 | 73 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | |
| Specials | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 77 | 70 | 69 | 75 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | C |

| | Fall 1980 Actual | Fall 1985 Actual | Fall 1986 Actual | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Pharmacy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baccalaureate | 294 | 218 | 235 | 252 | 255 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | C |
| Pharm. D. | 61 | 84 | 85 | 75 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | C |
| Specials | 12 | 2 | 1 | 21 | | | | | | C |
| Collegiate | 367 | 324 | 321 | 329 | 333 | 345 | 345 | 345 | 345 | |
| Grad School | 79 | 82 | 81 | 73 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 446 | 386 | 402 | 402 | 413 | 430 | 435 | 440 | 445 | |
| Physical Therapy | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 61 | 59 | 61 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | |
| Specials | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 61 | 59 | 63 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | C |
| Public Health | | | | | | | | | | |
| Masters | 319 | 260 | 247 | 220 | 218 | 223 | 228 | 233 | 238 | |
| Psychology Fellow Spec. | 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| Specials | 61 | 16 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | |
| Collegiate | 365 | 276 | 257 | 231 | 230 | 235 | 240 | 245 | 250 | C |
| Grad School | 117 | 113 | 114 | 122 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 115 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 505 | 389 | 371 | 353 | 330 | 340 | 350 | 360 | 365 | |
| Home Economics | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,299 | 1,302 | 1,278 | 1,295 | 1,218 | 1,141 | 1,064 | 987 | 910 | |
| Specials | 88 | 45 | 42 | 27 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | |
| Collegiate | 1,387 | 1,347 | 1,320 | 1,322 | 1,256 | 1,179 | 1,102 | 1,025 | 948 | M |
| Grad School | 128 | 324 | 311 | 343 | 315 | 315 | 315 | 315 | 315 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 1,515 | 1,651 | 1,631 | 1,665 | 1,571 | 1,494 | 1,417 | 1,340 | 1,263 | |
| Humphrey Institute | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad School | 92 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 158 | 168 | 178 | 178 | 178 | |
| Grad School | 92 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 158 | 168 | 178 | 178 | 178 | |
| Law | | | | | | | | | | |
| J.D. | 728 | 755 | 767 | 766 | 760 | 760 | 760 | 760 | 760 | |
| Specials | | 10 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| Collegiate | 728 | 765 | 780 | 771 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 | C |
| Grad School | | | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 728 | 765 | 780 | 771 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 | |
| Liberal Arts | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 16,783 | 15,633 | 16,362 | 15,228 | 14,904 | 14,467 | 13,531 | 13,135 | 12,725 | |
| Variance from Model | | | | 1,499 | 1,644 | 1,469 | 1,748 | 1,564 | 1,394 | |
| Specials | 1,176 | 500 | 467 | 355 | 445 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | |
| Collegiate | 17,879 | 16,133 | 16,829 | 17,082 | 16,993 | 16,336 | 15,679 | 15,099 | 14,519 | M |
| Grad School | 2,203 | 1,671 | 1,722 | 1,762 | 1,770 | 1,775 | 1,775 | 1,783 | 1,783 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 20,082 | 17,804 | 18,551 | 18,844 | 18,763 | 18,111 | 17,454 | 16,882 | 16,302 | |
| Management | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,483 | 1,548 | 1,526 | 1,526 | 1,526 | 1,526 | 1,526 | 1,526 | 1,526 | |
| Variance from Model | | | -22 | -149 | -289 | -416 | -543 | -670 | -797 | |
| Specials | 51 | 23 | 32 | 7 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | |
| Collegiate | 1,534 | 1,571 | 1,536 | 1,364 | 1,258 | 1,131 | 1,004 | 877 | 750 | C |
| Grad School | 1,207 | 1,425 | 1,511 | 1,534 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 2,541 | 2,596 | 3,047 | 2,918 | 2,758 | 2,631 | 2,504 | 2,377 | 2,250 | |

| | Fall 1980 | Fall 1985 | Fall 1986 | Fall 1987 | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | | | | | |
| Technology | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 5,364 | 5,430 | 5,362 | 5,362 | 5,362 | 5,362 | 5,362 | 5,362 | 5,362 |
| Variance from Model | | | | -250 | -292 | -334 | -375 | -419 | -462 |
| Specials | 468 | 318 | 326 | 267 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Collegiate | 5,853 | 5,748 | 5,666 | 5,379 | 5,370 | 5,328 | 5,286 | 5,243 | 5,200 |
| Grad School | 1,845 | 1,625 | 1,655 | 1,913 | 1,702 | 1,705 | 1,712 | 1,720 | 1,720 |
| Collegiate & Grad | 6,897 | 7,377 | 7,323 | 7,292 | 7,072 | 7,033 | 6,998 | 6,963 | 6,920 |
| University College | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 152 | 121 | 125 | 136 | 131 | 126 | 120 | 114 | 108 |
| Specials | 12 | 5 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Collegiate | 154 | 126 | 125 | 136 | 133 | 128 | 122 | 116 | 110 |
| Veterinary Medicine | | | | | | | | | |
| D.V.M. | 316 | 308 | 309 | 309 | 309 | 309 | 309 | 309 | 309 |
| Variance from Model | | | -15 | -27 | -58 | -63 | -63 | -63 | -63 |
| Specials | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Collegiate | 316 | 310 | 294 | 285 | 253 | 248 | 248 | 240 | 248 |
| Grad School | 78 | 94 | 96 | 95 | 99 | 101 | 103 | 105 | 105 |
| Collegiate & Grad | 390 | 424 | 390 | 380 | 352 | 349 | 351 | 353 | 353 |
| Two Cities Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 32,418 | 30,850 | 31,225 | 29,919 | 29,040 | 28,299 | 26,833 | 26,170 | 25,181 |
| Variance from Model | 0 | 0 | -160 | 893 | 744 | 227 | 359 | -173 | -591 |
| Net | 32,418 | 30,850 | 31,066 | 30,712 | 29,784 | 28,326 | 27,092 | 25,997 | 24,590 |
| Masters | 668 | 696 | 634 | 635 | 627 | 632 | 637 | 662 | 717 |
| Education Postbaccalaureate | | | | 27 | 40 | 190 | 275 | 375 | 475 |
| Specials | 2,786 | 1,612 | 1,584 | 939 | 1,340 | 1,295 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,345 |
| D.D.S. | 592 | 503 | 506 | 514 | 525 | 535 | 545 | 555 | 555 |
| Variance from Model | | -65 | -85 | -106 | -134 | -158 | -183 | -203 | -196 |
| Net | 592 | 438 | 421 | 408 | 391 | 377 | 362 | 352 | 357 |
| M.D. | 1,073 | 1,022 | 943 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 1,052 |
| Variance from Model | | -22 | -67 | -142 | -137 | -157 | -157 | -157 | -157 |
| Net | 1,073 | 960 | 876 | 910 | 915 | 895 | 895 | 895 | 895 |
| N.D. Contract | 34 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Post-M.D. Fellows | 859 | 944 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 1,050 |
| Variance from Model | | | -14 | -72 | -95 | -127 | -127 | -127 | -127 |
| Net | 859 | 944 | 1,036 | 978 | 955 | 923 | 923 | 923 | 923 |
| Nurse Anesthetists | 10 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Pharmacy B.S. | 206 | 220 | 236 | 254 | 265 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 |
| Pharm.D. | 61 | 84 | 85 | 75 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Psychology Fellow Spec. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C.D. | 728 | 755 | 730 | 771 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 | 770 |
| D.V.M. | 318 | 310 | 309 | 312 | 311 | 311 | 311 | 311 | 311 |
| Variance from Model | | | -15 | -27 | -58 | -63 | -63 | -63 | -63 |
| Net | 318 | 310 | 294 | 285 | 253 | 248 | 248 | 240 | 248 |
| Graduate School | 7,325 | 7,666 | 7,972 | 8,275 | 8,109 | 8,142 | 8,177 | 8,230 | 8,232 |
| Total | 47,388 | 44,390 | 45,200 | 44,293 | 43,542 | 42,168 | 41,084 | 40,157 | 38,923 |
| Undergraduate/Grad | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.38 | 3.68 | 3.75 | 3.54 | 3.55 | 3.30 | 3.12 | 2.95 | 2.75 |

