

687-3
1/17

A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

REPORT OF
INTERIM PRESIDENT KENNETH H. KELLER
TO THE
BOARD OF REGENTS

FEBRUARY 8, 1985

A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

In November, I outlined my views on the general directions that the University should be taking, building on our planning of the past few years and moving with a sense of purpose through this period of transition and into the future. It was a set of views based on the identity of the University as an international research university, a land-grant institution, and a metropolitan university. It was a statement that presumed our commitment to setting priorities and to making choices; in short, a commitment to focusing our activities to preserve and enhance our quality.

The response to that statement has been positive and supportive and because of that response and enthusiasm, I believe it is appropriate to expand upon it and to suggest how I think we should implement it. There are other reasons as well for taking this next step of making clear how our commitment to focus translates into actions for program enhancement and program curtailment. Here are two in particular:

First, in submitting its request to the Legislature this year, the University has made a strong case for both the restoration of adequate funding to carry out its mission and the flexibility to exercise its own judgment as to how best to use those funds to support its various programs. The Governor and the Legislature have both agreed that the Board of Regents is the proper body to make programmatic choices for the University. Still, there is no doubt that the support of public officials for our requests can be enhanced by a better understanding of our strategic plan for the future of the University.

Second, in the era of limited growth that lies ahead, the health of Minnesota's several systems of higher education will depend upon the thoughtful coordination of their missions. I believe it is appropriate that the University take the first steps toward that coordination by defining its programs with a clear sense of its own identity and with a sensitivity to the capacities of the other systems. By so doing, we will set the stage for the healthy evolution of complementary missions for each of the systems, an important step in assuring the maximum return on the State's investment in higher education.

The following set of proposals grows out of the concepts and priorities set forth in my November report. Let me emphasize that these proposals are programmatic rather than budgetary in nature. They address a redirection of efforts; the release of faculty from certain involvements to allow them to be more effective in other activities more central to our mission. They will not result in reductions of faculty although, to be sure, over time the programmatic redirection may result in gradual shifts through normal turnover in the numbers of faculty in various areas. In short, this is not a plan for budgetary retrenchment.

While the proposals rely heavily on the Board's Mission Statement and our institution-wide planning activities they must, at this stage, be viewed as my personal recommendations. In the next month, I plan to invite discussion of them within the University and, of course, I expect this Board to examine them carefully. However, to the extent that my suggestions are acceptable, it would be useful for the Board to take early action on them.

Let me summarize some of the key points I made in November. The University, I maintained, should pursue the realistic goal of being among the top five public institutions of higher education in the country. 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, I suggested, the University is seriously out of balance. The ratio of undergraduates to graduates 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, given the limited national pool of applicants and our limited physical space, it seems to me best to allow our undergraduate enrollments to decrease as the size of high school graduation classes diminishes. I believe that we should then focus on:

- . improving the financial support of graduate students to maintain their current numbers (or to increase their numbers in certain fields) and to increase their quality;
- . recruiting high-ability undergraduates who can best benefit from the University's programs; and
- . improving the quality of our undergraduate programs.

In addition to these general thrusts for improvement, the University must also be selective in programmatic terms. As a land-grant institution, our primary obligation is to respond to the needs of society both in this region and in the broader community that an international university serves. Our primary resource for dealing with those needs is our scholarly capacity. For a program to have a high priority, not only must it carry out research at the leading edge of knowledge, but the research should be stimulated by the needs of society and the results should be transmitted to society through active teaching programs, through outreach and service activities, through technological transfer. In short, such programs should engage the community and the society. This is true not only in the traditional connections of our agricultural programs and rural society, but in science and the arts and in the metropolitan community as well.

Within the context of these long-range programmatic directions, the University must set immediate priorities as part of the budgetary process. Since these priorities will change from year to year, it does not seem appropriate to discuss them in this report. However, they will be the subject of separate proposals in the near future.

The University must also define its role among the institutions of higher education in the State. Here, clear directions emerge for preserving our identity, serving our land-grant mission, working toward a position of excellence among research universities, and complementing the activities of the other public systems. In terms of research and service activities, we

are clearly unique, and in graduate and professional education we are substantially so. Our activities are driven by these responsibilities although we can still be selective, recognizing that neighboring states provide opportunities for Minnesotans in certain graduate and professional fields. At the undergraduate level, where many other opportunities exist in Minnesota and its adjacent states, we should fashion a role to fit our strengths and contract our programs to achieve a new balance of graduate and undergraduate activities. In doing so, however, the limited availability of other opportunities for four-year public education in the Twin Cities area must be kept in mind.

