

FOOTNOTE

□ October 27, 1993

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

□ Volume 7, Number 1

Planning on planning: U2000

As administrators work out details, FCC works to ensure faculty input—in the plan and the planning process

It's coming. University 2000. Although the broad outline of the administration's plan for reorganizing the University is falling into place, much still remains to be decided about time frames and deadlines for gathering input from colleges, departments, units, and the 12 clusters envisioned for the Twin Cities campus.

The big issue facing the faculty governance system is how to effectively engage the University's 5,000 faculty members—in particular the 3,200 faculty on the Twin Cities campus—in the discussion and planning process; as has been pointed out, it is the faculty who will be expected to implement the teaching and research parts of any plan ultimately adopted.

To try to ensure full faculty participation, the FCC is taking a three-pronged approach.

One prong is the series of Senate-sponsored meetings that began October 4 with President Hasselmo's State of the University address before the University Senate, and continued with the faculty forum October 21. The next in this series is the special Faculty Senate meeting November 18, 2:30–4 pm in 25 Law Building, when the faculty will have a chance to propose its own specific plans vis-à-vis strategic planning. Yet another such opportunity is the University Senate and Assembly meeting December 2, 2–5 pm, 25 Law Building.

Faculty and other members of the University community also

have a chance to ask questions and offer comments during the 10 forums President Hasselmo is holding on strategic planning (see box). And November 8 from 7 to 8:30 pm faculty and staff are offered five-minute time slots to speak at the regents' forum at the Earle Brown Center on the St. Paul campus (see page 2 for information).

The second prong of the approach to inspire faculty participation is site visits by pairs of FCC members

President Hasselmo meets with faculty on the Twin Cities campus

Nov 1, 4–5 pm, Theater/Lecture Hall, Coffman Union
 Nov 2, 12–1 pm, Cowles Auditorium, West Bank
 Nov 2, 4–5 pm, Theater/Lecture Hall, Coffman Union
 Nov 3, 4–5 pm, St. Paul Theater, St. Paul Student Center

to meet and discuss the strategic planning process with faculty senators from different schools on the Twin Cities campus. To make sure these meetings are not governed by preconceptions or prior relationships, FCC members will visit only units where they themselves are not faculty members.

The third prong is FacultyWrites, the new—since September—electronic hot line on the Gopher network. Exclusively for faculty use, FacultyWrites provides a forum

for faculty members to communicate with each other and members of the faculty governance system. One of the system's four sections is devoted to strategic planning; two others—Updates and Town Meeting—have already become a lively exchange of information and comments about University 2000. Although faculty may sign their names to comments they enter into the system, it is possible to participate anonymously—a feature bound to spur discussion.

Originally, the administration was to present the strategic plan during the November regents meeting, but now it will be presented in December for action in January. Even if regents accept the plan as presented, their vote only represents the end of phase one of the planning process. Phase two will consist of filling in the details of the plan before its final implementation.

Until then, says FCC chair Judith Garrard, faculty are urged to make their views known. "The actions of the faculty governance system depend upon the action of senators, especially proposals and actions during the meetings November 18 and December 2. I urge faculty to channel their comments not only to us on the FCC and other senate committees, but also to contact faculty senators in their units. Let them know where their constituents stand on University 2000."

—Richard Broderick

Regents' open forum

November 8, 1993
7-8:30 pm
135 Earle Brown Center
St. Paul campus

Faculty wishing to speak at the forum should write or call the regents' office, 220 Morrill Hall, 625-6300. Include your name, address, telephone number, and the topic you want to address as well as the group you represent, if any. Each speaker will be limited to five minutes. Before the meeting you will be notified of your position on the agenda.

In the event that more people sign up than there is time to accommodate, speakers will be selected to represent a range of views. Names will be confirmed by November 1.

If you plan to present written information or documents, please submit them to the regents' office for duplication. ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 1
October 27, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Faculty Senate Members 1993-94

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

David Wildung—
phone: 1-218-327-4490

AGRICULTURE

Paul Bloom—
pbloom@soils.umn.edu
Francis F. Busta—
fbusta@che2.che.umn.edu
Jonathan Chaplin—
jchaplin@gaia.ageng.umn.edu
Beverly Durgan—phone: 625-8700
Richard Epley—phone: 624-1735
Gary Gardner—phone: 624-3606
Leslie Hansen—
hanse009@staff.tc.umn.edu
Emily Hoover—phone: 624-6220
James Orf—phone: 625-8275
David Ragsdale—
ragd001@staff.tc.umn.edu

Bert Swanson—phone: 624-7432
Delane Welsch—
welschd@staff.tc.umn.edu

ARCHITECTURE

Joan Nassauer—fax: 625-7525

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

John Anderson—
ander049@maroon.tc.umn.edu
John Beatty—fax: 624-6777
David Biesboer—phone: 625-1799
Gary Nelsestuen—phone: 624-3622
Douglas Pratt—phone: 625-8258

CONTINUING EDUCATION & EXTENSION

Earl Nolting—phone: 625-7576
John Malmberg—fax: 624-5891

CROOKSTON

phone: 1-218-281-6510
Cleon Melsa—phone: x 386
Lynnette Mullins—phone: x 392
Kenneth Myers—phone: x 441

DULUTH—MEDICAL

Lester Drewes—
phone: 1-218-726-7925
Louise Hawley—
lhawley@ua.d.umn.edu

DENTISTRY

Muriel Bebeau—phone: 625-4633
James Holtan—phone: 625-5650
Joy Osborn—phone: 625-8970
Nelson Rhodus—phone: 625-0693

EDUCATION

George Copa—phone: 624-9284
Stanley Deno—phone: 624-7090
Jean King—
kingx004@staff.tc.umn.edu
Dale Lange—
jkurata@epx.cis.umn.edu

Ann Masten—phone: 624-0215
Leo McAvoy—phone: 625-5887
Susan Rose—phone: 624-6387
Frank Wood—phone: 624-4178

GENERAL COLLEGE

Jay T. Hatch—
hatch001@staff.tc.umn.edu
Fred Johnson—625-7847
Geoffrey Sirc—625-0134

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Beverly Miller—phone: 625-9364

HUMAN ECOLOGY

Jean Bauer—
jbauer@che2.che.umn.edu
David Olson—phone: 625-5289
Oliver Williams—phone: 624-0873

LAW

Robert J. Levy—phone: 625-5328

LIBERAL ARTS

F. Ronald Akehurst—
phone: 624-8521
Josef Altholz—fax: 624-7096
Hyman Berman—fax: 624-7096
Thomas Bouchard—
bouch001@staff.tc.umn.edu
Thomas Clayton—phone: 625-3371
Edwin Fogelman—
colsen@polisci.umn.edu
Joseph Galaskiewicz—
phone: 624-7548
Michael Hancher—
mh@staff.tc.umn.edu
Michael Kac—phone: 624-3528
Stephen Kanee—phone: 625-5809
Carol Klee—klee@vx.cis.umn.edu
Stanford Lehmberg—fax: 624-7096
Richard Leppert—
leppe001@staff.tc.umn.edu
Judith Martin—626-1626

H.E. Mason—phone: 625-7573
 Ellen Messer-Davidow—
 phone: 625-2071
 Paul Murphy—phone: 624-9813
 Gary Oehlert—gary@stat.umn.edu
 J. Bruce Overmier—
 phone: 625-1835
 Angelita Reyes—phone: 624-6006
 Tom Rose—phone: 625-0743
 Philip Sellow—phone: 625-5353
 Amy Sheldon—phone: 624-2504
 Craig Swan—phone: 625-6353
 David Ward—fax: 624-7020
 Gerhard Weiss—fax: 624-8297
 Judith Zaimont—phone: 624-7329

LIBRARIES

Dorothy Bohn—
 d-bohn@vm1.spcs.umn.edu
 Clarence Carter—c-cart1@
 vm1.spcs.umn.edu
 Gertrude Foreman—g-fore@
 vm1.spcs.umn.edu
 Barbara Kautz—phone: 624-2373

MANAGEMENT

Rajiv Banker—
 rbanker@csom.umn.edu
 Larry Cummings—phone: 624-3582
 Jack Hughes—phone: 626-1570
 Stephan LeRoy—phone: 624-5051
 Allan Shocker—phone: 626-7258