| | Fall 1980 Actual | Fall 1985 Actual | Fall 1986 Actual | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Business & Economics-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,409 | 1,495 | 1,538 | 1,529 | 1,410 | 1,357 | 1,274 | 1,218 | 1,160 |
| Specials | 10 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 18 | 26 | 30 | 35 |
| Collegiate | 1,419 | 1,497 | 1,543 | 1,531 | 1,425 | 1,375 | 1,300 | 1,248 | 1,195 |
| Grad School | 53 | 57 | 50 | 45 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Collegiate & Grad | 1,472 | 1,554 | 1,593 | 1,576 | 1,482 | 1,432 | 1,357 | 1,305 | 1,252 |
| Education-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 834 | | | | | | | | |
| Masters | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Specials | 161 | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 996 | | | | | | | | |
| Grad School | 58 | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 1,054 | | | | | | | | |
| Education & Human Services Professions-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | | 1,138 | 1,332 | 1,249 | 1,151 | 1,070 | 1,025 | 997 | 961 |
| Variance from Model | | | | 119 | | | | | |
| Masters | | 16 | 25 | 47 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Specials | | 30 | 74 | 42 | 99 | 105 | 114 | 125 | 135 |
| Collegiate | | 1,184 | 1,431 | 1,457 | 1,345 | 1,270 | 1,234 | 1,217 | 1,191 |
| Grad School | | 69 | 50 | 91 | 114 | 144 | 144 | 144 | 144 |
| Collegiate & Grad | | 1,253 | 1,481 | 1,548 | 1,459 | 1,414 | 1,378 | 1,361 | 1,335 |
| Fine Arts-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 333 | 279 | 303 | 276 | 275 | 263 | 250 | 240 | 229 |
| Specials | 11 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 23 | 26 |
| Collegiate | 344 | 286 | 307 | 282 | 290 | 280 | 270 | 263 | 255 |
| Grad School | 9 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Collegiate & Grad | 353 | 294 | 317 | 288 | 306 | 298 | 288 | 281 | 273 |
| Letters & Science-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 4,086 | | | | | | | | |
| Specials | 91 | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 4,177 | | | | | | | | |
| Grad School | 74 | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 4,251 | | | | | | | | |
| Liberal Arts-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | | 2,568 | 2,518 | 2,195 | 2,441 | 2,699 | 2,792 | 2,833 | 2,732 |
| Variance from Model | | | -36 | -30 | -186 | -295 | -250 | -30 | 213 |
| Specials | | 41 | 45 | 28 | 48 | 55 | 69 | 75 | 80 |
| Collegiate | | 2,609 | 2,802 | 2,193 | 2,303 | 2,459 | 2,611 | 2,878 | 3,025 |
| Grad School | | 21 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Total | | 2,630 | 2,217 | 2,213 | 2,326 | 2,484 | 2,636 | 2,903 | 3,050 |
| Medicine-UMD | | | | | | | | | |
| Medical Students | 96 | 97 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Collegiate | 96 | 97 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Grad School | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Collegiate & Grad | 99 | 102 | 99 | 96 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 |

| | Fall 1988 Actual | Fall 1985 Actual | Fall 1986 Actual | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Science and Engineering-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | | 1,589 | 1,499 | 1,561 | 1,510 | 1,467 | 1,455 | 1,315 | 1,364 | M |
| Masters | | | | 21 | | | | | | |
| Specials | | 41 | 45 | 161 | 46 | 55 | 69 | 75 | 80 | M |
| Collegiate | 1,630 | 1,544 | 1,579 | 1,566 | 1,542 | 1,524 | 1,524 | 1,390 | 1,444 | |
| Grad School | | 58 | 50 | 65 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | |
| Total | | 1,686 | 1,594 | 1,644 | 1,621 | 1,597 | 1,579 | 1,445 | 1,499 | |
| Social Development-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 109 | | | | | | | | | |
| Specials | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate | 111 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad School | 53 | | | | | | | | | |
| Collegiate & Grad | 164 | | | | | | | | | |
| Duluth Summary | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 6,771 | 7,069 | 7,190 | 6,610 | 6,795 | 6,876 | 6,796 | 6,603 | 6,446 | |
| Variance from Model | | | -361 | 89 | -186 | -295 | -250 | -301 | 213 | |
| Net | 6,771 | 7,069 | 6,829 | 6,699 | 6,609 | 6,581 | 6,546 | 6,573 | 6,659 | |
| Specials | 275 | 121 | 173 | 94 | 225 | 250 | 298 | 328 | 356 | |
| Masters | 1 | 16 | 25 | 49 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | |
| Medical Students | 96 | 97 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | |
| Graduate School | 250 | 216 | 183 | 231 | 275 | 307 | 307 | 307 | 307 | |
| Total | 7,393 | 7,519 | 7,301 | 7,365 | 7,300 | 7,329 | 7,342 | 7,399 | 7,513 | |
| Morris | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG Projection Model | 1,576 | 1,595 | 1,723 | 1,740 | 2,032 | 2,011 | 1,898 | 1,808 | 1,793 | |
| Variance from Model | | | | 195 | | | | | | |
| Net | 1,576 | 1,595 | 1,723 | 1,935 | 2,032 | 2,011 | 1,898 | 1,808 | 1,793 | |
| Specials | 48 | 87 | 51 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | |
| Collegiate | 1,624 | 1,682 | 1,774 | 1,957 | 2,064 | 2,043 | 1,930 | 1,840 | 1,825 | M |
| Dorchester | | | | | | | | | | |
| Undergrad-Regular | 994 | 737 | 730 | 834 | 802 | 770 | 738 | 706 | 675 | |
| Specials | 135 | 400 | 483 | 302 | 398 | 399 | 400 | 401 | 400 | |
| Collegiate | 1,179 | 1,137 | 1,213 | 1,136 | 1,200 | 1,169 | 1,138 | 1,107 | 1,075 | M |
| Waseca | | | | | | | | | | |
| Undergrad-Regular | 852 | 842 | 845 | 990 | 947 | 904 | 861 | 818 | 775 | |
| Specials | 271 | 305 | 304 | 173 | 202 | 233 | 264 | 295 | 325 | |
| Collegiate | 1,183 | 1,148 | 1,149 | 1,163 | 1,149 | 1,137 | 1,125 | 1,113 | 1,100 | M |
| TOTAL - REGULAR TERMS | 53,702 | 55,076 | 56,443 | 55,324 | 55,255 | 53,846 | 52,619 | 51,616 | 50,435 | |

| | Fall 1980 Actual | Fall 1985 Actual | Fall 1986 Actual | Fall 1987 Actual | Fall 1988 | Fall 1989 | Fall 1990 | Fall 1991 | Fall 1992 | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|
| Continuing Educ & Ext | | NA | 22,029 | 23,057 | 23,042 | 23,110 | 23,179 | 23,250 | 22,320 | 21,425 |
| DTF Reduction | | | -46 | -46 | -46 | -46 | -46 | -46 | -46 | -46 |
| Net | | 22,029 | 23,011 | 22,996 | 23,064 | 23,133 | 23,204 | 22,274 | 21,379 | |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 78,105 | 79,454 | 78,920 | 78,319 | 76,979 | 75,823 | 73,890 | 71,814 | |
| Summer Sessions* | 30,213 | 24,360 | 24,500 | 24,000 | 23,490 | 23,000 | 21,500 | 20,850 | 20,225 | |

*Noncomparable between 1982 and 1983

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| TC Undergrads | 35,204 | 32,462 | 32,650 | 31,651 | 31,124 | 29,621 | 28,427 | 27,332 | 25,935 |
| TC Grads | 8,193 | 8,362 | 8,606 | 8,937 | 8,776 | 8,964 | 9,089 | 9,267 | 9,424 |
| TC Prof | 3,589 | 3,766 | 3,750 | 3,705 | 3,642 | 3,583 | 3,568 | 3,558 | 3,563 |
| UMD Undergrads | 7,046 | 7,190 | 7,002 | 6,993 | 6,834 | 6,831 | 6,844 | 6,901 | 7,015 |
| UMD Grads | 251 | 232 | 208 | 200 | 370 | 402 | 402 | 402 | 402 |
| UMD Prof | 96 | 97 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| UMM Undergrads | 1,624 | 1,682 | 1,774 | 1,967 | 2,064 | 2,043 | 1,930 | 1,840 | 1,825 |
| UMC Undergrads | 1,179 | 1,137 | 1,213 | 1,136 | 1,200 | 1,169 | 1,138 | 1,107 | 1,075 |
| UMW Undergrads | 1,123 | 1,148 | 1,149 | 1,163 | 1,149 | 1,137 | 1,125 | 1,113 | 1,100 |
| | 58,705 | 56,076 | 56,443 | 55,924 | 55,255 | 53,846 | 52,619 | 51,616 | 50,435 |
| Total Undergrads | 46,176 | 43,619 | 43,788 | 42,910 | 42,371 | 40,801 | 39,464 | 38,293 | 36,950 |