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

In the next several sections of this report, which are of key importance, I am recommending a number of specific programmatic shifts that I believe will help us to reach our institutional goals. The shifts deal with undergraduate education, professional education and the coordinate campuses.

I. Undergraduate Education

In any discussion of the contraction of undergraduate programs at the University, the important issue of access arises and, with it, a concern that the contraction may represent an undesirable elitism. The concern is understandable and might be valid under certain circumstances. I, however, do not think that it is elitist to ensure that there are public undergraduate programs of the highest quality -- the kind possible only at a research university -- available to Minnesotans regardless of their economic status. Further, I cannot accept the notion that access is effective when quality must be sacrificed to preserve a breadth of programs for which adequate funding does not exist. Finally, we must not forget that in 1851 when the University was founded, there were no other opportunities in the territory for public higher education, while in 1985 there are many such opportunities. To ignore them would be anachronistic and might even be criticized as arrogant.

In other words, access is important, but I believe that it must be carefully defined. At the undergraduate level, we must offer programs that are consistent with our broader mission, our standards of quality, and our distinctiveness, and we must make them available to all who can reasonably benefit from them. We should encourage rigor in our programs, but welcome all who seek the challenge of such rigor. Above all, if access is to be meaningful, we must assure that the nature of our programs, our expectations, and our entrance requirements are clearly understood by prospective students so that they can prepare for them adequately and enter them knowledgeably. With these considerations in mind, I have the following recommendations:

- Eliminate two-year degree programs in all colleges and at all campuses except Crookston and Waseca. At the undergraduate level, the focus of the University should be on four-year baccalaureate programs. The community colleges of the State, including those in the Twin Cities, offer appropriate opportunities for associate degrees. Before effecting this change, however, the University should ensure that transfer of credit to a community college will allow a University student to earn an

associate degree when it is not feasible for the student to complete a four-year program at the University.

• Eliminate degree and certificate programs from General College. The General College has a proud history of providing an open access point to the University. The original goal of the College was to assist certain students in making the transition to the various four-year disciplinary programs in the several undergraduate colleges. In recent years, however, the College has taken on additional activities that diffuse its primary focus. For example, the associate degree programs and the certificate programs offered by the College are not consistent with its original mission since they serve as terminal degrees short of the baccalaureate degree and provide only limited contact for those students with the other programs of the University. Eliminating them will help us to emphasize that our ultimate goal for students entering General College is a four-year degree.

The College's baccalaureate programs answer a need for certain non-traditional students, but they, too, are not central to the mission of the College. While no two programs are ever identical, Metropolitan State University's programs have very similar goals to the College's two baccalaureate programs. Thus, in eliminating the College's programs, we will not reduce the opportunities for students; rather, we will free up excellent faculty who can contribute to the University in other ways.

With the elimination of these degree programs the College can return to its earlier, valuable mission of assisting students under its open admission policy and helping them to correct their deficiencies in preparation so that they can move on into our four-year programs in disciplinary areas. The College can play a particularly important role in the coordinated lower division discussed below. It can become the focus of all of our special developmental programs. Indeed, with that in mind, I also recommend the relocation of the Student Affairs Learning Centers to the College so that our academic help activities can be most effectively administered.

• Eliminate University Without Walls Program. This University College program has served a small number of non-traditional students well through experiential learning and individualized programs. However, like the General College baccalaureate programs, the UWW activities are similar to those offered at Metropolitan State University. If we eliminate the University's program, the UWW counselors would be able to combine their efforts with those of General College and CEE counselors to create an expanded advising service for other traditional and non-traditional prospective and enrolled University students. We could serve a significantly larger number of students in this way and improve access to the University markedly. These counselors could also work with Metro State students to help them to develop a University component of their individualized programs, where that seems appropriate.

• Unify and increase entrance standards across all Twin Cities undergraduate colleges (except General College), Duluth, and Morris. At the present time, the individual entrance standards used by each college and campus lead to confusion among prospective students, advisors, and parents. By unifying entrance requirements and ensuring that they are appropriately rigorous, the University can play a useful role both in encouraging high school students to enrich their programs of preparation and in encouraging school boards to increase the availability of appropriate courses. It is important to note that while I believe that higher standards should be set in terms of minimum course preparation, I do not believe that increases in grade point average (GPA) standards are necessary or appropriate. As in the past GPA may well have to play a role when spaces are limited, but decreasing undergraduate enrollment may mitigate that problem.

