



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

ALL-UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Regents Room, 12:15 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Thursday, April 16, 1981

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of April 2 SCC meeting and Conversation with the President (enclosed)
3. Report of the Chair (enclosed)
4. Report of the Student Chair
5. 12:15-12:30. Report from Peter Robinson
6. 12:30-1:30. Institutional Planning Statement, discussion with the President. (Members of UCBRBR and the Facilitative Committee have been asked to join us)
7. 1:30-2:30. Remarks from Vice President Keller
8. Committee Reports
9. Report from Regents meetings.

NOTE: Entire meeting was a "Conversation with the President."
See record in volume of special meetings.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

All-University Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 30, 1981
12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
Room 626 Coffman Memorial Union

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of April 16 (enclosed).
3. Report of Chair (enclosed).
4. Report of Student Chair.
5. Committee Reports.
6. Meeting with Civil Service Committee (1:00 - 1:45).
7. Daily resolution from ACSA (please bring).
8. Nominations for Sexual Harrassment Board.
9. Committee Assignments.
10. Resolution to Regents concerning Constitution (enclosed).
11. Assembly Constitution (please bring).
12. Adjourn.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 5/14/81

All-University Senate Consultative Committee
April 30, 1981

The regular meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Chairperson Marcia Eaton at 12:30 p.m. in Room 626 of Coffman Memorial Union. Other SCC members present were Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Russ Hobbie, Judy Nord, Douglas Pratt, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Patricia Swan, and Bruce Thorpe. Guests were Mary Jane Plunkett, Carol Pazandak, Maureen Smith (University Relations), Liz Fuller (Daily) and Kathy Olson.

Announcement: May 28 SCC meeting will be held in #626 CMU instead of at the Earl Brown Center in St. Paul.

1. Agenda. Drop item 10. Add item on SCC '81-'82 budget. Remainder of agenda fixed.
2. Minutes of April 16 were approved as written.
3. Report of the Chair.
 - a. Proposed dates for 1981-82 Senate and Assembly meetings, recommended by the Clerk of the Senate, were approved by the SCC as follows:

<u>Senate</u>	<u>Assembly</u>
December 3	November 19
February 18	January 28
April 15	April 29.
May 20	

b. Consent decree implementation. The special masters have called Vice President Hasselmo to a hearing at which they will consider objections of the Faculty Women's Advisory Committee to the complaint procedures; the special masters have invited the SCC to also participate. Professor Schletzer will attend; if possible Julie Bates, Sue Pribyl and one or two other faculty members will also attend, to explain what the SCC has done regarding implementation of the consent decree. Hearing is Wednesday, May 6, at 1:00 p.m. at the courthouse. The special masters will hear testimony from the Faculty Women's Advisory Committee, hear testimony alleging harrassment arising out of implementation of the decree, and hear challenges to the consent decree claims handling from Professors Faunce and Woodward.

Professor Eaton circulated a letter from Professor Faunce containing a number of requests concerning consent decree implementation. Several of the requests appear to be acceptable to all parties. Of the 38 complaints filed against the University under the decree, the University has recommended settlements for some claims and has forwarded others to the special masters

with the University opinion that the complainant has no case. Only one or two cases require an internal tribunal.

4. Report of the Student Chair.

a. The Student SCC wants to discuss with Business and Rules Chairperson Connie Sullivan incorporating into the revised Assembly constitution an allocation of power similar to that in the new Senate constitution, reserving certain areas to the Faculty Senate or Assembly and others to the Student Senate or Assembly. (See item 11.)

b. Dr. Pazandak has requested student nominations to the Sexual Harrassment Board. The committee has good prospects for those appointments.

c. Committee is recruiting students to serve on four Senate committees and hopes to name them at the May 14 Senate meeting.

d. Committee voted unanimously to support ACSA's Assembly motion on restoring the Daily fee to the mandatory fee structure.

e. Student government is at odds with the administration over its student representatives to the Board of Regents. Student government assumes it should have the right to remove a representative who is not in fact representing the position of student government to the Regents. The Regents will not remove student representatives other than by previously established criteria.

5. Committee Reports.

a. UCBRBR. Professor Swan reminded the SCC that UCBRRB's May meeting is with Finance Vice President Bohem, and invited members to forward through Bruce Thorpe, Professor Brasted or herself, their comments on the University's support services for that discussion.

b. Budget committee.

(i) Professor Hobbie reported the request of the Senate Research Committee for \$3,000 from the Senate budget to purchase notebook covers for 1500 copies of the Handbook of Research Facilities the committee has prepared. While the budget subcommittee applauded the project, it decided it could not fund the request.

(ii) SCC discussed its proposed '81-'82 budget. Some members wished to retain box lunches for the FCC when 4½ hours of meetings fill the middle of the day. The budget will request money to fly to Morris, and the actual choice between flying and driving will be made in the fall.

6. Civil Service Committee. At 1:00, Vice President Hasselmo and four members of the Civil Service Committee joined the meeting. Jerome Larson, CSC Chair, introduced Shirley Raines, Irene Kraft, and Barbara Kalvik. Professor Eaton introduced the SCC members.

Mr. Larson described the committee's two-fold responsibility. CSC is to see that the Civil Service rules are carried out, as well as to shepherd proposed rule changes through to the President. It is also to be aware of the views of Civil Service personnel and represent those to the administration.

The committee oversees the Civil Service grievance system and can initiate inquiries into work conditions. The committee meets monthly. Today's meeting was arranged by Vice President Hasselmo at the suggestion of President Magrath when the CSC meeting with him last month raised questions of faculty-staff relations.

a. Overlapping concerns of Civil Service staff with students and with faculty regarding Senate committee activity. Civil Service has representatives on some Senate committees. Mr. Larson asked if a process exists for monitoring Senate committees to determine whether a committee is addressing all the concerns brought to it. He cited Parking and Transportation as an example in which reportedly none of the issues raised by the students and Civil Service members have been addressed. Professor Eaton explained that the only formal requirement is the annual report to the Senate and to the Assembly of each of their committees. She added that an individual Senator, however, dissatisfied with inaction on an issue, may take an item to the floor of the Senate and request referral to a committee and a report back.

Sue Pribyl said that students have often felt the same dissatisfaction. This year student members fill out for MSA their evaluation of their committee. MSA also urges students to contact the chair of a sluggish committee and push for action. Mr. Larson said the CSC is considering telephoning committee members to ask their assessment of their committee's work, but does not wish to be subversive. Judy Nord recommended a newsletter, such as MSA uses internally, as helpful inter-committee communication.

Mr. Larson asked if the SCC would be willing to consider suggestions about committees where the CSC thinks Civil Service representation would be appropriate, and he cited the Calendar Committee. Professor Eaton said the CSC could make such a request to either the SCC or to Business and Rules. She suggested the CSC regard the SCC as the steering committee of the Senate, which would forward their suggestions to the appropriate committee(s).