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Headcount Students
"Regular" Instruction
Fall Term

| | East Bank | West Bank ¹ | Minneapolis | St. Paul ² | Twin Cities | Duluth | Morris | Crookston | Waseca | System |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|
| 1980 Actual | 28,879 | 13,356 | 42,235 | 5,151 | 47,386 | 7,393 | 1,624 | 1,179 | 1,123 | 58,705 |
| 1981 Actual | 28,832 | 13,479 | 42,311 | 5,116 | 47,427 | 7,524 | 1,690 | 1,161 | 1,101 | 58,903 |
| 1982 Actual | 28,975 | 13,520 | 42,495 | 4,888 | 47,383 | 7,734 | 1,583 | 1,149 | 1,113 | 58,962 |
| 1983 Actual | 28,402 | 13,258 | 41,660 | 4,785 | 46,445 | 7,530 | 1,603 | 1,143 | 1,110 | 57,831 |
| 1984 Actual | 27,482 | 12,401 | 39,883 | 4,776 | 44,659 | 7,461 | 1,665 | 1,145 | 1,120 | 56,050 |
| 1985 Actual | 27,225 | 12,801 | 40,026 | 4,564 | 44,590 | 7,519 | 1,682 | 1,137 | 1,148 | 56,076 |
| 1986 Actual | 27,353 | 13,242 | 40,595 | 4,411 | 45,006 | 7,301 | 1,774 | 1,213 | 1,149 | 56,443 |
| 1987 Actual | 26,821 | 13,251 | 40,072 | 4,221 | 44,293 | 7,365 | 1,967 | 1,136 | 1,163 | 55,924 |
| 1988 MPIS Estimate | 26,321 | 13,068 | 39,389 | 4,153 | 43,542 | 7,300 | 2,064 | 1,200 | 1,149 | 55,255 |
| 1989 MPIS Estimate | 25,496 | 12,625 | 38,121 | 4,047 | 42,168 | 7,329 | 2,043 | 1,169 | 1,137 | 53,846 |
| 1990 MPIS Estimate | 24,954 | 12,179 | 37,133 | 3,951 | 41,084 | 7,342 | 1,930 | 1,138 | 1,125 | 52,619 |
| 1991 MPIS Estimate | 24,539 | 11,766 | 36,305 | 3,852 | 40,157 | 7,399 | 1,840 | 1,107 | 1,113 | 51,616 |
| 1992 MPIS Estimate | 23,824 | 11,349 | 35,173 | 3,749 | 38,922 | 7,513 | 1,825 | 1,075 | 1,100 | 50,435 |
| 1993 HECB Trend Estimate | 23,289 | 11,094 | 34,383 | 3,665 | 38,048 | 7,363 | 1,798 | 1,089 | 1,117 | 49,415 |
| 1994 HECB Trend Estimate | 22,966 | 10,940 | 33,906 | 3,614 | 37,520 | 7,297 | 1,779 | 1,096 | 1,123 | 48,815 |
| 1995 HECB Trend Estimate | 22,945 | 10,931 | 33,876 | 3,611 | 37,487 | 7,366 | 1,825 | 1,113 | 1,145 | 48,936 |
| 1996 HECB Trend Estimate | 23,071 | 10,990 | 34,061 | 3,631 | 37,692 | 7,567 | 1,887 | 1,152 | 1,182 | 49,480 |
| 1997 HECB Trend Estimate | 23,290 | 11,094 | 34,384 | 3,665 | 38,049 | 7,788 | 1,951 | 1,183 | 1,216 | 50,187 |
| 1998 HECB Trend Estimate | 23,684 | 11,283 | 34,967 | 3,727 | 38,694 | 8,043 | 2,030 | 1,206 | 1,248 | 51,221 |
| 1999 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,075 | 11,468 | 35,543 | 3,788 | 39,331 | 8,255 | 2,088 | 1,215 | 1,260 | 52,149 |
| 2000 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,367 | 11,608 | 35,975 | 3,834 | 39,809 | 8,353 | 2,124 | 1,209 | 1,259 | 52,754 |
| 2001 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,522 | 11,681 | 36,203 | 3,859 | 40,062 | 8,280 | 2,121 | 1,175 | 1,239 | 52,877 |
| 2002 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,566 | 11,702 | 36,268 | 3,866 | 40,134 | 8,255 | 2,122 | 1,159 | 1,245 | 52,915 |
| 2003 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,583 | 11,711 | 36,294 | 3,868 | 40,162 | 8,269 | 2,133 | 1,177 | 1,271 | 53,012 |
| 2004 HECB Trend Estimate | 24,544 | 11,692 | 36,236 | 3,862 | 40,098 | 8,238 | 2,137 | 1,171 | 1,280 | 52,924 |

1 Management, Law, Humphrey Institute, 50% of Liberal Arts.

2 Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, Biological Sciences, Veterinary Medicine.

In Fall 1992, the last year of UM projection, the Coordinate Campus estimates exceed HECB estimates while the T.C. campus is less. UM estimates reflect an undergraduate projection model, Commitment to Focus initiatives, student demand and enrollment limits. Beyond Fall 1992, rates of change are those shown in HECB projections.

Appendix - Table 4

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Detail of Instructional Costs
by College and Level
FY 1986

Exhibit II

| | Total Direct Costs by Source of Funds | | | Indirect Costs | Total Costs | FYE Students | --- Costs per FYE Student --- --- Total Funds --- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | State | Other | Total | | | | Direct | Indirect | Total | State |
| Liberal Arts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 13,265.8 | 1,205.1 | 14,470.9 | 8,455.4 | 22,926.3 | 6,870 | 2,106 | 1,231 | 3,337 | 2,919 |
| Upper Division | 16,426.9 | 1,013.5 | 17,440.4 | 8,590.1 | 26,030.5 | 5,506 | 3,168 | 1,560 | 4,728 | 4,223 |
| Graduate | 6,154.3 | 202.6 | 6,356.9 | 2,760.0 | 9,116.9 | 1,157 | 5,494 | 2,385 | 7,880 | 7,234 |
| Total | 35,846.9 | 2,421.2 | 38,268.1 | 19,805.6 | 58,073.7 | 13,533 | 2,828 | 1,464 | 4,291 | 3,818 |
| Technology | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 9,218.4 | 386.3 | 9,604.7 | 5,487.2 | 15,092.0 | 3,716 | 2,585 | 1,477 | 4,061 | 3,676 |
| Upper Division | 14,997.7 | 862.3 | 15,860.0 | 6,854.9 | 22,714.9 | 3,542 | 4,478 | 1,935 | 6,413 | 5,770 |
| Graduate | 4,863.6 | 123.0 | 4,986.6 | 2,766.2 | 7,752.8 | 1,146 | 4,351 | 2,414 | 6,765 | 6,222 |
| Total | 29,079.8 | 1,371.5 | 30,451.3 | 15,108.4 | 45,559.7 | 8,404 | 3,623 | 1,798 | 5,421 | 4,906 |
| Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,609.8 | 79.0 | 1,688.8 | 1,065.8 | 2,754.6 | 381 | 4,433 | 2,797 | 7,230 | 6,447 |
| Upper Division | 3,193.4 | 39.0 | 3,232.4 | 1,465.3 | 4,697.6 | 431 | 7,500 | 3,400 | 10,899 | 10,208 |
| Graduate | 1,499.8 | 19.6 | 1,519.4 | 759.9 | 2,279.2 | 218 | 6,970 | 3,486 | 10,455 | 10,034 |
| Total | 6,303.0 | 137.5 | 6,440.6 | 3,290.9 | 9,731.5 | 1,030 | 6,253 | 3,195 | 9,448 | 8,780 |
| Forestry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 139.2 | 7.4 | 146.6 | 51.5 | 198.1 | 18 | 8,144 | 2,861 | 11,005 | 10,022 |
| Upper Division | 612.2 | 9.5 | 621.7 | 241.6 | 863.3 | 81 | 7,675 | 2,983 | 10,658 | 9,955 |
| Graduate | 365.5 | 12.5 | 378.0 | 145.4 | 523.4 | 37 | 10,216 | 3,930 | 14,146 | 13,061 |
| Total | 1,117.0 | 29.3 | 1,146.3 | 438.5 | 1,584.8 | 136 | 8,429 | 3,224 | 11,653 | 10,809 |
| Home Economics | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 652.6 | 45.2 | 697.7 | 568.9 | 1,266.7 | 276 | 2,528 | 2,061 | 4,589 | 3,766 |
| Upper Division | 2,171.9 | 3.9 | 2,175.8 | 1,005.7 | 3,181.4 | 429 | 5,072 | 2,344 | 7,416 | 6,958 |
| Graduate | 1,133.1 | 74.1 | 1,207.3 | 510.8 | 1,718.1 | 213 | 5,668 | 2,398 | 8,066 | 7,689 |
| Total | 3,957.6 | 123.2 | 4,080.8 | 2,085.4 | 6,166.2 | 918 | 4,445 | 2,272 | 6,717 | 6,168 |
| Medicine | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 222.7 | 114.2 | 336.8 | 92.5 | 429.4 | 38 | 8,864 | 2,435 | 11,300 | 7,706 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 18,661.9 | 9,530.9 | 28,192.7 | 9,178.1 | 37,370.8 | 2,131 | 13,230 | 4,307 | 17,537 | 12,234 |
| Graduate/Professional | 4,358.3 | 2,231.0 | 6,589.3 | 4,131.7 | 10,721.0 | 1,750 | 3,765 | 2,361 | 6,126 | 4,462 |
| Total | 23,242.8 | 11,876.0 | 35,118.9 | 13,402.3 | 48,521.2 | 3,919 | 8,961 | 3,420 | 12,381 | 8,720 |