• Coordinate lower division education across Twin Cities units. With the likelihood of decreased undergraduate enrollments, the opportunity exists to improve the quality of our lower division education. By coordinating lower division activities, we can provide increased flexibility to students to move from one college to another and increase the availability of special opportunities now offered only within individual colleges. These may range from honors programs to developmental programs. Increased attention to lower division in an organized way can also lead to improvements in the quality of lower division instruction. I suggest that over the next two years we consider alternative administrative arrangements for carrying out this coordination, including, but not limited to, a totally integrated lower division (drawing its faculty from the collegiate departments), a model similar to our Graduate School.

II. Professional Education

While there are some similarities between graduate and professional education, there are also important differences that allow us to make decisions about the size and scope of our professional programs on the basis of a more restricted set of considerations than must apply in graduate programs. Graduate students, for example, collaborate with faculty in their thesis research; they also promote the quality of undergraduate education through teaching activities. Thus, increasing our graduate student enrollment improves our ability to serve several aspects of our mission and decreasing the enrollment works in the opposite way. In contrast, professional students do not interact as closely either in research or undergraduate education and these need not be considered in determining the size or number of our programs.

On the other hand, there are financial connections that link all of our activities. Clearly, the quality of a professional training program can be enhanced by increasing the resources we invest in it, but those additional resources would not then be available to improve other aspects of the School's mission, to improve graduate or undergraduate education, or to enhance research and service activities associated with all of our educational activities. If we could achieve the same enhancement of quality by decreasing enrollments, the additional resources that might otherwise have to be committed to professional training would be freed for other uses.

To determine the feasibility of achieving improved quality by reducing enrollment in professional schools, it is necessary to consider the demand for trained professionals, the availability of similar training at other regional schools, the minimum class size for cost-effective education, and the cost of quality. With these factors in mind, I have the following recommendations:

- Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Management. Undergraduate business programs are now available at most of the State University System campuses as well as through their extension classes in the Twin Cities area. The primary focus of our School of Management is, and should continue to be, its graduate programs, research activities, and outreach. By reducing the undergraduate class size, we can assure programs of outstanding quality, usefully linked to our graduate programs. The School should consider how best to accomplish this shift, but the final result should be a class size no larger than half of the present enrollment.

- Reduce undergraduate class size in College of Education. As in the case of Management, in many areas of professional teacher education Minnesotans are well-served by the State University System. The University, therefore, should focus its undergraduate curriculum on special programs: preparation for teachers of mathematics, science, and language; special education; and vocational-technical education. Its more general programs should be limited to model programs that will provide a vehicle for effecting the ideas developed through research and will maintain the contact with school districts essential to remaining sensitive to their needs.

- Reduce undergraduate class size in School of Nursing. Here, again, opportunity is broadly available for undergraduate training at many State institutions. The University's essential contribution is in its advanced degree programs. Accordingly, its undergraduate program should be structured to appeal to and to serve those intending to proceed to graduate work.

- Cap undergraduate Institute of Technology engineering enrollments. The need for additional engineering graduates by Minnesota industry has been well documented and reductions in the University's undergraduate programs cannot be justified. On the other hand, simply dealing with present enrollments will require significant expansion of facilities and faculty. I believe that the primary role of IT must be in graduate education, research, and technology transfer. Therefore, while we should maintain undergraduate engineering enrollments in IT, we should not allow them to expand. Instead, IT should cooperate in the development of undergraduate engineering programs at UMD and in the State University System, and, indeed it has already begun to do so.

- Reduce DVM program in College of Veterinary Medicine. Although there have been significant infusions of new resources into Veterinary Medicine recently, the University has not been able to provide an adequate level of per-student support in the School's professional education program (DVM). The problem arises from the increasing importance of its graduate

and research programs that have required increased funding and its service programs (most particularly the Diagnostic Laboratory), which have also required substantially increased funding. Under the circumstances, it seems reasonable to consider a reduction in DVM class size. Two factors prompt such a recommendation. First, there is a widely held opinion that we are entering an era of overproduction of veterinarians. Second, and more importantly, the University of Wisconsin has recently opened its own School of Veterinary Medicine. It seems reasonable to take advantage of this expanded training capacity to reduce our veterinary class size by the number of positions previously reserved for Wisconsin students and to eliminate Veterinary Medicine from our reciprocity agreement. Such a change would maintain the same access for Minnesota students, improve the quality of our veterinary education and relieve the burden on our clinical faculty so that they can increase their contributions to other aspects of the School's mission.