Sue Pribyl pointed out that, under the new Senate rules, some committees are not closed to ex officio membership, which could include Civil Service personnel. Professor Pratt added that people can certainly be invited to sit in on some committees and take part in discussion, without waiting for any Constitutional amendment.

b. Grievance mechanisms, jurisdictions.

(i) Sexual harrassment. Mr. Larson referred to the newly adopted University policy on sexual harrassment grievances. The new Board is to include one Civil Service employee. The existing Civil Service grievance mechanism provides for handling sexual harrassment cases. SCC members pointed out that Civil Service would need a broader body to have clout against an offender outside Civil Service, although they clearly would prefer to use their own structure for cases in which both parties are civil service employees.

(ii) Resolution of conflicts within a department. Professor Hobbie said faculty members often lack the training to settle disputes between Civil Service workers and their supervisors, and he thought the Personnel department might well have the expertise to assist. Vice President Hasselmo said one deliberate aspect of the personnel structure is that Personnel does not intervene between a civil service employee and the employee's supervisor, unless a legalistic process is sought. The Human Resources Office of the Personnel department, however, as CSC and some SCC members testified, stands ready to assist in resolving differences. Unit administrators are aware of

those services. There was general acknowledgement of the lack of broad awareness of many procedures and services in existence.

Dr. Pazandak said that the questions raised in this meeting are relevant to the preparations now underway to compile a "Guide to Grievance Mechanisms Within the University."

c. Publications and policies. Mr. Larson noted that the booklet, "Introduction to the University," says nothing about the Civil Service structure. Professor Eaton recommended Civil Service send a specific proposal for inclusion to the officer which publishes the bulletin (University Relations).

Mr. Larson pointed out that the new policy proposal on nepotism as related to staff review, which happens to be more broadly inclusive than the Civil Service rules, is silent on whether it is applicable only to faculty, or to other categories of employees too. He stressed the need for explicitness on applicability in such writings. Professor Eaton advised the CSC to address questions of this sort directly to the originating office--in this case, Academic Affairs.

d. Work assignments and job classification. Mr. Larson stated that a common occurrence is for a Civil Service employee to come to handle a good deal of administrative work but not get credit for it in a request for reclassification because the assigning faculty member describes it as really his or her own work and responsibility. Professors Brasted and Schletzer added that it also happens frequently that a faculty member tries hard to upgrade the job classification of a valuable employee to make it reflect more accurately the responsibilities, and can't win the reclassification. Dr. Hasselmo and Dr. Pazandak spoke of the real constraints in the classification system--relating to budgetary limitations, requirements of numbers of people to be supervised, and so on.

e. Civil Service access to appropriate functions. Mr. Larson cited an example in the libraries as one among many. Many highly trained Civil Service employees wanted to hear some speakers at a dinner function which was designed for faculty only. Their request was denied, although the library administration offered to arrange separate meetings for them. Mr. Larson expressed the hope that such employees could be permitted to take part when they were prepared to benefit from the offering.

In response to Professor Brasted's summing up question, Mr. Larson said the CSC could see the SCC as a route by which it could request changes, a body which could offer advice and assistance. Dr. Hasselmo urged the CSC to establish close contacts with the Civil Service personnel serving on committees now, to collect their concerns. Sue Pribyl suggested the CSC study the Assembly constitution, currently undergoing revision, and apply to Business and Rules for specific inclusions in that structure. SCC office will get a copy of the constitution to Mr. Larson.

7. Daily Funding--Refundable Fee Experiment. Judy Nord moved the Assembly Steering Committee support the ACSA's resolution to the Regents to return funding for the Daily to the mandatory, non-refundable student fee structure. Motion passed unanimously. Resolution will go before the Assembly this afternoon.

8. Nominations for the Sexual Harrassment Board. Dr. Pazandak has requested that SCC, Judicial, Tenure and SCFA each recommend at least one or two faculty members to serve on the new board. The SCC will forward these names: Dorothy Loeffler, Margaret Davis, Phyllis Frier, Michael Root, and Donald Rasmussen.

9. Committee Assignments. Professor Eaton has written to all the faculty members the FCC nominated for the committees on All-University Honors, Business and Rules, Finance, and Planning. No one has declined to serve. However, since Wayland Noland was prevailed upon to become Chair of the Library Committee, the SCC must name a replacement to Business and Rules. The following were proposed, and Professor Eaton will ask them in this order: Stuart Fenton, Rutherford Aris, Skip Scriven. The Senate Consultative Committee gave its approval to the entire roster of nominees from the FCC.

10. Resolution to the Regents concerning the new Senate constitution. The President has decided simply to recommend that the Regents endorse the new constitution, with no accompanying resolution.

11. Assembly Constitution. The Assembly Consultative Committee is in possession of the current draft of the revised constitution.

a. Recreational Sports. The major change recommended is moving Recreational Sports from Campus committee status to that of an Assembly committee, in acknowledgement of the size of its responsibility and the widespread faculty and student interest in the area. Professor Schletzer said that committee should have direct access to the Assembly, as they feel a lot of pressure and have many items to take to the Assembly. Dr. Pazandak raised the question of the relationship between Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreational Sports, since there is sharing of facilities and equipment, and considerable cross-charging. Prof. Schletzer said coordination of all four units--mens and women's intercollegiate athletics, physical education, and recreational sports, comes through the facilities coordinator and facilities committee, and through equipment management.

b. ACIA composition. Professor Eaton reported that Gary Engstrand of the Office of Administration and Planning will request of Business and Rules that the women's equivalent of the 'M' club alumni representative be added to ACIA. Present membership allows for two alumni representatives, one of whom has been from the 'M' club. Change would mean 3 alumni members on ACIA.

c. University-ROTC Relations Committee, formerly a committee of the Senate, becomes a committee of the Assembly.

d. Faculty Assembly / Student Assembly delegation of power. Orhan Arkan reported that the Student SCC hopes to see a provision in the Assembly constitution parallel to that in the new Senate constitution, allocating SCFA, Tenure, Judicial, and All-University Honors to the faculty portion of the body (Faculty Senate or Faculty Assembly) and student government, student organizations and student publications to the student portion.

Professor Hobbie explained that the differentiation had been dropped from the new Senate constitution because there are no University-wide areas of

purely student concern within the Senate. The writing subcommittee did not disapprove the concept of such separation and did not notice that the Assembly constitution had no parallel provision for it.

Sue Pribyl added that students would also want a mechanism to get items of theirs (such as the fee for the Daily) before the entire Assembly when students see them as issues of campus-wide concern.