Appendix - Table 4

Detail of Instructional Costs, by College and Level, FY 1986, Page 2

Exhibit 11

| | Total Direct Costs by Source of Funds | | | Indirect Costs | Total Costs | FYE Students | --- Costs per FYE Student --- | | | State Total |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| | State | Other | Total | | | | --- Total Funds --- | Direct | Indirect | |
| Public Health | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 1,727.6 | 734.5 | 2,462.1 | 783.1 | 3,245.2 | 319 | 7,718 | 2,455 | 10,173 | 7,306 |
| Graduate/Professional | 1,945.1 | 600.9 | 2,546.0 | 1,107.8 | 3,653.8 | 387 | 6,579 | 2,862 | 9,441 | 7,337 |
| Total | 3,672.6 | 1,335.4 | 5,008.1 | 1,890.9 | 6,898.9 | 706 | 7,094 | 2,678 | 9,772 | 7,323 |
| Pharmacy | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 2,219.8 | 874.7 | 3,094.4 | 1,361.0 | 4,455.4 | 289 | 10,707 | 4,709 | 15,417 | 11,617 |
| Graduate/Professional | 438.3 | 51.2 | 489.5 | 160.5 | 650.0 | 28 | 17,483 | 5,732 | 23,215 | 20,136 |
| Total | 2,658.1 | 925.9 | 3,584.0 | 1,521.5 | 5,105.4 | 317 | 11,306 | 4,800 | 16,105 | 12,369 |
| Nursing | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 1,401.0 | 89.7 | 1,490.7 | 807.4 | 2,298.1 | 143 | 10,425 | 5,646 | 16,071 | 14,608 |
| Graduate/Professional | 1,317.7 | 84.4 | 1,402.1 | 506.0 | 1,908.1 | 92 | 15,240 | 5,500 | 20,740 | 18,673 |
| Total | 2,718.7 | 174.1 | 2,892.8 | 1,313.4 | 4,206.2 | 235 | 12,310 | 5,589 | 17,899 | 16,200 |
| Dentistry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 85.5 | 7.9 | 93.4 | 45.2 | 138.6 | 18 | 5,187 | 2,512 | 7,699 | 7,339 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 7,246.8 | 310.4 | 7,557.2 | 2,782.7 | 10,339.9 | 549 | 13,765 | 5,069 | 18,834 | 17,204 |
| Graduate/Professional | 993.1 | 57.6 | 1,050.7 | 352.4 | 1,403.1 | 61 | 17,225 | 5,777 | 23,002 | 20,755 |
| Total | 8,325.4 | 375.9 | 8,701.3 | 3,180.3 | 11,881.6 | 628 | 13,856 | 5,064 | 18,920 | 17,266 |
| Humphrey Institute | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division | 106.2 | 100.4 | 206.5 | 47.9 | 254.4 | 12 | 17,211 | 3,991 | 21,202 | 11,986 |
| Graduate | 666.0 | 544.1 | 1,210.1 | 409.9 | 1,620.0 | 108 | 11,204 | 3,796 | 15,000 | 9,289 |
| Total | 772.2 | 644.4 | 1,416.6 | 457.8 | 1,874.4 | 120 | 11,805 | 3,815 | 15,620 | 9,559 |
| Mortuary Science | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division | 274.8 | 13.7 | 288.5 | 140.9 | 429.4 | 62 | 4,653 | 2,273 | 6,926 | 6,293 |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 274.8 | 13.7 | 288.5 | 140.9 | 429.4 | 62 | 4,653 | 2,273 | 6,926 | 6,293 |
| Biological Sciences | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 2,073.1 | 30.4 | 2,103.5 | 1,192.0 | 3,295.5 | 665 | 3,163 | 1,792 | 4,956 | 4,597 |
| Upper Division | 1,744.2 | 16.4 | 1,760.6 | 828.0 | 2,588.6 | 373 | 4,720 | 2,220 | 6,940 | 6,460 |
| Graduate | 820.9 | 10.1 | 831.0 | 435.9 | 1,266.9 | 158 | 5,259 | 2,759 | 8,018 | 7,470 |
| Total | 4,638.2 | 56.9 | 4,695.1 | 2,456.0 | 7,151.0 | 1,196 | 3,926 | 2,053 | 5,979 | 5,557 |

Appendix - Table 4

Detail of Instructional Costs, by College and Level, FY 1986, Page 3

Exhibit II

| | Total Direct Costs by Source of Funds | | | Indirect Costs | Total Costs | FYE Students | --- Costs per FYE Student --- | | | |
|---|--|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | State | Other | Total | | | | --- Total Funds --- | State | Total | Total |
| Veterinary Medicine | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 36.8 | 1.5 | 38.3 | 18.4 | 56.7 | 7 | 5,467 | 2,628 | 8,095 | 7,428 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 6,911.5 | 227.6 | 7,139.1 | 2,063.7 | 9,202.7 | 508 | 14,053 | 4,062 | 18,116 | 16,779 |
| Graduate/Professional | 558.4 | 14.0 | 572.4 | 163.2 | 735.6 | 32 | 17,886 | 5,101 | 22,987 | 21,442 |
| Total | 7,506.7 | 243.0 | 7,749.7 | 2,245.3 | 9,995.0 | 547 | 14,168 | 4,105 | 18,272 | 16,932 |
| Law | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 4,116.9 | 393.2 | 4,510.1 | 1,440.3 | 5,950.4 | 728 | 6,195 | 1,978 | 8,174 | 7,181 |
| Graduate/Professional | 31.1 | 3.0 | 34.1 | 12.6 | 46.7 | 5 | 6,819 | 2,528 | 9,348 | 8,239 |
| Total | 4,148.0 | 396.2 | 4,544.2 | 1,452.9 | 5,997.1 | 733 | 6,199 | 1,982 | 8,182 | 7,189 |
| Management | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 870.0 | 214.5 | 1,084.4 | 467.2 | 1,551.6 | 392 | 2,766 | 1,192 | 3,958 | 3,157 |
| Upper Division | 3,644.4 | 614.2 | 4,258.6 | 2,071.7 | 6,330.4 | 1,518 | 2,805 | 1,365 | 4,170 | 3,484 |
| Graduate | 4,608.6 | 674.4 | 5,283.0 | 2,192.5 | 7,475.5 | 1,010 | 5,231 | 2,171 | 7,401 | 6,307 |
| Total | 9,123.0 | 1,503.1 | 10,626.0 | 4,731.4 | 15,357.5 | 2,920 | 3,639 | 1,620 | 5,259 | 4,416 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,486.7 | 9.7 | 1,496.4 | 629.8 | 2,126.2 | 329 | 4,548 | 1,914 | 6,463 | 6,050 |
| Upper Division | 5,780.3 | 37.6 | 5,817.9 | 2,633.7 | 8,451.6 | 1,256 | 4,632 | 2,097 | 6,729 | 6,287 |
| Graduate | 4,610.7 | 30.0 | 4,640.6 | 2,498.7 | 7,139.4 | 961 | 4,829 | 2,600 | 7,429 | 6,939 |
| Total | 11,877.7 | 77.2 | 11,954.9 | 5,762.2 | 17,717.1 | 2,546 | 4,696 | 2,263 | 6,959 | 6,502 |
| General College | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 3,674.3 | 1.0 | 3,675.3 | 2,212.2 | 5,887.5 | 1,905 | 1,929 | 1,161 | 3,091 | 2,854 |
| Upper Division | 924.3 | 81.2 | 1,005.5 | 408.7 | 1,414.3 | 253 | 3,974 | 1,616 | 5,590 | 4,915 |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,598.6 | 82.2 | 4,680.9 | 2,621.0 | 7,301.8 | 2,158 | 2,169 | 1,215 | 3,384 | 3,096 |
| Business & Economics-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 899.7 | 22.1 | 921.7 | 731.4 | 1,653.1 | 351 | 2,626 | 2,084 | 4,710 | 4,455 |
| Upper Division | 1,101.5 | 31.1 | 1,132.6 | 849.8 | 1,982.4 | 362 | 3,129 | 2,347 | 5,476 | 5,176 |
| Graduate | 84.5 | 2.3 | 86.8 | 53.9 | 140.7 | 17 | 5,108 | 3,169 | 8,277 | 7,839 |
| Total | 2,085.7 | 55.5 | 2,141.1 | 1,635.1 | 3,776.2 | 730 | 2,933 | 2,240 | 5,173 | 4,891 |
| Education & Human Services-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,060.2 | 189.8 | 1,250.0 | 949.2 | 2,199.2 | 459 | 2,723 | 2,068 | 4,791 | 4,189 |
| Upper Division | 1,547.2 | 277.0 | 1,824.2 | 1,212.9 | 3,037.0 | 506 | 3,605 | 2,397 | 6,002 | 5,231 |
| Graduate | 353.2 | 63.2 | 416.5 | 273.5 | 690.0 | 91 | 4,576 | 3,005 | 7,582 | 6,616 |
| Total | 2,960.6 | 530.0 | 3,490.6 | 2,435.6 | 5,926.2 | 1,056 | 3,306 | 2,306 | 5,612 | 4,897 |