MEDICAL SCHOOL

Robert Bache—phone: 625-2454
 John Bantle—fax: 626-3133
 David Beebe—fax: 626-2363
 Peter Bitterman—fax: 625-2174
 Carole Bland—fax: 624-5930
 Joseph R. Bloomer—
 phone: 625-8999
 Henry Buchwald—fax: 625-3206
 Arthur L. Caplan—
 capla001@staff.tc.umn.edu
 Mary Dempsey—phone: 625-9986
 David Dunn—phone: 626-1999
 Martin Dworkin—phone: 624-5634
 Patricia Ferrieri—phone: 624-1948
 Scott Giebink—fax: 624-8927
 Roberto Heros—fax: 624-0644
 Marshall Hertz—phone: 624-0999
 Margaret Hostetter—
 phone: 624-1112
 James H. House—fax: 626-6032

Edward L. Kaplan—
 phone: 624-1112
 Karen R. Karni—phone: 625-5136
 Thomas MacKenzie—
 phone: 626-3613
 James H. Moller—fax: 626-2784
 Paul Quie—phone: 625-5146
 Virginia S. Seybold—
 ginger@med.umn.edu
 Dale Snover—fax: 626-1142
 Sheldon Sparber—phone: 625-5960
 Michael W. Steffes—
 msteffes@tahiti.umhc.umn.edu
 Akira Takemori—phone: 625-3248

MINNESOTA EXTENSION SERVICE

William Bomash—
 wbomash@nes.umn.edu
 Sue Meyers—fax: 625-3746

MORRIS

Mercedes Ballou—
 balloump@caa.mrs.umn.edu
 Edith Borchardt—
 phone: 1-589-6297
 James Cotter—
 cotterjf@caa.mrs.umn.edu
 Farah Gilanshah—
 phone: 1-589-6214
 Thomas Johnson—
 phone: 1-589-2211 x 6207

NATURAL RESOURCES

Peter Jordan—phone: 624-9281
 James Perry—phone: 624-9796

NURSING

Marsha Lewis—phone: 624-7694
 Sheila Corcoran-Perry—
 fax: 626-2359

PHARMACY

Daniel Canafax—
 canaf001@staff.tc.umn.edu
 Cynthia Gross—
 gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

James Jernberg—
 jjernberg@hhh.umn.edu

PUBLIC HEALTH

John Connett—
 john-c@blueox.cabr.umn.edu
 Robert Kane—
 kanex001@staff.tc.umn.edu
 Cheryl Perry—phone: 624-4188

Vernon Weckwerth—
 weckw001@staff.tc.umn.edu

TECHNOLOGY

Vernon Albertson—
 albertso@ee.umn.edu
 Subir Banerjee—phone: 624-5722
 John Baxter—baxter@math.umn.edu
 Kris Davidson—phone: 624-5711
 Jack Eagon—fax: 626-2017
 David Frank—phone: 624-2890
 Richard Goldstein—
 phone: 625-5552
 Warren Ibele—phone: 625-7527
 Richard Kain—kain@ee.umn.edu
 David Kittelson—phone: 625-1808
 Leonard Kuhi—phone: 624-7053
 K.S.P. Kumar—phone: 625-9016
 Hung-wen (Ben) Liu—
 phone: 625-5356
 Tim Lodge—phone: 625-0877
 Peter McMurry—
 mcmurry@staff.tc.umn.edu
 Willard Miller—
 miller@ima.umn.edu
 V.R. Murthy—
 murthy@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
 Dennis Polla—phone: 625-4873
 Wayne Richter—
 richter@math.umn.edu
 Yechiel Shulman—
 shulman@mailbox.cdtl.umn.edu

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Kent Warren—phone: 624-4020

VETERINARY MEDICINE

Daniel Feeney—fax: 624-0751
 Patrick McKeever—
 phone: 625-7744
 Elaine Robinson—phone: 625-3147
 V. Sivanandan—phone: 625-5035 ■

Committee Chairs, 1993-94

All-University Honors

Ellen Berscheid—
fax: 626-2079, phone: 625-6641

Committee on Committees

Michael Steffes—
msteffes@tahiti.umhc.umn.edu
fax: 625-0617, phone: 624-8164

Computing & Information Systems

Thomas Burk—
tburk@mercury.forestry.umn.edu
fax: 625-5212, phone: 624-6741

Consultative

Judy Garrard—
jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu
fax: 626-6931, phone: 625-9169

Council on Liberal Education

Richard H. Skaggs—
fax: 625-3068, phone: 626-1830

Disabilities Issues

Terence Collins—
tcollins@maroon.tc.umn.edu
fax: 626-7848, phone: 625-5366

Educational Policy

Kenneth Heller—
heller@mnhep.hep.umn.edu
fax: 624-4578, phone: 624-7314

Equal Employment Opportunity for Women

Mariah Snyder—
snyde002@maroon.tc.umn.edu
fax: 626-2359, phone: 624-2686

Facilities Management Subcommittee

Mark Davison—
mld@umnacca.bitnet
fax: 624-8241, phone: 624-1327

Faculty Affairs

Carl Adams—
cadams@csom.umn.edu
fax: 626-1316, phone: 624-5220

Finance and Planning

Irwin Rubenstein—
irwin@molbio.cbs.umn.edu
fax: 625-1738, phone: 625-1234

Intercollegiate Athletics

Norman Chervany—
nchervany@csom.umn.edu
fax: 626-1316, phone: 624-1520

Judicial

David Ward—
fax: 624-7020, phone: 624-9085

Library

Kay Cooper—
cooper001@maroon.tc.umn.edu
fax: 627-4280, phone: 627-4274

Research

Albert Yonas—
yonas@vx.acs.umn.edu
fax: 624-6373, phone: 624-6805

Social Concerns

Frank Wood—
fwood@epx.cis.umn.edu
fax: 624-8241, phone: 624-4178

Student Affairs

Thomas Soulen—
soule001@maroon.tc.umn.edu
fax: 625-1738, phone: 625-2761

Student Behavior

James Holte—holte@ee.umn.edu
fax: 625-4583, phone: 625-0811

Support Services

Deon Stuthman—
akunkel@uminn1.bitnet
fax: 625-1268, phone: 625-3709

University College Assembly

Robert Pepin—
fax: 624-4578, phone: 624-0819 ■

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

Strategic planning gathers steam;
now's the time to speak up

Next Footnote—November

This publication is available in alternative
formats. Please call 612-624-6868.

Serials
U of M Libs./1AJE4646
OMWL

Walter

FOOTNOTE

December 27, 1993

Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Volume 7, Number 2

About University 2000

FCC members hear faculty questions and concerns on the plan

The Faculty Senate has endorsed University 2000 (see page 3), but many lively questions remain about the plan and the planning process.

That's the message teams of Faculty Consultative Committees members heard when they met with senators and faculty from colleges and academic units on the Twin Cities campus.

"In general, the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) were cautious in their response [to U 2000] in the sense that they were willing to accept the framework of the plan but were very, very interested in knowing what the details might be," reports Karen Seashore Louis, part of the two-person teams that met with representatives from liberal arts and the health science units.

Among other things that concerned CLA faculty is the perception that U 2000 emphasizes undergraduate education even more than research.

In the health sciences, meanwhile, Louis says "the issues are fundamentally different." There, faculty wonder if their units, which already produce the most indirect-cost funding at the University, will serve as a "cash cow" to underwrite the undergraduate initiatives called for in the strategic plan.

On the St. Paul campus, says Geoffrey Maruyama, "what people wanted to know is who is going to [implement the plan], faculty or administration?"

Maruyama, along with FCC member Robert Jones, also met with faculty from the Humphrey Institute, the law school, and the

Carlson School of Management. Questions there are about future funding for graduate programs—specifically, whether U 2000 might result in less money for research and research assistants because graduate programs are cut back.

Mario Bognanno teamed up with FCC chair Judith Garrard to meet with faculty from the Institute of Technology, College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Continuing Education and Extension, College of Education, General College, and others. He found several broad concerns voiced about U 2000.

One was the emphasis on attracting undergraduates who are fully prepared for instruction by faculty recruited to do research as well as teach. This was especially true in regard to the still developing concept of the University College.