• Consider reductions in other professional school class sizes. The possibility of achieving improved quality by reducing student numbers while maintaining constant budget levels exists in each of our professional school programs. Some changes have already been made in Dentistry and Medicine, but schools such as Law and Pharmacy have not yet raised these questions in methodical ways. Over the next year, I believe we should consider the feasibility and advisability of reducing professional school class sizes by examining data on societal needs, applicant pools, and marginal costs or savings with altered enrollments.

• Consider reductions in size and scope of medical residency programs. The changes in patterns of medical care, the projected surplus in physicians, and proposed changes in financing call for a reassessment of our medical residency programs. It may well be that we should contract in at least some of those programs and rebalance our activities in basic medical research and clinical training over the next few years.

III. Coordinate Campuses

The role of the coordinate campuses in the University's mission has occasionally been questioned in recent years. Few of the questions have suggested that the campus programs should not exist, but many have implied that they could be part of one of the other systems in the State. This, it is argued, would allow the University to focus its attention on its Twin Cities programs.

I believe it is important to note that the transfer of any of these campuses to one of the other systems would not result in any significant cost savings to the State if the missions they presently serve are to be continued. For similar reasons, such a transfer would result in no financial benefit to the University's other programs. Therefore, the decision on where to locate these campuses in the State's higher education system should be based on a clear statement of their individual focus and an assessment of which system can provide optimal support for that focus. Although I believe that these campuses can better serve the needs of the State by some sharpening of focus, I also believe that the more clearly defined directions I would recommend for

them can best be carried out if they remain part of the University of Minnesota. The comments which follow for each campus expand on this notion.

• Crookston and Waseca: The distinctive characteristic of these two-year technical colleges is their unmatched capacity for providing technical agricultural education. Their proximity to branch stations of the Agricultural Experiment Station, their faculty, their facilities, and their working relationship with faculty and programs on the St. Paul campus all support and enhance that capacity.

I believe that it is in the interest of the State to focus two-year agricultural education on the Crookston and Waseca campuses, transferring it from the other systems in which it is now offered. I also believe that our campuses should examine their programs and phase out those activities that do not depend upon our agricultural offerings since these latter programs can well be carried out in other post-secondary systems. Finally, I recommend that both campuses become part of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. This could help to streamline the administrative operation of the campuses and help to achieve a fuller integration of activities to take even greater advantage of the association of these campuses with the University.

• Duluth: The size and diversity of Duluth make it, in many ways, an independent comprehensive university. Because UMD is committed to research and some graduate and professional education, its association with the University is valuable in providing its faculty access to various faculty development opportunities and seed money research grants. It is reasonable to expect the campus to function as the land-grant University serving the northeast region of the State. This implies particular attention to the needs of the region and increased activity in its research, outreach, and service programs. It also implies the same narrowing of focus in its undergraduate programs suggested for the Twin Cities: eliminating its associate degree programs, setting entrance standards identical to those proposed for the Twin Cities undergraduate colleges, restricting its undergraduate professional programs to the extent that other opportunities exist for similar training, and examining the content of its undergraduate programs in such areas as language training, mathematics, and science, to ensure that undergraduates are challenged in the course of their studies and rewarded by the quality of the education they receive.

• Morris: The University's campus at Morris offers one of the most exciting opportunities in public education in the country; the possibility for State residents to attend a small, homogeneous liberal arts college usually available only in the private sector. The opportunity is not an easy one to maintain. In a small state college, there is great pressure to diversify offerings to keep enrollments up. This, however, leads to a diversification of faculty, which, in turn, leads to an inability to maintain a rich liberal arts program.

It is clear that Morris has been tempted to opt for "self-preservation" by seeking the diversity necessary to attract a greater range of students. Were that to be its direction in the future, I believe the campus would

lose its uniqueness and it would be less obvious why it should remain in the University system. Its role as a liberal arts college, however, can be much more easily maintained within the University than elsewhere. The opportunities for faculty development and exchange, the integrated recruiting of prospective students, the possibility of developing coordinated programs with the Twin Cities are all of great benefit in carrying out that focused mission.