Appendix - Table 4

Detail of Instructional Costs, by College and Level, FY 1986, Page 4

Exhibit II

| | Total Direct Costs by Source of Funds | | | Indirect Costs | Total Costs | FYE Students | --- Costs per FYE Student --- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | State | Other | Total | | | | Direct | Indirect | Total | State |
| Fine Arts-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,032.3 | 137.0 | 1,169.4 | 1,007.0 | 2,176.4 | 503 | 2,325 | 2,002 | 4,327 | 3,878 |
| Upper Division | 446.9 | 33.8 | 480.7 | 255.7 | 736.4 | 94 | 5,114 | 2,720 | 7,834 | 7,190 |
| Graduate | 24.5 | 1.1 | 25.6 | 18.0 | 43.6 | 6 | 4,271 | 2,995 | 7,266 | 6,812 |
| Total | 1,503.8 | 172.0 | 1,675.7 | 1,280.6 | 2,956.4 | 603 | 2,779 | 2,124 | 4,903 | 4,423 |
| Liberal Arts-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 2,247.6 | 17.2 | 2,264.8 | 2,412.2 | 4,677.1 | 1,233 | 1,837 | 1,956 | 3,793 | 3,591 |
| Upper Division | 1,473.0 | 19.6 | 1,492.6 | 1,199.7 | 2,692.3 | 538 | 2,774 | 2,230 | 5,004 | 4,813 |
| Graduate | 31.9 | 3.8 | 35.7 | 22.8 | 58.6 | 10 | 3,573 | 2,284 | 5,857 | 5,747 |
| Total | 3,752.6 | 40.6 | 3,793.2 | 3,634.8 | 7,427.9 | 1,781 | 2,130 | 2,041 | 4,171 | 3,973 |
| Medicine-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 88.5 | 12.7 | 101.3 | 31.6 | 132.9 | 8 | 12,656 | 3,952 | 16,608 | 14,475 |
| Upper Division/Professional | 2,751.3 | 382.2 | 3,133.5 | 948.5 | 4,082.0 | 206 | 15,211 | 4,605 | 19,816 | 17,320 |
| Graduate/Professional | 106.9 | 4.2 | 111.1 | 37.0 | 148.2 | 7 | 15,872 | 5,292 | 21,164 | 19,861 |
| Total | 2,946.7 | 399.1 | 3,345.8 | 1,017.2 | 4,363.0 | 221 | 15,140 | 4,603 | 19,742 | 17,298 |
| Science & Engineering-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 3,122.8 | 2.0 | 3,124.9 | 2,253.3 | 5,378.2 | 1,005 | 3,109 | 2,242 | 5,351 | 5,087 |
| Upper Division | 2,466.7 | 56.1 | 2,522.9 | 1,419.6 | 3,942.5 | 560 | 4,505 | 2,535 | 7,040 | 6,755 |
| Graduate | 224.6 | 0.1 | 224.7 | 121.6 | 346.3 | 38 | 5,914 | 3,200 | 9,114 | 8,911 |
| Total | 5,814.2 | 58.2 | 5,872.4 | 3,794.5 | 9,666.9 | 1,603 | 3,663 | 2,367 | 6,031 | 5,760 |
| Support Services-UMD | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 249.3 | -0.0 | 249.3 | 175.9 | 425.2 | 80 | 3,116 | 2,199 | 5,315 | 5,094 |
| Upper Division | 45.2 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 34.2 | 79.5 | 15 | 3,016 | 2,281 | 5,298 | 5,134 |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 294.6 | -0.0 | 294.5 | 210.1 | 504.7 | 95 | 3,101 | 2,212 | 5,312 | 5,100 |
| Morris | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,934.4 | 5.8 | 1,940.2 | 3,233.6 | 5,173.9 | 1,023 | 1,897 | 3,161 | 5,058 | 4,826 |
| Upper Division | 1,888.3 | 4.3 | 1,892.6 | 2,220.3 | 4,112.8 | 578 | 3,274 | 3,841 | 7,116 | 6,872 |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3,822.7 | 10.1 | 3,832.8 | 5,453.9 | 9,286.7 | 1,601 | 2,394 | 3,407 | 5,801 | 5,565 |
| Crookston | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 2,679.7 | 3.1 | 2,682.8 | 3,129.5 | 5,812.3 | 736 | 3,645 | 4,252 | 7,897 | 7,728 |
| Upper Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2,679.7 | 3.1 | 2,682.8 | 3,129.5 | 5,812.3 | 736 | 3,645 | 4,252 | 7,897 | 7,728 |

Detail of Instructional Costs, by College and Level, FY 1986, Page 5

Exhibit II

| | Total Direct Costs by Source of Funds | | | | Indirect Costs | Total Costs | FYE Students | --- Costs per FYE Student --- --- Total Funds --- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|--------------|--------------|-------|
| | State | Other | Total | Total | | | | Direct | Indirect | Total | State |
| Waseca | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 2,106.8 | 4.6 | 2,111.4 | 3,781.7 | 5,893.1 | 810 | 2,607 | 4,669 | 7,275 | 6,921 | |
| Upper Division | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Graduate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | 2,106.8 | 4.6 | 2,111.4 | 3,781.7 | 5,893.1 | 810 | 2,607 | 4,669 | 7,275 | 6,921 | |
| Summer Session | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 711.1 | 96.1 | 807.2 | 509.9 | 1,317.1 | 479 | 1,685 | 1,065 | 2,750 | 2,338 | |
| Upper Division | 2,115.9 | 285.8 | 2,401.7 | 1,213.5 | 3,615.2 | 889 | 2,702 | 1,365 | 4,067 | 3,464 | |
| Graduate | 683.9 | 92.4 | 776.2 | 541.2 | 1,317.4 | 299 | 2,596 | 1,810 | 4,406 | 3,788 | |
| Total | 3,510.9 | 474.2 | 3,985.1 | 2,264.6 | 6,249.7 | 1,667 | 2,391 | 1,358 | 3,749 | 3,199 | |
| Continuing Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Division | 3,445.2 | 0.0 | 3,445.2 | 2,331.0 | 5,776.3 | 2,185 | 1,577 | 1,067 | 2,644 | 2,432 | |
| Upper Division | 5,967.5 | 0.0 | 5,967.5 | 3,220.5 | 9,187.9 | 2,355 | 2,534 | 1,368 | 3,901 | 3,621 | |
| Graduate | 2,083.6 | 0.0 | 2,083.6 | 1,169.9 | 3,253.5 | 592 | 3,520 | 1,976 | 5,496 | 5,134 | |
| Total | 11,496.2 | 0.0 | 11,496.2 | 6,721.4 | 18,217.6 | 5,132 | 2,240 | 1,310 | 3,550 | 3,289 | |
| Twin Cities Campus | 159,861.1 | 21,786.8 | 181,647.9 | 81,904.7 | 263,552.6 | 40,108 | 4,529 | 2,042 | 6,571 | 5,631 | |
| Duluth Campus | 19,358.1 | 1,255.4 | 20,613.5 | 14,007.9 | 34,621.4 | 6,089 | 3,385 | 2,301 | 5,686 | 5,260 | |
| Morris Campus | 3,822.7 | 10.1 | 3,832.8 | 5,453.9 | 9,286.7 | 1,601 | 2,394 | 3,407 | 5,801 | 5,565 | |
| Crookston Campus | 2,679.7 | 3.1 | 2,682.8 | 3,129.5 | 5,812.3 | 736 | 3,645 | 4,252 | 7,897 | 7,728 | |
| Waseca Campus | 2,106.8 | 4.6 | 2,111.4 | 3,781.7 | 5,893.1 | 810 | 2,607 | 4,669 | 7,275 | 6,921 | |
| Summer Session & Extension | 15,007.1 | 474.2 | 15,481.3 | 8,986.0 | 24,467.3 | 6,799 | 2,277 | 1,322 | 3,599 | 3,267 | |
| System Wide Totals | 202,835.5 | 23,534.2 | 226,369.8 | 117,263.7 | 343,633.4 | 56,143 | 4,032 | 2,089 | 6,121 | 5,349 | |