University College was also high on the list of faculty concerns. "They wondered how that college would function in relation to other degree-granting colleges at the University," Bognanno says. In particular, many faculty want to know who will draft curriculum for the University College (assuming it has a separate curriculum) and who will be responsible for ensuring quality in curriculum and instruction.

As the senate vote indicates, faculty accept the need for a strategic plan. But many faculty leaders worry about a lack of enthusiasm among faculty for U 2000. Some wonder what the administration must do to fire up faculty members

over the prospect of formulating and implementing a strategic plan.

"The president has gone out to open forums, and attendance there has been spotty at best," says Louis. "Perhaps we need more administrators out discussing the plan."

The greatest cause of concern with U 2000, she believes, is the perception that the plan has changed from the time it was introduced until today. "Just as you think you understand it, it seems there's a shift."

Partly the difficulty occurs because it has taken "a long time" for faculty and even the FCC to accept that U 2000, to date anyway, is not a strategic plan but an outline for a plan including a set of broad proposals. "I think people were initially expecting a strategic plan," she says.

Faculty skepticism about U 2000 constitutes a "real challenge" for the administration, says Garrard. "I think their greatest success has been in selling the plan to external constituencies. I have not seen similar success with faculty."

One way she sees to counteract the skepticism would be to create a "clear planning process" that spells out what tasks need to be done, by whom, where and when faculty and units will be involved, as well as deadlines for each stage of planning and expected outcomes.

Says Garrard: "We need much more specificity." ■

—Richard Broderick

Framing the debate on U 2000

By Judith Garrard

As we frame the debate about strategic planning, faculty need to engage four fundamental questions.

1. Do we need a strategic plan at the University of Minnesota?

Without a doubt, yes. The matter is not one of whether we want or need change. It has been thrust upon us.

In this we are not alone. Most major U.S. research universities are in the midst of change and face common problems:

- concern about the quality of undergraduate education
- deteriorating physical plants
- reduced federal and other research funding

- decline in prestige and trust in the eyes of the American public

Here at the University of Minnesota, we have an additional overlay of problems:

- decline in state funding
- a series of scandals
- negative publicity over the past five years
- salary freezes
- decline in faculty morale
- problems with user-friendliness—not only for students, but also for faculty and staff, especially on the Twin Cities campus

Do we therefore need a strategic plan that addresses these problems? The answer has to be yes; the alternative is to continue to be at the mercy of changes and events. In a complex organization like the University, one vehicle for managing change is a targeted strategic plan that addresses some, if not all, of our problems.

2. Are the five areas outlined as “strategic directions”—research, graduate and professional programs, undergraduate education, access and outreach, and user-friendliness—the ones we should be focusing on?

This question is harder to answer. As we have debated this question among ourselves at FCC meetings, as we listen to our colleagues, as we interact with the other senate committees, especially those on financial affairs, educational policy, finance and planning, and research, we continually ask, are these the areas of emphasis?

To gather more data, teams of FCC members met during November with groups of faculty senators throughout the Twin Cities campus. Those we met tended to be informed about and interested in the content of University 2000. They made knowledgeable and creative suggestions for improving the plan. In one or two of the groups, we found discouragement, but even in

those groups, faculty were willing to think together about what could be. We found more consternation about the details of the plan than with the plan itself.

During the site visits, faculty senators told us that, in their opinion, the five areas of emphasis are the right ones; in fact, the senators and their colleagues have been discussing them in one way or another for years.

So, based on our own deliberations, our consultation with colleagues in other senate committees, and discussions with subsets of the Faculty Senate, we as an FCC conclude that these are the five appropriate areas of emphasis.

3. Finally, we come to the crux of the matter. If these five areas are the strategic directions, then what is right and wrong with them? Which parts are acceptable? What needs to be modified?

4. How can the planning process be improved?

FCC has made specific suggestions:

- We want true consultation about all aspects of the strategic plan before the material is formally distributed to the community outside of the University.

A creative faculty member suggested that we use the “bathrobe criterion” to determine whether consultation had occurred: If faculty who should have been consulted find out about a University issue that involves them for the first time in the newspapers as they sit at breakfast in their bathrobes, then there has been no consultation!

- We want an active and specific role for the faculty and the academic units, and we want those roles to be explicitly spelled out in a planning document.
- The process must be oriented to energizing departmental and collegiate planning.

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 2
December 27, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote*'s publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Faculty Senate endorses U 2000

The Faculty Senate has adopted a resolution, drawn up by the Faculty Consultative Committee, about University 2000.

Before the vote, President Hasselmo addressed the senate, urging passage of the resolution.

"There are three points I would like to address briefly," he said. "First, we have put important issues of the University's future on the agenda, and we have begun to engage in serious discussion of those issues... I see the last three months as only the beginning of that governance discussion."

The second point, Hasselmo told senators, was that the resolution they were voting for or against was "a reaffirmation of certain fundamental values associated with this University," among them the values of a research university and undergraduate education. They were also, Hasselmo said, voting on the values of a land-grant university and of user-friendliness.

"In each of those areas we have to make decisions about what programs must be curtailed in the best interest of the institution, as well as those that must be emphasized," he said.

After regents affirm the strategic plan, Hasselmo explained, the next step in U 2000 is to develop specific plans and actions to implement those plans. Each step, he promised, will come before the University governance system before final decisions are made.

Decisions about "academic programs, requirements, major organizational change, budget decisions... [or decisions that] would curtail some activities in order to transfer resources into other areas," will all "come before the governance structure.

"By taking this vote," he said, "you are reaffirming basic values and directions, but final decisions about the plan are yet to be formulated and reviewed."

During the course of debate on the FCC resolution, the senate discussed and passed three amendments. All added language specifying in greater detail the conditions under which the senate would endorse U 2000, reflecting concern that everyone ultimately affected by the strategic plan be included in the process of consultation and approval.

The first, accepted by the FCC and therefore not voted upon by the senate, specified that representatives of the University staff and student body be included in consultations along with senators and members of governance bodies in the individual colleges.

The second amendment was more pointed. It added the line, "passage of this resolution does not constitute endorsement, expressed or implied, of any specific plan for implementation of the U 2000 vision."

"I represent a college with deep misgivings about the entire planning process," said Michael Kac, the senator from the College of Liberal Arts on the Twin Cities campus who introduced the amendment. "We fear that this endorsement will be read as an approval in advance" for whatever specific plan the administration produces.

Following debate, the resolution endorsing U 2000 passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 116 for, 14 against.

The resolution as adopted appears at right. ■

—Richard Broderick

The Faculty Senate strongly endorses the need for a strategic plan;

The Faculty Senate endorses the five strategic directions identified in "University 2000: Mission, Vision, Strategic Directions, and Performance" (research, graduate and professional education, undergraduate education, outreach and access to the University, and a user-friendly University community);

The Faculty Senate expresses appreciation for the consultation that has gone into the current draft of the "U 2000" documents;

The Faculty Senate emphasizes passage of this resolution does not constitute endorsement, expressed or implied, of any specific plan for implementation of the U 2000 vision and further emphasizes the need for increased participation by members of the faculty, as well as by staff and students, in the continued planning and the implementation of "U 2000"; and

The Faculty Senate calls for:

1. a continuation of active consultation with the faculty governance structure (1) of the Senate and (2) of the colleges; and with appropriate representatives from the staff and student body;
2. a clearer elaboration of University College and the cluster planning process in the very near future;
3. further clarification of the steps remaining in the planning process this year, including identification of the tasks to be accomplished, the participants, the deadlines, and the expected outcomes; and
4. the administration to submit, through the regular governance structure, major matters of implementation or action prior to their submission to the Board of Regents for approval.

Working groups formed

- We want a more direct role for faculty in the resource allocation process.

If you have suggestions for how to improve the planning process, then focus your comments on what needs to be done and done better.

As we continue this discussion, I ask that you bear in mind these additional points:

- This planning effort must be not "business as usual." The faculty cannot allow it.
- We the faculty must shake loose the dust of discouragement and demoralization and commit ourselves to active participation in the development of this plan. ■

In response to University 2000, the FCC has established a blue ribbon task force on teaching and research excellence and is setting up a joint FCC-SCC task force on "user-friendliness"—an objective in the administration's strategic plan.

Law professor Fred Morrison chairs the committee on teaching and research excellence. Members include Regents' Professors, recipients of the Morse-Alumni teaching award, and faculty governance leaders.