Professor Swan described the separation clauses in the documents as having been intended to safeguard the integrity of each of the two bodies-- the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate. The Faculty Senate is the faculty's sole mechanism for system-wide governance. In fact, however, the faculty has used its separate Senate very little, except for consideration of the new Tenure Code in 1973-74. She remarked that the steering committees can and probably should steer some items to the separate bodies.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele,
Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

April 16, 1981

Senate Consultative Committee, University Committee on
Biennial Request and Budget Review, and Facilitative Committee

The joint meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee, UCBRR, and the Facilitative Committee with President Magrath was called to order at 12:30 p.m. in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall by Marcia Eaton, SCC Chair. SCC members present were Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Russell Hobbie, Keith Jacobson, Douglas Pratt, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, W. D. Spring, Paul Quie, and Bruce Thorpe, and members-elect Virginia Fredricks and John Howe. Guests present were Kenneth Keller, Carol Pazandak, Jim Borgestad, and Maureen Smith.

1. Professor Eaton introduced the newly-elected Twin Cities faculty members of the SCC, Professors Fredricks and Howe.
2. The SCC minutes of April 2 and the record of the conversation with the President of April 2 were approved.
3. Support materials distributed in advance or at the meeting included a draft of the SCC annual report, a summary of the minutes of other Senate committees for the year, and the newly revised Assembly constitution, bylaws and rules, as prepared by Business and Rules.
4. Institutional Planning Statement. President Magrath described the document as readable and discussable, but not specific nor highly prescriptive. It remains open for reconsideration and emendation on a year-by-year basis.

Professor Hexter asked how, aside from stimulating discussion, the president foresaw the document being used in making practical decisions. The president replied that the document gives students and faculty an insight into his own thinking, alerts the community to the fiscal difficulties of the immediate future, implies approaches to certain types of ventures, and challenges the units to be very explicit about their own internal planning. Professor Brasted asked how wide would be the distribution. The president said it should to at least to all senators and department heads.

President Magrath described Professor Eaton's letter of interpretation to him as a good summary of the document, and asked her to share it. She read the 13 questions she had distilled as those the statement requires be asked in regard to planning for a unit. The discussion produced assessments that while failure on any one question would not doom a unit, negative answers on all 13 would give a clear signal. The questions also address bringing a unit to distinction.

Professor Harvey Sarles argued for a discussion of the proper make-up of the University among a faculty group, representing the whole University and

thinking as faculty, not as managers, to parallel central administration's consideration.

Professors Eaton and Sullivan said they had interpreted 'responsiveness' in the document to mean meeting the specifically articulated needs. As Professor Sullivan interpreted the document's assessment of needs in the state, CLA, Education and the coordinate campuses are not clearly responsive to those needs. Vice President Keller and President Magrath emphasized that the document is to be taken in the overall context of the land grant act and the mission statement, which underlie this statement. This document is meant to convey that a good liberal arts core and research base are the first essentials; without them 'responsiveness' is without meaning. They said they would try to rework some sections to prevent such a misreading. Professor Sullivan commended the document for demonstrating the many significant issues that central administration is considering.

Professor Eaton recommended that the committees represented at the meeting discuss the document among themselves.

5. Planning for Fiscal Crises--Options for Selectivity. Vice President Keller distributed a list of very preliminary considerations. While he has no target date in mind for making cuts, he thinks it worthwhile to begin to talk about the issues.

A. Definition: Keller recommends defining a fiscal exigency as existing when a cut is required which, while it could be taken gradually, cannot be done without affecting adversely the quality of the University.

Professor Pratt asked what precedents exist for defining fiscal exigency based upon experience at other institutions. Vice President Keller replied that an administration has asserted a financial exigency exists; lawsuits follow. There are few precedents for large universities. Professor Sarles noted that New Jersey recently legislated permission to fire tenured faculty.

Vice President Keller believes we as a University haven't yet come to understand what fiscal exigency means and how the quality of the University can be eroded. He asks whether a community of scholars can agree upon the definition. He and the President said a group such as those making up this meeting can help decide what constitutes the emergency.

B. Goals for reductions. Assume for planning purposes a 10% cut in the state appropriation, about \$25 million. This suggests a loss of 300 faculty members (7% of the faculty); no more than 100 faculty depart annually by retirement and resignation.

C. Cuts in academic programs.

1. Appropriate level for cutting would be departments and/or programs within departments. To cut either individuals or entire colleges would be impractical.

2. Criteria for protection.

a. Degree of interconnectedness with other programs.
(Professor Pratt observed that structure affects connectedness and that some needs might be met through restructuring.)

b. Programmatic integration and service to state.

c. Other relations to mission.

d. Quality. Programs of extremely high quality become national resources. In Vice President Keller's mind, this importance almost overrides other issues.

e. Uniqueness--by itself, an insufficient criterion. Keller favors increasing curricular flexibility and reciprocity with neighboring states. He sees opportunities to join departments, and favors cross-teaching of introductory level courses by related faculties. Professor Hexter said that in light of the threatened programs at major universities it is important to renew reciprocity agreements. President Magrath referred to the recent meetings of executive officers of the Association of American Universities and discussions of the financial challenge forcing them to question some programs. Hexter pointed out that even industries are having to select from among their undertakings.

f. Student demand--also in itself an insufficient justification: hard to assess; of temporary nature while administrative decisions must be for many years.

Professor Hexter asked whether central administration looks back at the documents on retrenchment planning developed over the past ten years. Those deliberative processes produced only minute changes, he said. Vice President Keller said they do study that record. He added that units cannot be asked to plan for their own demise. The actual decision-making process, while highly consultative, must be strongly centralized. Priorities, rather than needs, must be the focus in the new plan.

Professor Lambert remarked that apparently during the Great Depression everyone took across-the-board cuts. Keller responded that the University is very different now; the state has made a huge investment to turn the University into a central resource.

The president and vice president stated that many programs cannot be compared with each other and that whatever data are used, judgments are subjective in the end.

3. Cost-effectiveness. Since good programs which meet some needs would be under consideration for elimination, any such elimination would have to save money to be justified. Considerations are:

a. Reduction in students--tuition loss.

b. Reduction in faculty.

c. Reduction in support services (maintenance = \$3/square foot).

Professor Brasted added loss of outside funding sources.

D. Support units. (Vice President Bohlen is currently taking a fresh look at the utility of support units.)

1. To what extent should support services be cut? Should each one have to be justified de novo? Should the cut goal be set as a ratio of

support unit cuts to academic unit cuts, e.g., 2:1? 1:1?

2. Criteria.

- a. Relation to student enrollment.
- b. Convenience: How much? Where to draw the line?
- c. Effect of support services on quality of education (books needed on schedule; psychological effect of dirty buildings).
- d. Necessity (certain labs must be clean).

E. Tuition policy. Keller asked if we harm a student more by closing a unit or a campus, or by maintaining it through raising its tuition substantially. Professor Spring asked if the legislature would not appropriate less if the University significantly raised tuition. Keller replied that the University would need an advance agreement from the legislature that it would be able to keep whatever extra it could raise.

Professor Sarles said the way changes are carried out is critical: who makes the decisions and how much consultation precedes them. He suggested the administration might want to float out its conception of what a trimmed-back University ought to look like.

Vice President Keller defined the key issue as whether quality is to be preserved. Would the University community favor a policy of retaining all tenured faculty regardless of all other considerations?