Ok

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
State Instructional Funds
Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
Page No. 1

| | FY 1977 | FY 1979 | FY 1981 | FY 1983 | FY 1985 | FY 1986 |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1.918 | 1.669 | 1.371 | 1.172 | 1.044 | 1.000 |
| Liberal Arts | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 20,988,593 | \$ 22,437,400 | \$ 25,550,600 | \$ 28,244,887 | \$ 33,763,492 | \$ 35,846,918 |
| -Constant | \$ 40,262,464 | \$ 37,444,884 | \$ 35,040,312 | \$ 33,104,810 | \$ 35,238,618 | \$ 35,846,918 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -7.0% | -13.0% | -17.8% | -12.5% | -11.0% |
| FYE Students | 13,814 | 12,714 | 13,169 | 12,993 | 12,903 | 13,533 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -8.0% | -4.7% | -5.9% | -6.6% | -2.0% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,915 | \$ 2,945 | \$ 2,661 | \$ 2,548 | \$ 2,731 | \$ 2,649 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 1.0% | -8.7% | -12.6% | -6.3% | -9.1% |
| Technology | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 12,918,162 | \$ 14,847,000 | \$ 17,019,800 | \$ 18,928,421 | \$ 27,541,581 | \$ 29,079,789 |
| -Constant | \$ 24,780,938 | \$ 24,777,567 | \$ 23,341,100 | \$ 22,185,318 | \$ 28,744,872 | \$ 29,079,789 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.0% | -5.8% | -10.5% | 16.0% | 17.3% |
| FYE Students | 6,925 | 7,048 | 7,908 | 8,669 | 8,570 | 8,404 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 1.8% | 14.2% | 25.2% | 23.8% | 21.4% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 3,578 | \$ 3,516 | \$ 2,952 | \$ 2,559 | \$ 3,354 | \$ 3,460 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -1.8% | -17.5% | -28.5% | -6.3% | -3.3% |
| Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 3,434,334 | \$ 3,926,900 | \$ 4,226,000 | \$ 5,133,843 | \$ 5,882,328 | \$ 6,303,028 |
| -Constant | \$ 6,588,090 | \$ 6,553,447 | \$ 5,795,573 | \$ 6,017,192 | \$ 6,139,327 | \$ 6,303,028 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.5% | -12.0% | -8.7% | -6.8% | -4.3% |
| FYE Students | 1,623 | 1,553 | 1,433 | 1,262 | 1,105 | 1,030 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -4.3% | -11.7% | -22.2% | -31.9% | -36.5% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,059 | \$ 4,220 | \$ 4,044 | \$ 4,768 | \$ 5,556 | \$ 6,119 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 4.0% | -0.4% | 17.5% | 36.9% | 50.8% |
| Forestry | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 638,974 | \$ 646,200 | \$ 759,300 | \$ 718,722 | \$ 1,049,376 | \$ 1,116,991 |
| -Constant | \$ 1,225,745 | \$ 1,078,417 | \$ 1,041,311 | \$ 842,388 | \$ 1,095,223 | \$ 1,116,991 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -12.0% | -15.0% | -31.3% | -10.6% | -8.9% |
| FYE Students | 254 | 222 | 172 | 149 | 181 | 136 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -12.6% | -32.3% | -41.3% | -28.7% | -46.5% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,826 | \$ 4,858 | \$ 6,054 | \$ 5,654 | \$ 6,051 | \$ 8,213 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 0.7% | 25.5% | 17.2% | 25.4% | 70.2% |
| Home Economics | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,321,865 | \$ 1,790,700 | \$ 1,956,800 | \$ 2,253,636 | \$ 3,712,661 | \$ 3,957,612 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,535,737 | \$ 2,988,428 | \$ 2,683,572 | \$ 2,641,405 | \$ 3,874,867 | \$ 3,957,612 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 17.9% | 5.8% | 4.2% | 52.8% | 56.1% |
| FYE Students | 758 | 768 | 705 | 618 | 958 | 918 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 1.3% | -7.0% | -18.5% | 26.4% | 21.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 3,345 | \$ 3,891 | \$ 3,806 | \$ 4,274 | \$ 4,045 | \$ 4,311 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 16.3% | 13.8% | 27.8% | 20.9% | 28.9% |
| Medical School | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 13,922,672 | \$ 13,518,703 | \$ 15,862,213 | \$ 18,216,432 | \$ 23,347,953 | \$ 23,242,800 |
| -Constant | \$ 26,707,892 | \$ 22,560,825 | \$ 21,753,575 | \$ 21,350,821 | \$ 24,368,024 | \$ 23,242,800 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -15.5% | -18.6% | -20.1% | -8.8% | -13.0% |
| FYE Students | 4,362 | 4,332 | 4,319 | 4,046 | 4,106 | 3,919 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.7% | -1.0% | -7.2% | -5.9% | -10.2% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 6,123 | \$ 5,208 | \$ 5,037 | \$ 5,277 | \$ 5,935 | \$ 5,931 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -14.9% | -17.7% | -13.8% | -3.1% | -3.1% |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
 Page No. 2

| | FY 1977 | FY 1979 | FY 1981 | FY 1983 | FY 1985 | FY 1986 |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 1.918 | 1.669 | 1.371 | 1.172 | 1.044 | 1.000 |
| Public Health | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,528,982 | \$ 1,609,100 | \$ 1,749,900 | \$ 2,093,717 | \$ 3,462,009 | \$ 3,672,642 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,933,050 | \$ 2,685,363 | \$ 2,399,828 | \$ 2,453,970 | \$ 3,613,264 | \$ 3,672,642 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -8.4% | -18.2% | -16.3% | 23.2% | 25.2% |
| FYE Students | 606 | 647 | 644 | 842 | 755 | 706 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 6.8% | 6.3% | 38.9% | 24.6% | 16.5% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,840 | \$ 4,150 | \$ 3,726 | \$ 2,914 | \$ 4,786 | \$ 5,202 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -14.2% | -23.0% | -39.8% | -1.1% | 7.5% |
| Pharmacy | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,272,443 | \$ 1,631,100 | \$ 1,797,800 | \$ 1,827,599 | \$ 2,476,363 | \$ 2,658,105 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,440,930 | \$ 2,722,078 | \$ 2,465,518 | \$ 2,142,063 | \$ 2,584,555 | \$ 2,658,105 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 11.5% | 1.0% | -12.2% | 5.9% | 8.9% |
| FYE Students | 319 | 318 | 308 | 321 | 309 | 317 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.3% | -3.4% | 0.6% | -3.1% | -0.6% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 7,652 | \$ 8,560 | \$ 8,005 | \$ 6,673 | \$ 8,364 | \$ 8,385 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 11.9% | 4.6% | -12.8% | 9.3% | 9.6% |
| Nursing | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,116,839 | \$ 1,366,000 | \$ 1,958,300 | \$ 2,094,175 | \$ 2,635,593 | \$ 2,718,695 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,142,435 | \$ 2,279,663 | \$ 2,685,629 | \$ 2,454,507 | \$ 2,750,742 | \$ 2,718,695 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 6.4% | 25.4% | 14.6% | 28.4% | 26.9% |
| FYE Students | 219 | 267 | 306 | 307 | 269 | 235 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 21.9% | 39.7% | 40.2% | 22.8% | 7.3% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 9,783 | \$ 8,538 | \$ 8,777 | \$ 7,995 | \$ 10,226 | \$ 11,569 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -12.7% | -10.3% | -18.3% | 4.5% | 18.3% |
| Dentistry | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 5,634,753 | \$ 6,796,100 | \$ 8,809,500 | \$ 7,350,558 | \$ 8,153,284 | \$ 8,325,400 |
| -Constant | \$ 10,809,159 | \$ 11,341,741 | \$ 12,081,424 | \$ 8,615,323 | \$ 8,509,501 | \$ 8,325,400 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 4.9% | 11.8% | -20.3% | -21.3% | -23.0% |
| FYE Students | 932 | 831 | 814 | 814 | 689 | 628 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -10.8% | -12.7% | -12.7% | -26.1% | -32.6% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 11,598 | \$ 13,648 | \$ 14,842 | \$ 10,584 | \$ 12,350 | \$ 13,257 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 17.7% | 28.0% | -8.7% | 6.5% | 14.3% |
| Mortuary Science | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 143,031 | \$ 167,400 | \$ 192,800 | \$ 221,523 | \$ 266,195 | \$ 274,839 |
| -Constant | \$ 274,377 | \$ 279,367 | \$ 264,408 | \$ 259,639 | \$ 277,825 | \$ 274,839 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 1.8% | -3.6% | -5.4% | 1.3% | 0.2% |
| FYE Students | 65 | 51 | 51 | 64 | 72 | 62 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -21.5% | -21.5% | -1.5% | 10.8% | -4.6% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,221 | \$ 5,478 | \$ 5,184 | \$ 4,057 | \$ 3,859 | \$ 4,433 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 29.8% | 22.8% | -3.9% | -8.6% | 5.0% |
| Biological Sciences | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 2,965,865 | \$ 3,200,000 | \$ 3,007,200 | \$ 3,457,522 | \$ 4,189,321 | \$ 4,638,153 |
| -Constant | \$ 5,689,425 | \$ 5,340,353 | \$ 4,124,100 | \$ 4,052,436 | \$ 4,372,352 | \$ 4,638,153 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -6.1% | -27.5% | -28.8% | -23.1% | -18.5% |
| FYE Students | 1,377 | 1,327 | 1,206 | 1,256 | 1,234 | 1,196 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -3.6% | -12.4% | -8.8% | -10.4% | -13.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,132 | \$ 4,024 | \$ 3,420 | \$ 3,226 | \$ 3,543 | \$ 3,878 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -2.6% | -17.2% | -21.9% | -14.2% | -6.1% |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
 Page No. 3