FCC chair Judith Garrard charged committee members to "examine the potential impact of the strategic plan on faculty excellence in teaching of all students," including undergraduates, and graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students, and "on research and scholarly activity." In addition, she wants the committee to take into account both the good and the bad effects of U 2000 on excellence in instruction and research.

Before January, when regents vote on the framework for U 2000, the blue ribbon task force will review major emphases of the strategic plan and advise the FCC on "additions or modifications that relate to excellence in teaching and research."

Once regents approve U 2000, the

committee is charged with examining details of the strategic plan as they become available and advising the FCC about the plan's strengths and weaknesses in regard to teaching and research.

Meanwhile, as chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, Garrard is also establishing a task force on user-friendliness. So far members represent students, civil service staff, professional and academic administrative (P&A) staff, as well as faculty and administrators, the last serving ex officio.

The task force has three objectives:

—Define, operationally, major elements of user-friendliness at the University of Minnesota.

—Describe strengths and weaknesses of user-friendliness on the Twin Cities campus, focusing on problems that impede user-friendliness to the University's consumers, including students, staff, and faculty.

—Suggest solutions for each problem identified.

The committee has been asked to present a final report to the SCC at its final spring quarter meeting, June 2, 1994. ■

—Richard Broderick

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

Faculty endorse U 2000
And they want more specifics

Next Footnote—January

This publication is available in alternative formats. Please call 612-624-6868.

400531220
ASSOC PROF PENELOPE J KROSCH
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION
10 WA LIB
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55455

FOOTNOTE

□ January 14, 1994

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

□ Volume 7, Number 3

Breaking the silence

Progress on gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender concerns

Recommendations of the Select Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns are "all in progress and in different stages of implementation," committee chair and associate dean Marjorie Cowmeadow reported to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The recommendations are contained in "Breaking the Silence," a report presented to President Hasselmo this fall. The committee worked three years before finalizing the report.

The five recommendations are these:

Establish a Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender (GLBT) Programs Office.

Provide a full benefits and privileges package for the families and children of gay and lesbian employees.

Establish a Gay and Lesbian Studies Program.

Develop educational training programming on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues and concerns.

Update all printed publications and materials to reflect diversity in sexual orientation.

The recommendations are targeted to the Twin Cities campus but have, according to the committee, systemwide implications.

Cowmeadow reported that the GLBT office is open (it is part of academic affairs) and has hired a

director, Beth Zemsky.

Although other universities have similar offices, all are run as part of student affairs. Only the University of Minnesota has an office under the jurisdiction of academic affairs, meaning that its responsibilities extend beyond student concerns into staff and faculty issues as well.

"The amount of excitement here and at other institutions about what

"We are really seen as a model for the rest of higher education."

—Marjorie Cowmeadow

we're doing is amazing," Cowmeadow said. "We are really seen as a model for the rest of higher education."

Although her office has just been equipped with a phone (the number —612-626-9765—is not listed in the University directory because the office opened after the directory was compiled), Zemsky reports that she has already worked with students who have come to her with harassment concerns. She has also fielded questions about insurance for domestic partners of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students and employees.

Eventually, the office will provide a range of counseling and referral services. Zemsky foresees working with students interested in designing degree programs, counseling prospective students, and setting up

an information and referral system on the Gopher network.

Cowmeadow reported "some progress" in terms of the committee's second recommendation—to provide full benefits to domestic partners and children of staff and students.

"The University has extended benefits in rec sports, resident tuition, child care, and other areas," she said. "The University has fallen short in providing full medical benefits to children and partners of the University's gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community."

Currently, the University offers a reimbursement plan for medical expenses incurred by domestic partners. "But this means all upfront expenses have to come out of the patient's pocket," she said. In some cases, that leads to a choice between economic hardship or foregoing medical care.

The recommendation to establish a Gay and Lesbian Studies Program is still "in discussion among the faculty," she said. Meanwhile a task force is reviewing all University publications in terms of reflecting sexual diversity.

—Richard Broderick

University to explore 'responsibility-centered management'

The University of Minnesota may become only the second public university in the country to adopt an approach to cost accounting called "responsibility-centered management," if studies over the next few months indicate that the pros of such a system outweigh the cons, President Hasselmo reported to the FCC.

The approach, which entails establishing "responsibility-management centers," is used in some private universities, but to date only one public university—Indiana—has such a system in place.

"We are exploring the implications of going to that kind of approach for the University," Hasselmo said. "[Vice President] Infante is developing a schedule and in the next couple of months we will reach a go/no-go point."

Under such an accounting method, central administration would identify how much revenue is distributed to units within the University from tuition increases, indirect cost recovery, research grants, and private donations. Units then would be asked to pay for services and facilities the University provides.

"We are just in the first stages of study," Hasselmo said. "Many functions would be identified and charged to units."

The positive effect of such a system, he said, would be to encourage units to "consider it their responsibility to, say, have full enrollment and enroll top-flight students, and not to assume that it is the central administration's job to get that done. We want to have units thinking that they have to provide services that are attractive and competitive."

The system could also be useful, he said, in bringing about more efficient allocation of space and services.

On the other hand, a responsibility-centered management system has potential downfalls. There would be, for example, "an enormous cost-accounting complexity" to allocating costs among different units. Implementing the system would be expensive. "But in the long run, we would expect considerable economies," Hasselmo said. "It would create an incentive structure that would result in more efficient use of resources.

"Implementing such a system would also really test the management capability of the units," he

said. To make it work, there would have to be "massive training"—and there is also the possibility such a system would be incompatible with CUFS, the new accounting system installed by the University at considerable expense.

There could be other risks. "Obviously for different units—for example, those totally dependent on

"It would create an incentive structure that would result in more efficient use of resources."

—Nils Hasselmo

state funding—we'd have to safeguard against imposing conditions they can't possibly meet. We have to ask if we might end up with a system of haves and have-nots even more explicit than we have now," Hasselmo said.

With so many questions yet to be answered, FCC members urged the central administration to work with the new system for analytical purposes only before implementing it as a true cost-accounting method. Hasselmo said the administration is doing case studies right now to see how the new method might affect different units.

"We want to understand all the implications before we go ahead and do anything," he said.

—Richard Broderick

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 3
January 14, 1994

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Call for nominations: Senate Consultative Committee

Nominations are now being accepted for new Twin Cities/nonrepresented Duluth faculty positions on the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), the executive committee of the University Senate. Recall that in November 1992, the University Senate approved a motion merging the Twin Cities faculty and nonrepresented Duluth faculty for purposes of such elections. SCC oversees the work of the University Senate and its committees, and its members meet regularly with the president and other officials to discuss and give advice on the many vital issues affecting the University. Twin Cities members of the consultative committee also serve as the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee. Members do not represent specific constituencies, but serve the total University community.

Nominees should have a broad perspective on University affairs, an

interest in major policy and budgeting issues, some experience in University or college governance, and a readiness to help shape the University's agenda in the years immediately ahead. Service on the committee involves a substantial time commitment. Nominations are for three-year terms.

Nominations, citing the nominee's qualifications, may come from any college. Send them to the senate office by any of these means:

Mail:
427 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street SE
Minneapolis MN 55455

Phone: 612-625-9369

Fax: 612-626-1609

E-mail:
kvanbeck@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

**DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS
IS JANUARY 21.**

Twin Cities/nonrepresented Duluth faculty whose terms continue beyond June 1994 are John Adams (CLA-Twin Cities), Judith Garrard (Public Health), Robert Jones (Agriculture), Karen Seashore Louis (Education), Geoffrey Maruyama (Education), and Toni McNaron (CLA-Twin Cities).

Members whose terms expire in June and who are eligible for reelection are Mario Bognanno (Management) and Shirley Zimmerman (Human Ecology).

Terms of service of the Crookston and Morris SCC representatives continue through June 1996.

The following faculty are members of the nominating committee:

Carole Bland—612-624-2072
Marilyn DeLong—612-624-4909
Lester Drewes—218-726-7925
Megan Gunnar—612-624-2846
John Howe—612-624-9569
Roberta Humphreys—612-624-6530

□ LETTERS FROM READERS

CD-ROM University?

Not one word in the December 27 *Footnote* mentions higher education markets, market needs, and leadership connections to markets through curriculum/research/dissemination.