It is my strong recommendation that Morris should remain in the University of Minnesota system and retain and enhance its commitment to a liberal arts curriculum. Indeed, I believe that the campus must move more vigorously to be a small liberal arts college, rather than a small College of Liberal Arts. That is, rather than encouraging individual majors, and courses chosen on the basis of satisfying group requirements, it should take advantage of its size to develop an integrated core curriculum. For example, such a curriculum could be based on multi-disciplinary courses, staffed by faculty in several disciplines, with each course displaying the integration inherent in a liberal arts program. Students could take this common set of courses and augment them with electives in areas of particular interest. It is clear that if the campus is to move in this direction with the concurrence of the University, the support for Morris must be based primarily on the need to maintain program integrity rather than on student enrollments. The interest of the State in providing a diversity of opportunities to its citizens warrants a commitment to this approach.

IV. Continuing Education and Extension

No discussion of focus within the University would be complete without attention to Continuing Education and Extension, a key component in the activities of any land-grant institution. As we focus our educational mission with respect to our on-campus activities, we should ensure that these goals are reflected in our outreach activities as well. Thus, while our outreach activities should increase in the future in recognition of our land-grant mission, they should also be structured to draw on our particular strengths. For example, we should increase our efforts to provide access to our specialized and unique programs, particularly at the graduate level. We should also ensure that all resources of the University that have potential to meet outreach needs are tapped. Finally, we should be at the forefront in developing new organizational and technical mechanisms for delivering both informal instruction and formal degree programs to Minnesotans around the State.

In the light of these general comments, I recommend the following:

• Increase utilization of University expertise in Agricultural Extension. The Agricultural Extension Service has a long history of using the resources of the St. Paul Campus effectively to deal with the problems of rural Minnesota. Its future development can reflect the new focus suggested in this report by expansion of its efforts in the metropolitan communities of the State, by tapping the resources of our Minneapolis units as well as our St. Paul units in meeting community needs, and by integrating our Crookston and Waseca faculty in Extension activities as they become part of the Institute for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics.

• Shift Continuing Education offerings to reflect University curricular strengths rather than market circumstances. The delivery of credit courses by the division of Continuing Education and Extension has been driven to a great extent in the past by market considerations. As a result, their offerings are skewed toward lower division courses, thus failing to reflect the special strengths of the University and sometimes overlapping with the Extension activities of the other systems of higher education. I recommend that CEE be funded on a budget basis rather than an income basis so that we can modify its range of offerings based on the University's role among the institutions of higher education in the State.

• Consider setting admission standards for credit offerings in CEE. As in the case of our regular day school offerings, access must be defined carefully to ensure that we do not use it in such a way as to limit the quality of the programs to which we provide access. For example, I believe we should consider the adoption of admission standards and prerequisites for CEE credit courses. This would have clear advantages. For example, if all students in a course have had adequate preparation, the class can be taught at a level more profitable to all of them. Further, better control of Extension admissions will ease the way for increased use of day and Extension courses in degree programs. Finally, the application of similar standards to all students would ease the problem of combining day and Extension courses. Thus, we could accomplish both our aim of enhancing the quality of our courses and our aim of increasing the flexibility of our course delivery.

• Coordinate Extension activities with other higher education systems. As we begin to increase the range and specialization of our Extension offerings, we will certainly increase opportunity for Minnesotans, but we are also likely to decrease total enrollments. This could be offset in part if we can work successfully with other systems of higher education to ensure that we are not offering competing programs. We should be prepared to offer courses in other areas of the State in situations in which the University has some special expertise, just as we welcome the Extension efforts by other systems in fields where we believe the University should phase out its programs. We should clearly avoid similar offerings in the same geographical areas.

• Anticipate and exploit new technologies for instructional delivery. The delivery of courses, workshops, cultural productions, public affairs information, and other activities to a wider audience will be helped in the future by new computer, teleconferencing, and media transmission technologies. CEE should be shifting its budgetary investment and its creative energies to projects that can exploit these new technologies to allow others to benefit from the University's unique strengths. In this effort, the emphasis should be on program content rather than technical development and on programming that cannot be carried out in other higher education systems.