| | FY 1977 | FY 1979 | FY 1981 | FY 1983 | FY 1985 | FY 1986 |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1.918 | 1.669 | 1.371 | 1.172 | 1.044 | 1.000 |
| Veterinary Medicine | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 3,438,596 | \$ 3,513,900 | \$ 4,137,700 | \$ 5,374,093 | \$ 7,201,219 | \$ 7,506,681 |
| -Constant | \$ 6,596,266 | \$ 5,864,208 | \$ 5,674,477 | \$ 6,298,780 | \$ 7,515,840 | \$ 7,506,681 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -11.1% | -14.0% | -4.5% | 13.9% | 13.8% |
| FYE Students | 471 | 496 | 467 | 489 | 514 | 547 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 5.3% | -0.8% | 3.8% | 9.1% | 16.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 14,005 | \$ 11,823 | \$ 12,151 | \$ 12,881 | \$ 14,622 | \$ 13,723 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -15.6% | -13.2% | -8.0% | 4.4% | -2.0% |
| Law School | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,632,361 | \$ 2,053,200 | \$ 2,564,000 | \$ 2,922,152 | \$ 3,599,541 | \$ 4,148,000 |
| -Constant | \$ 3,131,362 | \$ 3,426,504 | \$ 3,516,292 | \$ 3,424,949 | \$ 3,756,805 | \$ 4,148,000 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 9.4% | 12.3% | 9.4% | 20.0% | 32.5% |
| FYE Students | 693 | 707 | 718 | 758 | 737 | 733 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 2.0% | 3.6% | 9.4% | 6.3% | 5.8% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,519 | \$ 4,847 | \$ 4,897 | \$ 4,518 | \$ 5,097 | \$ 5,659 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 7.3% | 8.4% | -0.0% | 12.8% | 25.2% |
| Education | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 7,836,654 | \$ 7,793,900 | \$ 8,469,100 | \$ 10,028,663 | \$ 11,097,871 | \$ 11,877,656 |
| -Constant | \$ 15,033,070 | \$ 13,006,929 | \$ 11,614,596 | \$ 11,754,233 | \$ 11,582,737 | \$ 11,877,656 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -13.5% | -22.7% | -21.8% | -23.0% | -21.0% |
| FYE Students | 2,553 | 2,347 | 2,321 | 2,293 | 2,508 | 2,546 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -8.1% | -9.1% | -10.2% | -1.8% | -0.3% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 5,888 | \$ 5,542 | \$ 5,004 | \$ 5,126 | \$ 4,618 | \$ 4,665 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -5.9% | -15.0% | -12.9% | -21.6% | -20.8% |
| Management | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 2,860,625 | \$ 3,434,000 | \$ 4,488,500 | \$ 5,557,932 | \$ 9,201,809 | \$ 9,122,955 |
| -Constant | \$ 5,487,543 | \$ 5,730,866 | \$ 6,155,567 | \$ 6,514,251 | \$ 9,603,836 | \$ 9,122,955 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 4.4% | 12.2% | 18.7% | 75.0% | 66.2% |
| FYE Students | 1,929 | 2,059 | 2,350 | 2,492 | 2,791 | 2,920 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 6.7% | 21.8% | 29.2% | 44.7% | 51.4% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,845 | \$ 2,783 | \$ 2,619 | \$ 2,614 | \$ 3,441 | \$ 3,124 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -2.2% | -7.9% | -8.1% | 21.0% | 9.8% |
| General College | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 2,511,846 | \$ 2,679,100 | \$ 3,290,000 | \$ 3,575,073 | \$ 4,317,918 | \$ 4,598,612 |
| -Constant | \$ 4,818,480 | \$ 4,471,043 | \$ 4,511,934 | \$ 4,190,214 | \$ 4,506,568 | \$ 4,598,612 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -7.2% | -6.4% | -13.0% | -6.5% | -4.6% |
| FYE Students | 2,159 | 1,880 | 2,410 | 2,324 | 2,263 | 2,158 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -12.9% | 11.6% | 7.6% | 4.8% | -0.0% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,232 | \$ 2,378 | \$ 1,872 | \$ 1,803 | \$ 1,991 | \$ 2,131 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 6.6% | -16.1% | -19.2% | -10.8% | -4.5% |
| Humphrey Institute | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 515,800 | \$ 523,793 | \$ 600,370 | \$ 772,189 |
| -Constant | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 707,373 | \$ 613,919 | \$ 626,600 | \$ 772,189 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| FYE Students | 0 | 0 | 123 | 87 | 101 | 120 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 5,751 | \$ 7,056 | \$ 6,204 | \$ 6,435 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
 Page No. 4

| | FY 1977 1.918 | FY 1979 1.669 | FY 1981 1.371 | FY 1983 1.172 | FY 1985 1.044 | FY 1986 1.000 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Duluth-Medicine | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,537,926 | \$ 2,045,900 | \$ 2,184,500 | \$ 2,612,688 | \$ 2,894,201 | \$ 2,946,721 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,950,207 | \$ 3,414,321 | \$ 2,995,842 | \$ 3,062,237 | \$ 3,020,649 | \$ 2,946,721 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 15.7% | 1.5% | 3.8% | 2.4% | -0.1% |
| FYE Students | 148 | 182 | 224 | 237 | 230 | 221 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 23.0% | 51.4% | 60.1% | 55.4% | 49.3% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 19,934 | \$ 18,760 | \$ 13,374 | \$ 12,921 | \$ 13,133 | \$ 13,334 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -5.9% | -32.9% | -35.2% | -34.1% | -33.1% |
| Duluth-Supportive Services | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 128,246 | \$ 152,130 | \$ 194,388 | \$ 244,322 | \$ 276,026 | \$ 294,550 |
| -Constant | \$ 246,015 | \$ 253,884 | \$ 266,585 | \$ 286,361 | \$ 288,086 | \$ 294,550 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.2% | 8.4% | 16.4% | 17.1% | 19.7% |
| FYE Students | 116 | 110 | 126 | 82 | 83 | 95 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -5.2% | 8.6% | -29.3% | -28.4% | -18.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,121 | \$ 2,308 | \$ 2,116 | \$ 3,492 | \$ 3,471 | \$ 3,100 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 8.8% | -0.2% | 64.7% | 63.7% | 46.2% |
| Duluth-Social Development | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 389,339 | \$ 434,300 | \$ 488,300 | \$ 498,546 | \$ 348,459 | \$ 0 |
| -Constant | \$ 746,870 | \$ 724,786 | \$ 669,659 | \$ 584,328 | \$ 363,683 | \$ 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -3.0% | -10.3% | -21.8% | -51.3% | 0.0% |
| FYE Students | 99 | 140 | 144 | 86 | 63 | 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 41.4% | 45.5% | -13.1% | -36.4% | 0.0% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 7,544 | \$ 5,177 | \$ 4,650 | \$ 6,794 | \$ 5,773 | \$ 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -31.4% | -38.4% | -9.9% | -23.5% | 0.0% |
| Duluth-Education & Human Services | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,840,047 | \$ 2,042,700 | \$ 2,286,900 | \$ 2,770,153 | \$ 2,724,285 | \$ 2,960,600 |
| -Constant | \$ 3,529,766 | \$ 3,408,981 | \$ 3,136,274 | \$ 3,246,796 | \$ 2,843,309 | \$ 2,960,600 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -3.4% | -11.1% | -8.0% | -19.4% | -16.1% |
| FYE Students | 1,239 | 1,282 | 1,429 | 1,194 | 1,124 | 1,056 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.5% | 15.3% | -3.6% | -9.3% | -14.8% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,849 | \$ 2,659 | \$ 2,195 | \$ 2,719 | \$ 2,530 | \$ 2,804 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -6.7% | -23.0% | -4.6% | -11.2% | -1.6% |
| Duluth-Letters & Science | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 3,536,976 | \$ 4,009,900 | \$ 4,835,500 | \$ 6,078,916 | \$ 9,044,403 | \$ 0 |
| -Constant | \$ 6,784,989 | \$ 6,691,963 | \$ 6,631,446 | \$ 7,124,878 | \$ 9,439,553 | \$ 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -1.4% | -2.3% | 5.0% | 39.1% | 0.0% |
| FYE Students | 3,227 | 2,947 | 3,140 | 3,307 | 3,252 | 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -8.7% | -2.7% | 2.5% | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,103 | \$ 2,271 | \$ 2,112 | \$ 2,154 | \$ 2,903 | \$ 0 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 8.0% | 0.4% | 2.5% | 38.1% | 0.0% |
| Duluth-Liberal Arts | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 3,752,600 |
| -Constant | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 3,752,600 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| FYE Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,781 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 2,107 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
 Page No. 5