Our existing and future undergraduate and graduate students are not even mentioned as value-adders in changing higher education markets.

What we do read about is institutional, and sometimes personal, change aversion and self-pity.

Assuming the continuing sabotage of prospective student futures, CD-

ROM/disk formats—associated with certificates of skills—deserve to replace "higher" education.

We are reflexively reverting to medieval models—even as Internet creates real-time global laboratories, libraries, seminars, enterprises, and people.

In the age of information and knowledge diversity and potential, it is crazy not to be a little crazy.

Art Harkins
Associate professor,
Summer Session

Hasselmo states budget option he favors

Of the nine budget options for fiscal year 1995 (July 94–June 95) presented to the Board of Regents this month, President Hasselmo has told the Faculty Consultative Committee that he favors option number four.

Under this scenario, the University would propose a 5 percent tuition revenue increase, a 6 percent salary increase, to be funded centrally, a \$7 million strategic investment pool (SIP), and a 3 percent nonsalary inflation adjustment.

"I think this is the best scenario we can envision at this time," Hasselmo said. "We are trying to be realistic, but have every intention of following through on this scenario."

He emphasized that the 6 percent average salary increase would cover faculty in all units. To ensure equity, central administration will fund the increase. Units that have open faculty lines would not be allowed to use funding to boost salaries in those areas by more than the average. ■

—Richard Broderick

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

Call for nominations: SCC
Responsibility-centered
management

Next Footnote—February

This publication is available in alternative formats. Please call 612-624-6868.

FOOTNOTE

February 16, 1994

Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Volume 7, Number 4

Bound by law

State law prevents the Judicial Committee from discussing some of the most highly publicized cases of faculty termination proceedings

"It's been apparent to me from the inquiries I receive that very few people at the University, and particularly among the faculty, have any knowledge whatsoever about the way the Senate Judicial Committee functions," says David Ward, who heads the committee. "Heretofore it has been a fairly low visibility operation because the complaints it has handled have almost entirely been about denial of tenure or promotion."

What has raised the committee's visibility and led to inquiries like one from a *Minnesota Daily* reporter asking to attend a hearing—a request Ward had to deny because the presence of a reporter would violate the state's data privacy law—is the spate of highly publicized termination proceedings initiated by the administration against John Najarian, Barry Garfinkel, and Tzvee Zahavy.

Ward is unable to comment on any of those cases other than to confirm whether a particular complaint is before the Judicial Committee and where it stands in the process (none of the three cases has been referred to Judicial), but he does understand why members of the University community might be confused about the committee's role.

"When the administration makes an announcement, people understandably believe that the termination process involving this commit-

tee is under way," he concedes. The review process only gets started, he points out, when a faculty member brings a complaint to the committee within 30 days of being notified that termination proceedings have been initiated against him or her.

In the Najarian case, for example, Ward says, "I was quite surprised to get a call from a faculty member in the Medical School who wanted to know why we had already conducted termination proceedings without hearing from the faculty member in question. Of course, we hadn't conducted any proceedings; but that's what happens when people rely on newspapers for their information."

"When the administration makes an announcement, people understandably believe that the termination process involving this committee is under way."

—David Ward

But incomplete information is not the only source of confusion. There is also the disparity between the committee's rules and provisions of the Minnesota Data Privacy Act.

The committee rules were adopted before passage of the act about 10 years ago. The old rules mandated that, except in extraordinary cases, evidentiary hearings would be open to faculty, students, staff, and the public.

"That's why I have *Daily* reporters calling to ask if they can attend hearings," Ward comments.

But by law, Ward and others associated with the committee, as well as University administrators, are barred from giving out any information about the formal process itself. "For all the cases that come to the Judicial Committee, all we are able to say is yes a case has come before the committee or no it has not," Ward says. "We can give the names of panelists and can say whether a preliminary or an evidentiary hearing has been or will be held and that findings and recommendations of the committee have been sent to the parties to the dispute for their comment and then ultimately for the president to act upon.

"I am not able to say anything about the nature of testimony or the evidence. Panel members and judicial members are instructed not to discuss any of the particulars of the case with anyone, and to go beyond that, to resist uninvited comments or opinions about a case from anyone outside the proceedings."

Judicial, to p. 2

Judicial, from p. 1

Maintaining this lid is not always easy, Ward says. The committee is composed of faculty members—not lawyers or even necessarily Law School faculty. This posed little problem up until a few years ago. Until then, virtually all hearings were about academic freedom or denial of tenure or promotion. The committee still hears complaints about academic freedom but the cases that could now potentially come before the committee are centers of controversy and thus naturally the focus of intense public interest.

To clear up some of the confusion, Ward and others are urging the senate to rewrite the policies governing judicial hearings so they conform with state law.

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 4
February 16, 1994

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

At this point, it is important to make clear that the Judicial Committee hearings are not the same as the formal grievance procedure adopted last year by the University. The grievance procedure is designed to handle all student and non-student grievances except those involving questions of tenure and promotion, academic freedom, termination of faculty for cause, or charges of sexual or racial harassment. The grievance system is wholly separate from Judicial Committee hearings and has its own grievance officer, hearing officer panel, advisory committee, and procedural rules.

“I think this is the best committee at the University, the faculty governance system at its best. The members clearly understand what is at stake in terms of the careers and reputations of their colleagues.”

—David Ward

The Judicial Committee consists of 25 members appointed by the Committee on Committees to serve three-year terms. Five faculty members and an alternate sit on panels for hearings on termination, three faculty members and an alternate for cases involving academic freedom or denial of promotion and tenure.

Once a case has been filed with the Judicial Committee, Ward appoints hearing panelists from among committee members. The choice of panelists can be challenged by complainants and respondents. From the final panel, Ward selects a hearing officer, who calls a pre-hearing conference in which the panel determines what issues are to be judged and compiles a complete list of all documents to be presented

and all witnesses to be called. Before adjourning, the panel also chooses a date for an evidentiary hearing—in some cases, involving multitudes of documents and witnesses. The date of the evidentiary hearing may be several weeks after the prehearing conference.

During the evidentiary hearing, the panel hears arguments and considers the evidence presented by both sides of the dispute. Soon after, the panel meets to discuss the case and to draft a set of findings and recommendations, which is circulated among the entire membership of the Judicial Committee. The panel then revises the draft based upon comments and recommendations from the committee and resubmits the draft. After further revision, a third draft is provided to complainants and respondents for their comments; in some cases, this results in a fourth draft. In the end, the recommendations and findings are submitted to President Hasselmo, who makes the final decision.

Although the committee acts strictly in an advisory capacity, the president has not rejected its recommendations in the dozen or so cases that have come before it during Ward's three-year term as chair—testimony to the extraordinary care with which the hearing panels and the committee deliberate on cases.

“Committee members expect that when they go through this process their recommendations will be heeded,” says Ward. “But they sure as hell understand they may not be. It is clearly the president's prerogative to overrule us.

“I think this is the best committee at the University, the faculty governance system at its best,” he says. “The members clearly understand what is at stake in terms of the careers and reputations of their colleagues.”

—Richard Broderick

Call for Nominations

The Senate Committee on Committees needs your help now with nominating faculty, academic professional staff, and students to serve on senate and assembly committees beginning July 1.

The University of Minnesota has a well-established tradition of active faculty/academic professional governance. In order to maintain that tradition during these difficult economic times—and particularly during a time when important strategic planning decisions are being made—we need individuals who are interested in the broader University community and willing to commit time and energy to committee work.