THE REQUISITE STATE RESPONSE

The recommendations that I have made in the preceding paragraphs offer exciting possibilities for the University to increase its value to the State and to set the stage for a new era of coordination among the State's institutions of higher education. It is not possible or appropriate in a report of this kind to deal with the details of these changes and, indeed, some must be studied further to determine whether they are advisable. I believe that, to the extent that they are adopted, we should seek to implement them during the next biennium, approving the plans for each change with the help and guidance of our new President.

However -- and it is a large and important caveat -- I cannot and do not recommend the implementation of any of these changes unless and until the current State approach to funding of the University is modified to remove the counterincentives that currently exist to focusing our activities. For under the present circumstances, far from strengthening the University, many of these changes would seriously weaken the institution's financial support.

Average cost funding, in its present form, would reduce the University's appropriation in proportion to its decrease in numbers of students. Thus, deliberately allowing a decrease in student numbers so that our funds could be used in a more focused way to improve the quality of education, would be a vain effort because the funds would disappear. Indeed, the situation would worsen because such fixed costs as maintenance, fuel and utilities would remain requiring some of the instructional dollars left to be used to cover them, and, thus, leaving even fewer dollars for teaching.

The rigid 33 percent offset to our instructional appropriation that must be provided through tuition is a further counterincentive to these changes. The University has been forced over many years to charge more than the average offset to students in low-cost programs since it had to charge less than the average offset to those in high-cost programs if access and competitiveness were to be maintained. The changes I have proposed would tend to reduce the size of these low-cost programs, but doing so would certainly not be advisable if it resulted in substantial tuition increases for our remaining students as, unfortunately, it would under the present system.

Finally, these changes presume and require an increased level of cooperation with the other systems of higher education as we exchange functions in areas such as agriculture, as we work together with non-traditional students, as we sort out our roles in continuing education. I am encouraged by my preliminary conversations with the heads of other systems to believe that they will welcome this cooperation but, of course, the details remain to be worked out.

In short, to the extent that these recommendations are acceptable to the Board of Regents, I believe that they should be viewed as a proposal to the State; a proposal to work with the University to enable us to carry out these changes. If we are successful, I believe that the University of Minnesota will emerge as an even better institution; stronger in its programs, more responsive to the needs of the State, and an even greater contributor to the nation's well-being.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

February 11, 1985

TO: All Academic Staff Members

Dear Colleagues:

Planning is not a new word at the University of Minnesota and, in the past several years, we have evolved and carried out a process of planning that has helped us to deal with a difficult economic situation and has earned us national attention. We have also learned a good deal about ourselves in that process and have begun to think more clearly about our identity as a University than we ever have before. In a report I made to the Board of Regents in November, I suggested that it has become clear through our planning discussions that the University's three primary characteristics were its roles as an international research University, a land-grant institution, and, in large part, a metropolitan University. I further suggested that these characteristics could provide us guidance in setting priorities for the future and that it was possible and appropriate for us to strive to be among the top five public universities in the country by focusing our activities on the basis of those priorities.

While those ideas have been largely accepted, in recent months there has been an increasing challenge, both from within the University and outside it, to be more specific about our priorities. The Governor and the Legislature, who are now considering our very important Biennial Request, have asked us to explain how our general statement of mission translates into specific programmatic concentrations. Other systems of higher education within the State have asked us to take a leadership role in working to coordinate the missions of the State's various systems of post-secondary education. Within the University, the very practical question has arisen as to what is included and what is excluded from our priorities by our statement of identity.

In response to these challenges, on February 8, 1985, I presented to the Board of Regents a set of specific recommendations on programmatic focus for consideration by the Board and discussion within the University community. I have enclosed a copy of the full text of my remarks to the Regents because I believe you would appreciate reading it in its entirety rather than depending on press reports or word of mouth. Over the next month, I will be discussing these recommendations with various University Senate committees. Because they constitute a challenge to the Governor and to the Legislature, as well as a commitment on the part of the University, it is important that we take action on them so that we can, in fact, issue that challenge to the Legislature as it acts on our Biennial Request this spring. Thus, while I hope the discussion will be thorough, it must also be accomplished quickly.

Page Two

I believe that this University is committed to focus. I also believe that there is a broadly-shared commitment to improve the quality of our education for both undergraduates and graduates. Both of those goals require that we make choices and such choices are never easy. I hope that you will read the enclosed document with that in mind. Naturally, I welcome your comments on it.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kenneth H. Keller", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:kb

Enclosure: "A Commitment to Focus"