President Magrath said central administration is learning from the planning documents where to place emphasis and where to de-emphasize. By putting out suggestions now there is time to get responses. He and Vice President Keller said that a fiscal crisis is not inevitable. They agree, however, with SCC and others who have said that the University should allow time to plan carefully for a possible fiscal crisis. The President said the University is presently silently cutting everything through inflation--a system politically painless but educationally detrimental.

6. President's announcements. President Magrath reported on the recent AAU meetings in Washington, D.C. He felt moderately encouraged by news there. There are moves to restore much of what was proposed cut from NSF and social science programs, largely out of the recognition of the long range national need for research. It appears that graduate student aid will be protected and undergraduate aid suffer less than was proposed.

He summarized the state appropriation picture (leaving out the separate faculty salary item). The University's present base is \$449.6 million. The governor's January recommendation for the University was for a biennial budget, O&M plus specials, of \$482.8. His April 15 recommendation is for \$468.5. That provides a net increase of \$18.9 M, of which about \$13.6 is essentially mandated. The bills from the House and Senate appropriations committees, drafted prior to the governor's revised budget message, recommend \$26 M and \$27 M net increase. Professor Pratt asked whether the University can hope for a larger appropriation than the governor's recommendation since anything more would seem to require a larger tax increase than he is requesting.

SCC joint conversation with the President
April 16, 1981
page 5

On April 9 the president presented the new Senate constitution to the Regents for information and Professors Spring and Eaton answered the Regents' questions. Their reaction was on the whole highly affirmative. They indicated a strong preference for having the open meeting provision defined in the Constitution proper rather than in the rules, however. President Magrath has drafted a possible resolution by which the Regents would adopt the new Constitution, reaffirming that the Constitution is based on a delegation of their corporate powers. This proposed text will be copied to the SCC.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary,
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

Report of the Chair for April 16.

1. A meeting of the Facilitative Committee was held on April 7. Professor Sullivan, Business and Rules, reported on a Forum held by that committee on April 2 to discuss possible Senate representation for people on P.A. appointments. Most people who attended the forum thought professionals in that category should vote as faculty in their units. Business and Rules will not be able to propose a solution, however, until central administration is clearer on the number of people involved and the types of functions they perform. This will be an item that Business and Rules will take up early next fall.

The Facilitative Committee also discussed briefly the Institutional Planning Statement. Members will attend our meeting today.

The Carr report on faculty activities was distributed and also discussed briefly. Members expressed worry that the connection between the recommended steering committee and other Senate and University committees is not clear. One member also suggested that any committee which has to define its own task is likely to fail. I have passed these worries on to Vice President Hasselmo who will consider them.

2. ACSA has recommended that the Daily refundable fee experiment be terminated at the end of this year. I shall put this matter on our April 30 agenda.

3. You should have received the final draft of the Claims Procedures--final in the sense that they have been sent on to the Special Masters. I will put discussion of them on an agenda only if requested to do so.

4. Enclosed is a draft of SCC's annual report. Please send suggestions for addition or revision to me by April 25, so that we can make the April 30 Senate docket deadline.

5. Vice President Keller has asked the East Bank Planning Advisory Committee to discuss the new alumni building. This report should be relevant to our discussion of this in the future.

6. The Business and Rules Committee is working on the TCCA constitution, but in order to have full consultation will not be able to put it before the April 30 Assembly meeting. It will go to an Assembly meeting early next fall.

Marcia M. Eaton



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President
for Administration and Planning
200 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 9, 1981

Professor Marcia Eaton
Philosophy Department
382 Ford Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Marcia:

Thank you very much for the comments on the Institutional Planning Statement that you sent to Peter. I think your approach is a very interesting one. It helps focus the statement to reformulate its major points into questions. Applying those questions to an evaluation of a single unit is also a valuable perspective.

It seems to me that you have captured the major points in the statement with your questions. There are some University-wide perspectives that cannot be captured. I am thinking, for example, of the "theme" of "intellectual community". It may also be that some question should be added that addresses the important point that has to do with the integration of research, teaching, and service as a unique feature of the University.

I should take this opportunity to mention to you that I have tried to tie the Institutional Planning Statement to our proposed assessment process in a very preliminary way. I have specifically asked Subcommittees I and IV of the Planning Council, the ones dealing with the planning statement and with assessment, to look at each issue raised in the Institutional Planning Statement from the point of view of a possible assessment mechanism. This is clearly the way we have to go as we continue to develop the statement and our assessment process.

Thank you very much for your comments.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nils".

Nils Hasselmo
Vice President for
Administration & Planning

pw

cc: C. Peter Magrath



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

April 15, 1981

Professor Marcia Eaton
Chairperson
Senate Consultative Committee
383 Ford Hall

Dear Marcia:

I thought your letter and the questions you extracted as being suggested by a reading of the Institutional Planning Statement from the point of view of what it means to an individual faculty member within an academic unit were excellent. In fact, I would like to refer to some of your questions and the issues they suggest when we discuss the Planning Statement this week with SCC.

Obviously, a statement of the kind we are looking at suffers from being general and suggestive rather than specific; as an agenda for discussion and to stimulate thinking at every level, this is probably all that can be expected in such a statement. I do not believe that a specific, detailed statement from "the top" can be done or, if done, would be very useful or acceptable. The more detailed statements clearly have to be fashioned at the collegiate and departmental level.

I have also seen Nils' letter to you and agree with his thought that perhaps some kind of question should be raised on the subject of how one best can integrate research, teaching, and educational service as one of our distinctive University of Minnesota features.

Thank you for looking at the Planning Statement so carefully and thoughtfully, and I look forward to discussing it with you and others on Thursday.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:kb

cc: Vice President Nils Hasselmo, Administration and Planning



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Philosophy
355 Ford Hall
224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 6, 1981

C. Peter Magrath, President
University of Minnesota
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

You encouraged individuals to respond to the Institutional Planning Statement, and I wish to do so. A problem with such documents--both in writing and in reading them--is the tension between generality and specificity. As a reader of this and other similar statements, e.g. the CLA College Plan, in recent months, I find myself wondering, "What does this mean to me as a member of the faculty in the Philosophy department, in CLA, and at the University?" It is often difficult to answer these questions and so, in reading your statement, I have taken another tack. Suppose I were given the responsibility for putting this plan into operation: what would I do? I would like to share with you the way in which I have answered this question in order to see if I have interpreted the document correctly.

Using the Planning Statement, one can distill a number of questions which must be asked whenever decisions (particularly budgetary) about a given unit are to be made. Answers to these questions will provide a basis on which various units can be compared, contrasted, and ultimately ranked.