Please assist us in identifying individuals who would make good committee participants on any of the following committees (self-nominations are welcome):

All-University Honors: recommends nominations for various University honors

Committee on Committees: nominates senate/assembly committee memberships

Computing and Information Services: concerned with computing and information systems, including telecommunications

Consultative: executive committee of the senate/assembly; consulting body to the president

Council on Liberal Education:* recommends baccalaureate degree requirements, including reviewing and approving all proposals for courses designated for the Diversified Core Curriculum

Disabilities Issues Committee: advises administrative offices on issues relating to physical access, access to academic programs, and the structure of and provision for student services for the disabled

Educational Policy: addresses all matters that influence the quality of education at the University

Equal Employment Opportunity for Women: recommends policies that guarantee equal employment opportunity for faculty and academic professional women; promotes compliance with the "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement"

Facilities Management: a standing subcommittee of the Finance and Planning Committee to advise on questions of physical facilities planning and space allocation

Faculty Affairs: recommends policies and procedures affecting the personal and professional welfare of the faculty, including tenure

Finance and Planning: consulting body to the president and vice presidents on issues of budget, space, and planning

Intercollegiate Athletics:* formulates, adopts, and supervises appropriate policy relating to the Twin Cities campus intercollegiate athletics program

Judicial: central judiciary body responsible for hearing cases involving denial of tenure and/or promotion and termination for cause

Library: makes recommendations regarding policies and administration of the University Libraries

Research: recommends policies with respect to research activities, facilities, personnel, resources, and patents

Social Concerns: recommends University's response to social problems

Student Affairs: recommends policies relating to the general social, cultural, and practical welfare of all students

Student Behavior:* central judiciary body involving violations of the Student Conduct Code and of rules and policies of student organizations

Support Services:* makes recommendations regarding policies and administration of all support services on the Twin Cities campus

University College Assembly: governing body for University College

**Twin Cities membership only*

The deadline for nominations is February 25. Please submit them to:

Senate Office
427 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
phone: 612-625-9369
fax: 612-626-1609
e-mail: Senate@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

Notice of Job Opening—Associate to the President

Faculty and P&A staff are invited to apply for the position of associate to the president. This job is being substantially restructured. Applications must be received by February 21, 1994. If you have questions, please contact any of the following search committee members.

Carl Adams—4-5220

Josie Johnson—4-0594

Jeanne Markell—4-4777

Paul Quie—4-5146

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

Judicial Committee
Call for Nominations

400531220
ASSOC PROF PENELOPE J KROSCHE
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION
10 WA LIB
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55455

Next Footnote—March

*This publication is available in alternative
formats. Please call 612-624-6868.*

FOOTNOTE

☐ March 28, 1994

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

☐ Volume 7, Number 5

Four initiatives Faculty must be vigilant and involved

By **Judith Garrard**

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

During recent months, central administration has announced four key initiatives that could have a major impact on faculty. I want to use this *Footnote* issue to briefly describe each initiative and its timing, and to state my opinion of how each might affect faculty at the unit level. Various Senate committees, including the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), are working on many other activities and initiatives, but the four described below loom large on the horizon of our attention. I want to emphasize that the opinions expressed here are mine, and not necessarily those of the FCC.

For more details about what FCC members (and those on other Senate committees) think, see the minutes of their meetings. You can get minutes on e-mail from FCC administrative staff member Gary Engstrand by calling him at 612-626-0884 or by sending an e-mail message to—
garye@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

The four initiatives are University 2000, the budgeting planning process, responsibility-centered management, and reorganization of central administration.

U 2000

By now, University 2000 should come as a surprise to no one in this academic community. This multi-faceted plan, approved at the December Faculty Senate meeting,

has five strategic directions—(1) research, (2) graduate and professional education, (3) undergraduate education, (4) outreach and access, and (5) a user-friendly university community. U 2000 began to take shape in September 1993 and will continue to evolve over the next six years. Initial implementation at the programmatic level will probably be seen in fall 1994. During the past two months, the general outline of the plan has been handed over to academic and support units for

Regents Meetings on the Budget

April 7–8

Administrators present final
budget proposal

May 12–13

Regents approve budget

development, and faculty, staff, and students should now be actively involved in some aspect of generating those plans. In my opinion, faculty should keep a careful eye on the operational definitions of key elements of these plans as they evolve. For example, concepts underlying University College (UC) have changed in major ways from last September to the present:

- from a focus on just the Twin Cities campus to a systemwide emphasis
- from the current practice of two separate registration systems (for day school and Continuing Educa-

tion and Extension) to the idea of a unified, perhaps single, registration system for all University students

- from an emphasis on non-degree-seeking students to the inclusion of both degree- and non-degree-seeking students.

Currently plans are being developed for colleges to play a major role in the content and management of CEE/UC courses—this will have implications for how such courses are funded and administered. Under current plans, colleges will probably have responsibility for deciding inloading, distribution of faculty effort, and the role that adjunct faculty will play in CEE/UC courses.

As this aspect of U 2000 evolves, faculty will need to consider questions such as these:

- What funding will be transferred to the academic units along with the CEE/UC responsibilities?
- How will faculty distribution of time be decided?
- How will the teaching, staffing, and administrative tasks for CEE/UC be fulfilled at the unit levels?

On a more general note, faculty should watch for the actions of two hardworking committees, the Blue Ribbon Committee on Excellence in Teaching and Research under U 2000 and the Joint Student/Faculty/Staff Task Force on User Friendliness. The former is chaired by Fred Morrison (and Regents' Professor Ellen Berscheid during his leave of

absence spring quarter). Members include four regents' professors, four Morse-Alumni Teaching Award winners, and three faculty governance leaders. The Task Force on User Friendliness is chaired by Anne Sales, former chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee. Its members include undergraduate and graduate students; civil service, professional, and administrative staff; faculty; and representatives of the three collective bargaining units at the University.

BUDGET PLANNING PROCESS

In past years, the administration's budget plan has been prepared in the spring, and minimal time has elapsed between presentation and

final approval by the Board of Regents. This year, a new budget planning process was inaugurated, consisting of five steps:

- Central administration developed budget guidelines in five key areas—tuition, salary increase, strategic investment pool (SIP), retrenchment/reallocation, and deficit.
- These guidelines were presented to the Board of Regents in January 1994.
- Using the regents' modifications of the guidelines, academic and support units were directed to develop their respective budgets during January/February and present them to the senior officers at budget hearings in late February.
- On the basis of these hearings and further planning, senior officers of central administration will develop a final budget plan to be presented to regents at their April meeting.
- The final budget plan for 1994-95 will be approved by the regents at their May meeting.

In December 1993, President Hasselmo, Senior Vice President Infante, and Vice President Erickson consulted with Senate committees, especially the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and the FCC, in the development of budget guidelines that included a 5 percent tuition increase, 6 percent salary increase, \$8.5 million SIP, continuation of the previously planned retrenchment and reallocation goals, and a \$7.5 million deficit (i.e., programmatic and other cuts). At their January meeting, the regents reduced the guidelines for tuition (to a 3 percent increase) and applied the difference to the size of the deficit (raising it to \$10.2 million). Regents and the administration were insistent at that meeting that the 6 percent salary increase remain the guideline.

I will have more to say about the implications of these changes in guidelines in the next issue of *Footnote*. For now I note that there are implications for faculty specifically in merit-based salary in-

creases, the purpose and size of the Strategic Investment Pool, and the magnitude of the budget deficit. Faculty need to question how the investment pool will be allocated, which U 2000 initiatives will be funded under it, and how the impact of funding for these initiatives will be evaluated. I am also concerned about the proposed growth in the deficit, from \$7.5 million to \$10.2 million. How much more "efficiency" and programmatic reductions can be squeezed out of academic and support units before we end up cannibalizing excellent units?

The budget planning process is happening in real time, as I write this column and as you read it. Public deadlines to watch for are the April 7-8 regents meeting, when the administration will present its final budget proposal, and May 12-13 when the regents will approve the final budget. Faculty, staff, and students will have to live with these decisions beginning July 1.

RESPONSIBILITY-CENTERED MANAGEMENT

Responsibility-centered management, affectionately known as "every tub on its own bottom," is basically the idea of letting a planning unit (e.g., a college) receive credit for its income (e.g., tuition, indirect cost recovery, auxiliary income) but also pay its own costs (e.g., heat, electricity, space rental). Responsibility-centered management (RCM) has been percolating for more than a year in central administration, but the FCC began to hear about it in a focused way in January 1994. As a group, the FCC strongly urged central administrators to try this idea out on paper before putting it into action.

Some of the issues that faculty should consider as this initiative evolves include space, indirect cost recovery, and standardization of costs across different units. Space undoubtedly will become a major focus of interest. Under RCM, space

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 5
March 28, 1994

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

will likely shift from being a highly valued resource that is jealously guarded to a potential liability as units begin having to pay for it. This change may make more space available; alternatively, some faculty, staff, and student employees may be crowded into physically smaller settings because a financially strapped unit will have to make choices between personnel and floor space or other commodities.