| | FY 1977 1.918 | FY 1979 1.669 | FY 1981 1.371 | FY 1983 1.172 | FY 1985 1.044 | FY 1986 1.000 |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Duluth-Science & Engineering | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 5,814,200 |
| -Constant | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 5,814,200 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| FYE Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,603 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 3,627 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| Duluth-Fine Arts | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 785,987 | \$ 932,800 | \$ 1,109,700 | \$ 1,295,705 | \$ 1,503,997 | \$ 1,503,769 |
| -Constant | \$ 1,507,761 | \$ 1,556,713 | \$ 1,521,852 | \$ 1,518,649 | \$ 1,569,707 | \$ 1,503,769 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.2% | 0.9% | 0.7% | 4.1% | -0.3% |
| FYE Students | 486 | 478 | 538 | 514 | 564 | 603 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -1.6% | 10.7% | 5.8% | 16.0% | 24.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 3,102 | \$ 3,257 | \$ 2,829 | \$ 2,955 | \$ 2,783 | \$ 2,494 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 5.0% | -8.8% | -4.8% | -10.3% | -19.6% |
| Duluth-Business & Economics | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 678,641 | \$ 976,500 | \$ 1,280,100 | \$ 1,540,001 | \$ 1,936,707 | \$ 2,085,689 |
| -Constant | \$ 1,301,839 | \$ 1,629,642 | \$ 1,755,540 | \$ 1,804,979 | \$ 2,021,322 | \$ 2,085,689 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 25.2% | 34.9% | 38.6% | 55.3% | 60.2% |
| FYE Students | 593 | 750 | 805 | 694 | 667 | 730 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 26.5% | 35.8% | 17.0% | 12.5% | 23.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,195 | \$ 2,173 | \$ 2,181 | \$ 2,601 | \$ 3,030 | \$ 2,857 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -1.0% | -0.7% | 18.5% | 38.0% | 30.1% |
| Duluth-Total | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 8,897,162 | \$ 10,594,230 | \$ 12,379,388 | \$ 15,040,331 | \$ 18,728,078 | \$ 19,358,129 |
| -Constant | \$ 17,067,445 | \$ 17,680,289 | \$ 16,977,199 | \$ 17,628,228 | \$ 19,546,307 | \$ 19,358,129 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 3.6% | -0.5% | 3.3% | 14.5% | 13.4% |
| FYE Students | 5,908 | 5,889 | 6,406 | 6,114 | 5,983 | 6,089 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.3% | 8.4% | 3.5% | 1.3% | 3.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,889 | \$ 3,002 | \$ 2,650 | \$ 2,883 | \$ 3,267 | \$ 3,179 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.9% | -8.3% | -0.2% | 13.1% | 10.0% |
| Morris | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,995,422 | \$ 2,547,320 | \$ 2,742,860 | \$ 2,906,705 | \$ 3,542,317 | \$ 3,822,700 |
| -Constant | \$ 3,827,822 | \$ 4,251,121 | \$ 3,761,582 | \$ 3,406,844 | \$ 3,697,081 | \$ 3,822,700 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 11.1% | -1.7% | -11.0% | -3.4% | -0.1% |
| FYE Students | 1,634 | 1,426 | 1,588 | 1,554 | 1,644 | 1,601 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | -12.7% | -2.8% | -4.9% | 0.6% | -2.0% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,343 | \$ 2,981 | \$ 2,369 | \$ 2,192 | \$ 2,249 | \$ 2,388 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 27.3% | 1.1% | -6.4% | -4.0% | 1.9% |
| Crookston | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,401,405 | \$ 1,685,640 | \$ 1,884,273 | \$ 2,149,116 | \$ 2,533,462 | \$ 2,679,681 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,688,318 | \$ 2,813,098 | \$ 2,584,108 | \$ 2,518,901 | \$ 2,644,149 | \$ 2,679,681 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 4.6% | -3.9% | -6.3% | -1.6% | -0.3% |
| FYE Students | 954 | 966 | 1,106 | 982 | 934 | 736 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 1.3% | 15.9% | 2.9% | -2.1% | -22.9% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,818 | \$ 2,912 | \$ 2,336 | \$ 2,565 | \$ 2,831 | \$ 3,641 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.3% | -17.1% | -9.0% | 0.5% | 29.2% |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

Exhibit IV
 Page No. 6

| | FY 1977 | FY 1979 | FY 1981 | FY 1983 | FY 1985 | FY 1986 |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 1.918 | 1.669 | 1.371 | 1.172 | 1.044 | 1.000 |
| Waseca | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 1,105,574 | \$ 1,485,023 | \$ 1,772,682 | \$ 1,863,594 | \$ 2,126,443 | \$ 2,106,779 |
| -Constant | \$ 2,120,825 | \$ 2,478,296 | \$ 2,431,071 | \$ 2,184,251 | \$ 2,219,347 | \$ 2,106,779 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 16.9% | 14.6% | 3.0% | 4.6% | -0.7% |
| FYE Students | 912 | 1,004 | 1,009 | 879 | 813 | 810 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 10.1% | 10.6% | -3.6% | -10.9% | -11.2% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,325 | \$ 2,468 | \$ 2,409 | \$ 2,485 | \$ 2,730 | \$ 2,601 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 6.1% | 3.6% | 6.9% | 17.4% | 11.8% |

Direct Instructional (Collegiate) Expenditures
 State Instructional Funds
 Inflated to Constant Dollars per Higher Education Price Index
 FY 1977 Through FY 1986

| | FY 1977 | FY 1979 | FY 1981 | FY 1983 | FY 1985 | FY 1986 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 1.918 | 1.669 | 1.371 | 1.172 | 1.044 | 1.000 |
| Twin Cities Campuses | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 84,166,595 | \$ 91,410,703 | \$ 106,355,313 | \$ 118,522,741 | \$ 152,498,884 | \$ 159,861,065 |
| -Constant | \$ 161,456,963 | \$ 152,551,684 | \$ 145,856,589 | \$ 138,916,217 | \$ 159,161,555 | \$ 159,861,065 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -5.5% | -9.7% | -14.0% | -1.4% | -1.0% |
| FYE Students | 39,059 | 37,567 | 39,424 | 39,784 | 40,065 | 40,108 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -3.8% | 0.9% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 2.7% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 4,134 | \$ 4,061 | \$ 3,700 | \$ 3,492 | \$ 3,973 | \$ 3,986 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -1.8% | -10.5% | -15.5% | -3.9% | -3.6% |
| Health Sciences | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 23,618,720 | \$ 25,088,403 | \$ 30,370,513 | \$ 31,804,004 | \$ 40,341,397 | \$ 40,892,481 |
| -Constant | \$ 45,307,842 | \$ 41,869,037 | \$ 41,650,382 | \$ 37,276,323 | \$ 42,103,911 | \$ 40,892,481 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -7.6% | -8.1% | -17.7% | -7.1% | -9.7% |
| FYE Students | 6,503 | 6,446 | 6,442 | 6,394 | 6,200 | 5,867 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.9% | -0.9% | -1.7% | -4.7% | -9.8% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 6,967 | \$ 6,495 | \$ 6,465 | \$ 5,830 | \$ 6,791 | \$ 6,970 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -6.8% | -7.2% | -16.3% | -2.5% | 0.0% |
| T.C. Non Health Sciences | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 60,547,875 | \$ 66,322,300 | \$ 75,984,800 | \$ 86,718,737 | \$ 112,157,487 | \$ 118,968,584 |
| -Constant | \$ 116,149,121 | \$ 110,682,647 | \$ 104,206,207 | \$ 101,639,895 | \$ 117,057,644 | \$ 118,968,584 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -4.7% | -10.3% | -12.5% | 0.8% | 2.4% |
| FYE Students | 32,556 | 31,121 | 32,982 | 33,390 | 33,865 | 34,241 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -4.4% | 1.3% | 2.6% | 4.0% | 5.2% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 3,568 | \$ 3,557 | \$ 3,159 | \$ 3,044 | \$ 3,457 | \$ 3,474 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.3% | -11.4% | -14.7% | -3.1% | -2.6% |
| Duluth Campus | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 8,897,162 | \$ 10,594,230 | \$ 12,379,388 | \$ 15,040,331 | \$ 18,728,078 | \$ 19,358,129 |
| -Constant | \$ 17,067,445 | \$ 17,680,289 | \$ 16,977,199 | \$ 17,628,228 | \$ 19,546,307 | \$ 19,358,129 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | 3.6% | -0.5% | 3.3% | 14.5% | 13.4% |
| FYE Students | 5,908 | 5,889 | 6,406 | 6,114 | 5,983 | 6,089 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.3% | 8.4% | 3.5% | 1.3% | 3.1% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 2,889 | \$ 3,002 | \$ 2,650 | \$ 2,883 | \$ 3,267 | \$ 3,179 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | -0.0% | 3.9% | -8.3% | -0.2% | 13.1% | 10.0% |
| System Total | | | | | | |
| Direct Expenditures-Actual | \$ 97,566,158 | \$ 107,722,916 | \$ 125,134,516 | \$ 140,482,487 | \$ 179,429,184 | \$ 187,828,354 |
| -Constant | \$ 187,161,373 | \$ 179,774,487 | \$ 171,610,549 | \$ 164,654,441 | \$ 187,268,439 | \$ 187,828,354 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -3.9% | -8.3% | -12.0% | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| FYE Students | 48,467 | 46,852 | 49,533 | 49,313 | 49,439 | 49,344 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -3.3% | 2.2% | 1.7% | 2.0% | 1.8% |
| Constant \$ per FYE Student | \$ 3,862 | \$ 3,837 | \$ 3,465 | \$ 3,339 | \$ 3,788 | \$ 3,807 |
| Percent Change from 1977 | 0.0% | -0.6% | -10.3% | -13.5% | -1.9% | -1.4% |
| FYE Student Reconciliation | | | | | | |
| University College | 103 | 62 | 46 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| System Total | 48,467 | 46,852 | 49,533 | 49,313 | 49,439 | 49,344 |
| Grand Total | 48,570 | 46,914 | 49,579 | 49,339 | 49,439 | 49,344 |