1. Does the unit have or is it soon likely to have distinction? If so, what must be done to maintain or assure this?
2. Is the unit actively engaged in research, basic and/or applied?
3. Does the unit contribute directly to the liberal education mission of the University?
4. To what extent will maintaining the unit require additional funding that is likely to necessitate a tuition increase?
5. Does the unit have a reasonable work load (where 'reasonable' is understood both in terms of some ideal and in terms of equity)?
6. Is the unit likely to suffer from an increasing lack of contact with younger scholars and scholars of distinction outside of the University?

C. Peter Magrath
April 6, 1981
page 2

7. Does the unit contribute to the uniqueness of the University?

8. Does the unit contribute to the diversity of the University in a positive way?

9. Is the unit contributing to and/or satisfactorily reacting to advances in technology?

10. Is the unit contributing to and/or satisfactorily reacting to advances in areas which are likely to influence our entire society in the coming years, e.g., energy, bioscience?

11. Are there special needs of the state that the unit responds to?

12. Do the unit and the University provide individuals with incentives for fulfilling the perceived missions of the unit?

13. Do our current institutional assessment procedures provide us with answers to the above questions?

Essentially now I have two questions to ask of you: Have I understood the Planning Statement? and, Are there important questions that I have left out of my list?

I hope that my way of approaching this matter does not seem too presumptuous or narrow. I believe that I agree with most of what you say in the document and that it provides a valuable means of discussing crucial issues which confront us all.

Very sincerely,



Marcia M. Eaton

MME:mbp

cc: Nils Hasselmo
Ken Keller



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President
for Administration and Planning
200 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 25, 1981

TO: Members of the University Committee on Biennial
Request and Budget Review

FROM: Nils Hasselmo *N.H.*

I enclose a copy of the fourth draft of the Institutional Planning Statement. As you will recall, this is a statement by the President that addresses the overall goals, objectives, and priorities of the University for the planning period up to about 1985, given our best assessment of the problems, circumstances, and opportunities that we will encounter.

An effort has been made to take account of the many comments on earlier drafts that have been received. This is an invitation to you to share your comments with us once more before the statement becomes "official" as far as this biennial cycle of the planning process is concerned.

Since we hope to finish any revisions within about a month, I would appreciate it if you could let us have your suggestions no later than April 10.

pw

Encl.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING STATEMENT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES FOR 1980-89

C. PETER MAGRATH

INTRODUCTION

During its history of over 130 years, the University of Minnesota has become one of the leading educational systems in the nation. We are one of the country's largest universities in terms of enrollments, comprehensive in terms of program variety, creative in terms of educational and research innovations, and respected in terms of overall quality.

In continuing this tradition of academic service, diversity, and excellence, we must develop a common understanding of the goals, objectives, and priorities that the University will pursue over the next decade. It is also necessary to understand those factors, internal and external, that will influence the pursuit of our institutional objectives. The purpose of this document is to promote such an understanding and discussion both within the University and among our external publics.

We should recognize that the University expresses its goals and objectives in a number of ways and with varying degrees of specificity. General directions and interests are enunciated in the Regents' Mission and Policy Statement, a document that was first developed in 1975 and that was revised in 1980. In turn, this Institutional Planning Statement adds specificity to the Mission Statement by outlining the areas that will be emphasized and the significant factors that may affect institutional choices over the next decade. Finally, within the context of both the Mission Statement and the Institutional Planning Statement are the more detailed plans that each of the major collegiate and support units have developed. Together, the three levels of planning statements form an integrated expression of institutional directions and priorities.

As the fourth draft in a series of Institutional Statements, this document reflects not only my personal views as President, but also the comments received from various Senate, campus, and collegiate groups. If the consultative response to this latest document is favorable, then the statement will become part of the planning structure to be used in further refining collegiate plans as well as in developing the 1983-85 legislative request.

This statement is organized in four sections. Section I discusses the traditional goals and characteristics of the University as well as the tensions that have accompanied the pursuit of these goals over the history of the institution. Section II outlines the major factors, both internal and external to the University, that will influence our choices and activities over the next ten years. Section III identifies areas of maintenance as well as opportunities for improvement that we should take advantage of during the next decade. Section IV concludes with an overview of how these goals and objectives can be implemented as well as assessed in the years ahead.

I. TRADITIONAL GOALS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Two characteristics, above all others, distinguish the history of the University of Minnesota. One is its tradition of responsiveness to the people of the State; the other is its status as a leading institution of higher learning. As a land-grant institution, the University has been called upon to serve the broad and multifaceted needs of a changing public. As a leading university, we have pursued scholarly excellence across the breadth of our programs. It is the interplay between these two characteristics -- that is, the effort to be a broadly responsive as well as a nationally leading university -- that serves to define the uniqueness of the University of Minnesota. At the same time, this interplay also gives rise to inevitable tensions, especially when constricted by inadequate fiscal resources.

One major tension relates to the University's efforts to be a broadly responsive institution. Here the reality of limited funding and unlimited needs forces difficult choices among competing goals, with priority given to those that best reflect the unique resources of the University. In my judgment, continued emphasis must be given to the integration of teaching, research, and service even as we recognize that some programs stress only one or two of these functions. Moreover, the University must maintain its special role in supporting professional programs, particularly those in the agricultural, health, and technological arenas. Similarly, the University's outreach and service responsibilities will continue as fundamental priorities.

A second tension grows out of the University's efforts to be a responsive institution. Typically, this takes the form of an "accessibility versus selectivity" argument among those who view the size of our student body and the breadth of our programs as being the antithesis of quality and high standards. On the one hand, we have an obligation to meet the general education needs of our constituencies. This requires a commitment to educational access and to undergraduate programs of various types and at various locations. On the other hand, many of our graduate and virtually all of our undergraduate and professional programs are characterized by great selectivity and exceptional standards.

Rather than being antithetical, it can be argued that the University's size is positively correlated to quality and selectivity. In many cases, our broad spectrum of programs attract superior students who might not otherwise consider the University. Similarly, we are able to expose undergraduates to faculty who are not only teachers but researchers as well. An additional consequence of our size is that we are able to offer opportunities for graduate student teaching and research assistantships. Together, these factors argue not for a multitude of separate programs for, many times, larger consolidated programs are able to provide equal or greater access than smaller specialized programs. Rather, such factors demonstrate that responsiveness can incorporate both access and quality.

Just as tensions arise out of our mandate to be a responsive institution, so too do they accompany our efforts to be a leading university. Here again, limited resources play a fundamental role. The first unavoidable issue is that not all good programs can be supported at levels that would make them outstanding ones. Resource considerations dictate difficult decisions that affect the overall quality of every program, and to ignore this simple truth is to deny the reality of legitimate needs in excess of available funding. Thus, our continuing and overriding objective must be to foster quality in all of our activities, and we must also recognize the importance of developing as many outstanding programs as possible. Such programs not only enhance the structure of the University as a whole, they also serve as the leaven in promoting sound standards of scholarships throughout the institution.