RCM also raises the issue of how indirect cost recovery funds from grants and contracts will be allocated to the units that generate them. Another issue that I have not yet heard discussed is how the assessment rates for space, "household bills" such as electricity and heat, and possibly a unit tax on infrastructure resources (e.g., libraries, computer network) will be set, and whether these rates will be standardized across units. Members of the Senate committees will be asking many of these questions, but it is important for individual faculty to raise these and other, more focused, questions in their own units as plans for RCM develop over the coming months.

REORGANIZING CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

Reorganizing central administration, the most recent initiative, appears to be on a fast track. In late February 1994, President Hasselmo told the FCC that he is examining different models for reorganizing central administration, the goal being to create a flatter organizational structure. His tentative plans are to replace the current vice presidential structure with a provost model, consisting of either two provosts (Twin Cities campus and health sciences) or three provosts (Minneapolis campus, St. Paul campus, health sciences). The provosts would report directly to the president (as would chancellors of the three coordinate campuses).

As discussed with the FCC, the president's goal is to eliminate dual

staff and line responsibilities of senior administrators. For example, the senior vice president for academic affairs (staff) is also provost of the Twin Cities campus (line). Under the new structure, this combined position would no longer exist; rather, the senior vice president would have systemwide responsibilities.

Based on preliminary information now available, it is not clear how these changes will affect faculty at the unit level. Such changes may

"Every tub on its own bottom" lets a college receive credit for its income but also pay its own costs. The FCC strongly urged central administrators to try this idea out on paper before putting it into action.

make a big difference, however, to deans. As described, provosts would have direct access to the president on a regular basis. The caution, however, is whether that access will be to the president or to an "organizational box" consisting of the president and the two senior vice presidents (for academic affairs and finance and operations).

Some cautionary questions faculty might consider include these:

- How will the proposed structure be operationally defined in the day-to-day management of the University?
- Will the senior vice president for academic affairs become, in effect, an executive vice president who stands in lieu of the president, or will the president be a "hands-on manager" directly accessible by the provosts and chancellors?
- What will be the specific responsibilities of the senior vice president for academic affairs, e.g., will final tenure and promotion decisions be made by that position or by the provosts?
- Is there an economy of scale to be achieved by having other vice presidential functions, such as research or student affairs, continue to be at the system rather than the

provost level?

Some of the four initiatives described above will have a profound effect on the ways in which the academic community operates; others will be peripheral to individual faculty, staff, and students. These four initiatives carry implications for both trauma and golden opportunities. The best way for faculty to minimize the former and maximize the latter is to maintain an alertness to new developments and

actively participate in planning and implementation at the unit level.

Taken together, these four initiatives reflect different facets of the rapid change currently taking place in American universities. I am convinced that research universities are in the midst of a paradigm shift in their assumptions, resources, and missions. We the faculty cannot afford to be complacent about these changes nor can we simply attribute them to local scandals, bad press, and reluctant funding by the legislature.

What we can do is to be vigilant during the process of rethinking the future of this University while simultaneously asking ourselves and our administrators whether the proposed changes will actually accomplish the goal of becoming one of the premier research universities by the year 2000. ■

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

**Budget, other initiatives
warrant scrutiny**

Walter Serials Process
U of M Libraries
68 Walter Library

Next Footnote—April

*This publication is available in alternative
formats. Please call 612-624-6868.*

A Newsletter for Faculty and Administrators

FOOTNOTE

□ April 15, 1994

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

□ Volume 7, Number 6

Shared sacrifice or not?

Administrators, regents would allocate resources differently

By Judith Garrard
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

This year marks the first time that the administration and the regents have established a new process for preparing the annual budget, a process that consists of five major elements:

- Central administration developed budget guidelines in five key areas—tuition, salary increase, strategic investment pool (SIP), retrenchment/reallocation, and deficit.
- Those guidelines were presented to the Board of Regents in January 1994.
- Using the regents' modifications of those guidelines, academic and support units were directed to develop their respective budgets in January/February and present them to the senior officers at budget hearings in February.
- On the basis of these hearings and further planning, senior officers of central administration developed a final budget plan presented to the regents at their April 7-8 meeting.
- The final budget plan for 1994-95 will be approved by the regents at their May 12-13 meeting.

The budget guidelines developed by the senior administrative officers in December and early January included a 5 percent tuition increase, a 6 percent salary increase, a strate-

gic investment pool of \$8.5 million to support U 2000, a continuation of the retrenchment and reallocation goals, and a deficit of \$7.5 million. The administration consulted with the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and with

In administrators' proposed guidelines, all members of the academic community would be called upon to make sacrifices to generate a strategic investment pool.

the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) in the preparation of this proposed budget.

When the proposed budget was presented at their January 13-14 meeting, regents said they wanted a new set of guidelines that would cut the tuition request from 5 percent to 3 percent which amounted to approximately \$3 million, left the salary increase at 6 percent, left the strategic investment pool at \$8.5 million, and increased the deficit from \$7.5 million to \$10.2 million.

The budget planning process is not "business as usual." The decisions the regents make at their April and May meetings will have profound implications for the future of the University—not only in the arena of competitive salaries, but also for the viability of U 2000. This month I want to describe how these budget

decisions could affect individual faculty as well as the future of the academic community.

Since the regents' retreat last September, the academic community has been discussing the strategic plan. From the perspective of faculty involvement, these activities fall into three distinct stages:

- Stage 1 lasted throughout fall quarter and consisted of discussion and consultation about the need for a strategic plan and its broad characteristics. In December, the Faculty Senate approved the administration's proposal for the framework for U 2000, including its five strategic directions: research, graduate and professional education, undergraduate education, outreach and access, and a user-friendly university community.
- January through March we were in Stage 2, when planning was being developed at the collegiate, departmental, and unit levels. Specifically, we have been filling in the details of the framework for U 2000.
- Stage 3 is in the future when we will translate these plans into action.

Implementation of U 2000 requires resources. Some of the resources were written into the Resource Allocation Guidelines administrators presented at the January regents meeting. Senior administra-

tive officers and the Board of Regents requested an additional \$16 million from the legislature in the form of extra appropriations; however, the governor did not include this request in his proposed budget. Whether the legislature will make a more enlightened decision this spring remains to be seen. To the extent that legislators want to see change at the University of Minnesota, they should be willing to invest in a portion of the start-up funds. Approval of the \$16 million request would provide the jump-start that U 2000 needs.

Let me return to the proposal for the University administration's 1994-95 Resource Allocation Guidelines. Before the January regents meeting, FCC and the Senate Committee on Finance and

Planning were consulted about these guidelines. Both committees agreed on the following points:

- The guidelines represent a balanced budget proposal consisting of five major components: tuition, salary, retrenchment and reallocation, a strategic investment pool, and, by necessity, a deficit.
- The guidelines also emphasize long-term investments in the institution over short-term solutions.
- Following consultation and discussion with President Hasselmo and Vice Presidents Infante and Erickson, we agreed that the proposed budget guidelines represent a shared sacrifice to carve out some of the needed resources for U 2000.

In the administration's proposed guidelines, all members of the academic community would be called upon to make sacrifices to generate a strategic investment pool (SIP). Let me outline these contributions.

□ We note with appreciation the commitment of the administration and the enthusiastic support by members of the Board of Regents to the proposed salary increase. An increase of 6 percent, proposed for continuing, nonrepresented faculty, or even the 7.2 percent increase for continuing civil service and bargaining unit employees, however, represents a sacrifice by all members of the University community—faculty, staff, and student employees—in light of no salary increases in two of the past three years.

□ Faculty, staff, and student employees will also make a contribution through programmatic cuts due to retrenchments made this year and last year in support of the ongoing retrenchment and reallocation process and in support of the proposed deficit of \$7.5 million. The administration has estimated that \$1 million is equal to approximately 35 positions. On that basis, a \$7.5 million deficit means the loss

of about 250 employee jobs.

□ The proposed guideline of 5 percent for a tuition increase represents a reasonable contribution by students to the future of their university. The FCC and the Finance and Planning Committee agreed with the administration's rationale that a 3 percent tuition increase plus an additional 2 percent to support the SIP was justified.

Thus the proposed guidelines represented a balanced approach to providing the resources needed to begin implementing U 2000.

A commitment must be made to the underlying quality of academic programs, with long-term investment in competitive salaries, a strategic investment pool, and realistic tuition levels.