A second tension for a leading university relates to its research responsibilities. The pursuit of knowledge through research is a defining characteristic of a major university and will remain a central responsibility of the University of Minnesota in the years ahead. Indeed, it is this pursuit that clearly distinguishes this institution from any other industry, agency, or post-secondary system in the State. To sacrifice support for research in favor of other pressing demands would ill serve either the State or the University. That sacrifice will not be made.

Third, in the same way that major universities have an obligation to support research that offers no prospect of immediate and practical pay-off, so too must leading institutions of higher learning protect and support the humanities and sciences. These areas are especially vulnerable to societal pressures as they enjoy less direct support from specific constituencies than do many professional programs. It is in the nature of a leading university to stress broad liberal educational programs at the undergraduate level even though this orientation sometimes runs counter to the demand for professional and vocational specialization. The University's commitment to the principle of liberal education must remain clear and strong.

The previously outlined tensions reflect the duality of our efforts to be both a responsive and a leading university. This duality will not likely change in the years ahead. Rather, we will continue to be called upon to serve our many clienteles and to develop excellence within constricted resources. However, we will have to address these and other challenges in a context that will be different from recent history. That context merits special attention.

II. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE UNIVERSITY IN THE 1980s

A variety of factors will influence higher education and the University of Minnesota in the years ahead. Three general factors -- those involving economic, social, and technological changes -- will be especially salient. Because these conditions will be subject to continuous change, our assumptions about them must be reviewed on a frequent and continuous basis.

Economic Conditions

As citizens, each of us realizes that the economy of the nation and the State is depressed, with inflation remaining high, tax revenues lagging, and political pressure for tax reductions mounting. As members of the University community, each of us also recognizes the spillover effect that such conditions have upon our activities. The subsidies we receive from the State, the research grants and contracts we have with the federal government, and the tuition rates that our students pay are all influenced by external economic conditions. We are called upon to be more creative in our efforts to generate funding and more accountable in our expenditures of funds. Such trends are not expected to abate in the immediate future.

Our fiscal forecasts must also reflect the fact that our instructional budgets, from both State and tuition sources, have historically been linked to enrollments. The critical issue here is that many of the activities we engage in are simply unrelated to the number of students we enroll. We should and must make every effort to persuade State officials of the inappropriateness of rigid enrollment driven funding formulas, but we cannot expect that such funding mechanisms will be entirely replaced.

If, as current projections indicate, enrollments decline, there will be a reduction in tuition revenue. And if we are to maintain access to all students interested in attending the University, then we must remain committed to maintaining tuition rates that are as low as possible. At the same time, if we confront the difficult choice of becoming an inexpensive but mediocre institution as opposed to a more expensive but first-rate university, then certain tuition increases will be inevitable.

A possible source of additional tuition income might be found in attracting new instructional clientele. Although the potential for adult and mid-career educational programs should not be overlooked, neither should it be over estimated. We should assume that well-constructed programs addressed to the needs of new and underserved clientele will attract support sufficient to finance these new ventures.

The need for increased support of basic research will continue to grow, yet it is unlikely that the federal government will fully meet this need. At best, there may be incremental increases in federal funding for applied research. This means that we may have to increase our efforts to attract

more State, private, and industry support for our research proposals. Our track record in private fund raising over the past decade has been impressive, more than doubling the private income that we generated ten years ago. We may be able to improve upon this record if we demonstrate a strong planning effort, a coordinated fund-raising campaign, and a continuing commitment to high quality and responsive programs.

Our efforts to generate increased public support for our educational programs will also be met by continuing calls for accountability. Again, our track record in this area is one that we can take pride in; we are both accountable and productive. We must caution the public, however, not to confuse productivity with quality or efficiency with effectiveness. Productivity is important, and we will strive to improve it wherever we can, but we must do so only in ways that are consistent with our efforts to maintain and enhance the quality of the University's overall programs and services.

In academic areas, we will have to continue to consider carefully such issues as faculty work loads, class sizes, frequency of offerings, and alternative pedagogical methods, recognizing that variations in such matters are generally the logical result of differences in responsibilities. In support areas, we will have to monitor the productivity of increases achieved by comparable programs in the general community, recognizing that here, too, universities differ significantly from other enterprises. An unwillingness or inability to demonstrate measures of effectiveness and efficiency can only hamper our efforts to maintain public confidence and support.

Since the University is a labor intensive enterprise, any discussion of productivity must concern all University employees. In the next decade, I do not anticipate any significant changes in the tenure code, even though academic personnel issues will require continued attention. For example, incentives for early faculty retirement, retraining, or transfers within the system might be examined as methods for adjusting to changing programmatic demands. Likewise, strategies for ensuring the continued flow of young and exceptionally qualified faculty into the system should be developed. The mix of faculty and Civil Service staff should also be studied. However, these and similar staffing issues can only be pursued in the context of University-wide review and discussion.

Finally, the same economic conditions that give rise to calls for accountability will also be reflected in increased efforts to coordinate the activities of public higher education. It is clear that the pressures of declining enrollments, limited income, inflation and similar matters will be as serious, if not more so, for other universities and colleges across the State. As a result, we can expect to encounter proposals to alter our programs and offerings particularly at the undergraduate level. We have a responsibility to cooperate with these universities and colleges, as well as with the Higher Education Coordinating Board, to carefully review their proposals, to consider their role in our planning activities, and to be as clear as possible in communicating our directions and decisions. At the same time, we have a responsibility to demonstrate the uniqueness of our programs and the wisdom of maintaining the diversity that distinguishes the higher education sector in Minnesota.

Social Change

Just as the University is not immune to external economic influences, so too is the institution subject to changing social conditions. One such condition involves the demographics of our society and the suggestion that there will probably be a dramatic decline in the enrollments of higher educational institutions by the end of the decade. On the one hand, we should avoid making any self-confirming assumptions about the size of the decline because factors such as the economy, institutional prestige, the location of our campuses, and employment prospects might mitigate the demographic trends. On the other hand, unless clear evidence can be shown to the contrary, the University as a whole should base its plans on a moderate enrollment decline throughout the rest of the decade. This prospect will require individual units to examine anticipated student loads, changes in the types of student clientele, and adjustments in the types of programs that will serve these students.

A second social change that will continue through the 1980s involves the increased participation of minorities, women, and the handicapped in University programs. Our concern for equal opportunity and affirmative action must remain steadfast as we strive to implement effective principles of access and quality. This commitment must be reflected in the planning and decision making across all institutional levels.

Recent events in Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, and South America reinforce our awareness that we are inescapably part of a world community. Our own businesses are increasingly becoming worldwide enterprises. Because of our capabilities and past performance we are in a position to facilitate better understanding of foreign cultures and the transfer of technology to assist the economies of developing countries. By assisting in the international arena, we also learn and improve our own methods. We must continue to emphasize our international activities across the breadth of the University's programs.

A commitment that has institutional implications involves the system of shared governance and decentralized decision making that has evolved over the history of the University. Currently, some or all of our faculty groups may choose to be represented by unions. Regardless of how these representation questions are resolved, we will have to continue our efforts to make the shared governance structure more responsive, for that structure reflects the essential spirit of a leading, multi-purpose university.

Technological Change

Technology has advanced rapidly in recent years and that trend will continue in the 1980s. The University has a major role in bringing about the technological improvements as well as educating members of society to deal appropriately with the changes. A few areas stand out in terms of their potential impact on the University.

Computation and communication advances are important in several ways. A major State industry relates to this technology. It behooves the State to have the University provide research and development programs that advance the technology and facilitate its transfer to industry. Also, advances in the areas of clerical and computational tasks suggest potential major changes in the University's operations. These same advances are already introducing significant changes in the way a major portion of society works and communicates.

Another area of technological interest relates to energy. In addition to our national interest, Minnesota has a special concern for improving both our ability to produce and conserve energy. Beyond the University's research and development contribution in this area, we can play a major role in educating both industry and the general public on energy issues.

I am also convinced that we are at the beginning of a bioscience revolution that has the prospects of having a far bigger impact on man's future than any of the physical, chemical, and material science developments that have occurred during the past two hundred years. These developments can have a startling influence in the diverse areas of energy production, pollution control, food production and chemical and pharmaceutical production.

It is essential that the University be organized to contribute effectively in helping society deal with the technological changes. Further, we must develop sound proposals that will attract public and private funding support for our efforts in these areas.

III. AREAS OF EMPHASIS

Whenever one tries to select specific areas of the University to emphasize in the near future, there is legitimate concern over whether in the process of improving one area we allow another excellent program to deteriorate. Our intention is clear. Where excellence exists, we will maintain it. Secondly, as a matter of strategy, we will seek to focus funds available for improving programs in such a way that the improvements can be made reasonably quickly. Such improved programs will, in my opinion, strengthen further the University's case for acquiring additional support.

The areas of emphasis for the University at this time reflect the combined influences of the fundamental goals and characteristics of the University; the general economic, social and technological conditions; and special opportunities. As suggested in Section I above, our stature as a leading university and our responsiveness in the land-grant tradition are the two major operational characteristics of the University. As such, they represent headings under which we have identified major areas of emphasis in this section. Another grouping of areas of emphasis is addressed in Section IV. It is a category that encompasses actions that relate to the means for achieving our goals. In particular, actions related to resource support, administrative processes and public relations are included in this group.

Leading University: Goals and Objectives

- To maintain and wherever possible strengthen research activities of the University.
- To improve and maintain the University's arts and science core.
- To ensure a University environment that attracts, retains, and supports high quality faculty, staff, and students.

As a major university, we are an exceptional resource for Minnesota as well as the nation. Three aspects of our leading university character are most prominent in my concern for maintaining and improving our stature: our level of research, the arts and science base of the University, and the environment supporting a vibrant intellectual community. These characteristics are vital to our role but they are difficult for those outside the academy to appreciate fully. We must vigorously rise to the challenge to promote a clear understanding of these fundamental needs.

The major direct support for our research activity comes from special State and federal programs such as agricultural research, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health. Recently, the federal support has been declining and economic conditions are not favorable for reversing that trend. We must, however, convince the public of the necessity to invest in research. Added support can be provided through provision of student fellowships and research assistantships. Also, the University should organize specific major research projects that can attract public and private support. Moreover, we must work hard to ensure that proper equipment and special facilities are available to support faculty research activities.

Indirectly, the State also supports research through the recognition that faculty in our institution are expected to engage in unsponsored research. Historically, this support has been related to enrollment because our overall funding is related to enrollment. We must strive to "uncouple" the support of the University from the slavish following of an enrollment-driven standard.

The liberal core of the University, its arts and science base, have been weakened in recent years by overextension in terms of programs. Concurrently, there is some pressure from professional programs to minimize the importance of this base in their curricula. We must reaffirm the essentiality of a strong arts and science core to our character as a leading university. In addition to seeking program consolidations that strengthen programs without decreasing access, we will support curricular changes designed to strengthen the undergraduate core offerings and our honors programs. Another special concern is the expansion of research, especially in the basic humanistic and social science disciplines. It is the special responsibility of a leading university to support scholarly inquiry in these areas because they generally lack the support of organized external constituencies.

To remain a leading university requires an environment that supports a vibrant intellectual community. A major ingredient in this environment is good faculty and good students. In order to maintain a faculty of distinction, we must continue our efforts to improve our faculty salaries. Emphasis must be placed on attracting our full share of high ability students, regardless of financial need or social circumstances. Another part of the environment is good facilities and services. Since the Twin Cities Campus is essentially an urban commuter university, we have the opportunity to serve a large faculty and student body but we have special challenges. On the more obvious side, we must maintain and improve our library and computation services. Less obvious but no less important, we need to improve the physical plant on all our campuses to include such simple things as adequate lounge and study space, improved recreational and intramural sports facilities, good dormitories, parking, and access to buildings and services at night and on weekends.

Responsiveness: Goals and Objectives

- To develop and maintain sound mechanisms for assessing and responding to the needs of the citizens of the State.
- To maintain programs with outstanding records of response to the needs of our constituents.
- To capitalize on opportunities to improve programs that address important societal needs.

As a major university we have an enormous capacity to respond to the needs of our constituents. We want to ensure that this capacity is fully utilized as well as emphasize the integration of our teaching, research, and service activities. Consequently, we intend to adhere to the following principles: 1) delivery of educational services will be the primary responsibility of our major academic units; 2) every university unit will continually support a systematic effort to understand the needs of all clientele that are related to their discipline area; and 3) central administration will provide a strong coordinating activity at the all-university level. Specific areas of emphasis that we are already aware of can be related to the major social problems of food, health, energy, technology development, and organizational efficiency. I wish to comment on each in turn.

In the agricultural arena, the University has long been a leader both in the research and development of new methods and in the dissemination of information on sound practice in food production and nutrition. These efforts must be maintained. Further, we must expand our development of expertise in the international aspects of food production and delivery. For example, the efforts already underway in developing cooperative programs with the People's Republic of China provide an excellent base from which to expand our internationally oriented activities.

Similarly, the rapid expansion of the University's programs in the health area during the past decade have put us in a leadership position among major universities. Now we must consolidate these gains and maintain that leadership position. Along with the continued development of new methods and treatments, we must tackle the problem of adequate, efficient, and equitable health care delivery. In addition to providing for the education of health care professionals, we must ensure the adequate education of the general population in the area of health care and stand ready to provide service support in whatever ways we can.

The maintenance of traditionally responsive programs will not be the only measure of University responsiveness in the 1980s. Rather, the institution will also be called upon to meet the growing needs of our clientele in other areas. Advancing technology, for example, presents a two-edged problem. We need to assist society in adjusting to and utilizing the advances already made as well as being on the forefront of advancing technology. An important aspect of improving our technology development capability is the support that would result for Minnesota's high technology industries. The benefit of facilitating the transfer of technology from the University to industry is substantial. My support of the MINNTECH proposal recognizes this fact. It is also clear that some of the technological advances in computation and communication could have a profound effect on the ways in which the University operates. This applies equally to our instructional and support activities. Along with issues of our own efficiency, we need to be in a position to play an appropriate role if these technological changes are indeed changing the way we all live and work.

A special area of technological interest is energy. The University currently has some important special expertise in the areas of solar and biomass energy production. Because of the State's dependence on outside energy, we need to be in the forefront of research and development in energy production as well as conservation. In addition, we need to educate the public on energy issues -- a challenge that will require the talents of individuals across the institution.

Responding to the needs of organizations, both public and private, is yet another challenge that the University must be willing to accept. The efficiency and effectiveness of these organizations affects us all. We have a unique opportunity with public and private support to put the University in the first rank in the areas of law, business administration, and public administration. We can be a leader of research activity and public policy formulation as well as a major source of well-trained professional administrators. Such an ability will serve the economic and political health of Minnesota.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- To develop and maintain an appropriate planning/decision-making structure that includes sound assessment procedures.
- To ensure that individual and unit incentives are consistent with the effective and efficient operation of the University.
- To make the general public aware of the importance and uniqueness of the University's current and potential contributions to the welfare of the citizens of the State.

In addition to enunciating our long-term and immediate goals and objectives, we must ensure that decisions are made to allocate resources, establish policies, and conduct operations in ways that support our aims. Our obligation is to not only provide the best case for acquiring necessary resources to meet our objectives, but to make the best use of the resources we have. To meet these needs, we are making a major effort to improve our planning/decision-making processes. I am convinced that our efforts will result in better decisions, stronger consultation throughout the community, improved communications among all elements of the University, and a better basis for explaining our needs to both public and private sources of support. This improvement of our administrative processes is not a short-term project. Much remains to be accomplished. In particular, we need to achieve a better integration of our general planning activities with: 1) the development of operating budgets and legislative requests; 2) the development of physical plant plans and the capital request; and 3) coordination of fund raising.

A major part of our planning process involves the development of unit plans for the colleges and major support units. We are also developing a central administration position regarding each of the unit plans in the form of a presidential planning memorandum. The Vice Presidents and I have spent considerable time reviewing these plans and interacting with the heads of the various units regarding assumptions, directions, and priorities. These plans are intended to be consistent with the overall directions and priorities of the University as expressed in this Institutional Planning Statement. Naturally, the major unit plans provide a far more detailed view of the activities that are envisioned in various parts of the institution as we strive to meet our objectives over the next several years. We expect that the current round of major unit plan development will result in final plans and planning memoranda in time to provide a sound basis for the development of the 1983-85 legislative requests.

Besides improving decision processes directly, we must make significant strides toward improving our institutional assessment processes. Such improvements are necessary both to meet the legitimate public demands for accountability and to support our own internal decision making. We are in the process of establishing a regular institutional assessment process that will periodically present an evaluation of our success in achieving our goals

and objectives and the extent to which our operating decisions are consistent with those goals and objectives. We must introduce a regular and systematic review process for all of the major academic and support units that assesses both their effectiveness and efficiency. If properly integrated, a good unit review process can provide valuable support to the planning, budgeting, and legislative request development processes.

One aspect of administration that I think we should all examine is the incentives for units and individuals. It often seems that we fail to provide incentives for the pursuit of important activities and sometimes we inadvertently create disincentives for good performance. Some specific areas we must examine are: flexibility of resource use at the unit level, retention rather than reversion of unspent funds, sharing of overhead on grants, and carry-over of unit over-expenditures into subsequent fiscal years. On a more global level, we must consider more flexibility on the acquisition of services either from inside or outside of the University and incentives to units to expand appropriate revenue-generating programs.

Finally, we must pay increased attention to the image that we project as an educational, research, and service institution. Many of our endeavors, especially in the area of research, are simply not understood by our constituencies. We have a responsibility to inform the public and their elected representatives of the differences between a multipurpose university and a single mission institution. We have made progress along these lines through our increased attention to planning and fund-raising issues. The creation of collegiate and campus advisory committees has also improved our capacity to relate with our professional clientele. The development of MATRIX as well as new publications about our research activities represent other productive vehicles for explaining the merits of our programs and the nature of our needs. Certainly, these and similar efforts will merit close attention in the years ahead if we are to continue to enjoy -- and increase -- the support of our many publics.

A FINAL STATEMENT

The opening section of this paper carries the comment that this statement is not intended to chart a rigid course for the 1980s, but rather to promote discussion about the directions we should pursue. The point bears repetition and emphasis: As an academic community dedicated to dialogue and debate, we must be willing to voice our views about the very nature of this academy and its goals, objectives, and priorities. I have attempted to do so here for the express purpose of generating the type of systematic communication and dialogue that will allow us to plan for the inescapable challenges of the new decade. Although this document must, of necessity, be a presidential and, therefore, a somewhat personal statement, I am striving, as much as possible, to also make it an institutional expression, and certainly a vehicle for internal University discussion. To the extent I have been successful, it reflects the values, judgments, and contributions of the entire University community.

PLANNING FOR FISCAL CRISES

Some very preliminary considerations

I. Defining fiscal exigencies

- a) Preservation of quality
- b) Tuition policy

II. Goals for reductions

What is a reasonable cut to plan for? As a point of departure assume 10% cut in state appropriation -- approximately \$25M.

Even if academic units are protected to a certain extent, this suggests a reduction of approximately 300 academic positions.

III. Academic programs

- a) At what level should cuts occur?

Individuals - Programs - Departments - Colleges

- b) What criteria should be used?

1. Connectedness.
2. Programmatic integration.
3. Other relations to mission.
4. Quality.
5. Uniqueness.
6. Student demand.

- c) Cost effectiveness

1. Reduction in students^{tuition} loss.
2. Reduction in faculty.
3. Reduction in support services.

income objectives

IV. Support units

- a) To what extent should they be cut? Set goal in terms of ratio of support unit to academic unit cuts? e.g., 2:1

- b) Criteria

1. Relation to student enrollments.
2. Level of convenience.
3. Quality.
4. Necessity.

V. Tuition policy

ACADEMIC STAFF - PROFESSIONAL CATEGORY
ESTIMATES

Below are very rough estimates by unit of the number of professional academic staff that will be in that category next year. Many of these, of course, will be temporary employees appointed on soft funds; others will be on fixed-term appointments. It is impossible at this time to determine how many of these will be on probationary or continuous appointments.

College of Liberal Arts	20-25 (many in Student Personnel on annual appointments)
Continuing Education and Extension	70-75 (15 on annual appointments on outside grants)
Health Service	25
Institute of Technology	20
Law	5-7
Library	35-50
Medical School	80 (many on outside funding)
Office of Vice President for Student Affairs (Housing, OMSSA, Student Counseling, Student Activities)	15-20
Agricultural Extension Service	(no estimate as yet)