Faculty and staff are called upon to contribute through reduced compensation increases and programmatic cuts. The students' contribution, a modest tuition increase, represents a down payment on the improvements in student education envisioned by U 2000.

The regents' action at the January meeting would require another \$3 million in retrenchment, approximately 2 percent of the budget. In the minds of many faculty, a 2 percent retrenchment this year on top of a 2.4 percent retrenchment last year, brings into question the University's long-term commitment to the quality envisioned by the strategic planning process now under way. A proposed tuition reduction would save only \$68 per year for an average full-time undergraduate student, but it would cause the equivalent loss of 95 employee positions.

We are deeply concerned that continuing programmatic cuts will undermine the base on which U

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 6
April 15, 1994

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of Footnote's publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

2000 is to be built. If the strategic planning process is to be realized and implementing U 2000 is to begin, then a commitment must be made to the underlying quality of the academic programs, with long-term investment in competitive salaries, a strategic investment pool, and realistic tuition levels.

For decades the physical infrastructure at the University has been undermined through inadequate facilities budgets, and we are now paying the cost of that neglect and deferred maintenance. We should not make the same mistake in underfunding the intellectual infrastructure of the University, especially when planning for the future is just beginning.

We urge the regents to make this commitment to the future of U 2000 by holding retrenchments to the levels contemplated in the Resource Allocation Guidelines originally proposed by the administration in January and by approving a final budget at their May 12-13 meeting.

Individual faculty can express their own opinions directly to the president (who will, no doubt, transmit a summary of these comments to the Board of Regents). Address your comments to President Nils Hasselmo, 202 Morrill Hall, or send an e-mail to:
hasselmo@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

**If legislators want
to see change
at the University,
they should be willing to
invest in a portion of
the start-up funds.
Approval of the
\$16 million request
would jump-start
U 2000.**

**Comments, questions, other responses
about the budget guidelines?**

Send them to

President Nils Hasselmo

202 Morrill Hall

e:mail: hasselmo@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

**Whose resource allocation
guidelines will prevail?**

Walter Serials Process
U of M Libraries
68 Walter Library

Next Footnote—May

*This publication is available in alternative
formats. Please call 612-624-6868.*

A Newsletter for Faculty and Administrators

FOOTNOTE

□ May 23, 1994

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

□ Volume 7, Number 7

'Outreach' says it better That's what the president's Outreach Council recommends

The University's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service could become teaching, research, and *outreach*. That is, if the strategic plan developed by the Outreach Council is put into action.

Chaired by Vice President Gene Allen, the 11-member council was appointed by President Hasselmo two years ago and charged to help the University "assert its franchise to lead and conduct outreach for the citizens of Minnesota." The strategic plan the council was to create, the president said, should "articulate an outreach taxonomy that describes our many categories and types of [outreach] activities, the tasks and functions involved, and the opportunities available." In addition, the plan had to serve as a foundation for outreach planning by defining the University's outreach mission and identifying "strategic, internal questions that stand in the way of our vision and mission for outreach..."

The council's report did all that and more, starting with formulating a new "customer-focused" taxonomy of University outreach that identifies 16 types of outreach activities including classes, artistic performances, health care services, conferences, forums, symposia, and informal workshops and seminars.

The length of the list demonstrates how varied, complex, and sometimes difficult to define outreach really is. For that reason, the council tackled the taxonomy

before settling into discussions about outreach mission and action steps the University should take.

"It really was the most urgent task before us," says council staff member Steven Laursen, assistant dean for extension and outreach in the College of Natural Resources. "The real surprise to all of us was how broad and rich our current outreach is."

The taxonomy enabled the council to proceed with its other tasks in a logical fashion by providing a framework for discussion about the University's outreach mission. From there, the council undertook a formal strategic planning process to reach its recommendations.

"For most of us on the council," says chair Gene Allen, "it was the first time through with a formal strategic planning exercise. We found ourselves not only learning a new process but also things about the University we didn't know when we began."

The more the council learned about outreach, Allen says, the more he and other members were convinced that the results of their work had to be broadcast throughout the University community.

"It seems quite clear that if research universities are going to be relevant to society they have to bring at an appropriate time the results of that research to society where it can be seen, evaluated, and applied," he says. "This has to happen with the

understanding that this information or technology came out of a research program—it didn't fall from the sky.

"In an era of increasing accountability," he says, "outreach looms as a vitally important way to garner support from society—much more so than in the past, because it is through outreach programs that people come to know and understand how many things we do touch their lives."

In studying the University's outreach activities, Allen says the council discovered a close connection between research and outreach. Strong outreach programs invariably are connected with strong research programs. More surprisingly, strong outreach programs also feed and strengthen research programs.

"Research and outreach have a two-way interaction," Allen says. "We give to the public, but they also give to us—if we listen to what they are saying."

Allen points to pharmacy as an example—one of many—of a symbiotic relationship between outreach and research.

In each of the 87 counties of Minnesota, he points out, there is a pharmacy intern working in a local pharmacy. Members of the pharmacy faculty make regular visits to monitor the progress of their interns as well as to convey new information and answer questions

Outreach, continued

from local pharmacists about their research.

"What faculty members told us," Allen says, "is that what they hear and see has an impact not only on what they teach but also in shaping research proposals and programs they are involved in."

After months of deliberation during which the committee heard from dozens of people inside and outside the University community, the council formulated an outreach mission statement that says the purpose of outreach is to "improve and enhance the quality of life, economy, and the environment through the transfer and exchange of knowledge between the Univer-

sity and society."

To reach that goal, the council contends, the University's strategic plan for outreach must include a vision of how the institution intends to position itself in the coming decade. For beginners the council's report urges the University to see itself as a knowledge system that integrates all three missions of a land-grant university. The report includes a list of values and principles that already exist within the institution and that form the basis of outreach activities.

It also offers a catalog of "desired outcomes" for outreach, among them help in shaping an enlightened citizenry that is mentally and physically healthy, educated and possessing needed skills, and living in a sustainable environment.

As for the proposal to replace *service* with *outreach*, that comes in the council's list of strategic goals and action steps, part of its recommendation is that outreach become fully integrated with teaching and research as a basic part of the University's "knowledge mission."

"The terms *service* and *public service* mean many different things to people," says Allen. "Ultimately, you could say that all three parts of the University's mission constitute a service to society.

"Therefore we concluded that the word *service* should not be used to try to depict just one of our missions."

The work of the council puts the University of Minnesota in the forefront of universities struggling to redefine their place in society. At the moment, only the University of Minnesota and Michigan State have outreach strategic plans in place. Since the report was issued, Allen has been invited to speak to numerous gatherings. Even some private universities are taking a closer look at incorporating a more vigorous outreach program into their overall system.

"It's fair to say that President Hasselmo was on the cutting edge when he commissioned this group," says Laursen. "By placing this on the agenda he has encouraged other university officials around the country to do the same." ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 7, Number 7
May 23, 1994

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110, 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Hello? TC voice-mail users?

Telecommunications Services informs all faculty on the Twin Cities campus, especially those who may be away for the summer, that the existing voice-mail system will be replaced by an entirely new system in August. Detailed information on how to gain access to and use the new system will be sent to all voice-mail users well before the cutover. If you return to campus after the new system is installed,

you will find the relevant information in your campus mail.

The new voice-mail system has been chosen for its online tutorial and ease of use, so users should be able to adjust without difficulty to the change. If you have questions, please call the Telecommunications User Services Information line at 626-7800. Watch for more information in a future issue of *Footnote*. ■

The chair's final word to the regents

By Judith Garrard

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

FCC chair Judith Garrard made these remarks at the May 13 meeting of the Board of Regents.

This is my third and final report on behalf of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) for this academic year. In previous reports, I have been pleased to inform you that the FCC and the Faculty Senate have endorsed the need for U2000 and its five strategic directions. Together with my senate colleagues, I have also urged you, in the strongest of terms, to support the administration's proposal for a budget that includes these elements:

- tuition increase of 4.2 percent
- salary increase of 6 percent
- strategic investment pool of \$8.5 million
- retrenchment and reallocation as previously planned
- nonsalary inflation adjustment of 3 percent
- deficit of \$10.2 million.

In light of the governor's veto of the Higher Education Supplemental bill to provide \$9.1 million to jump start U2000, there is an even more urgent need to revise upwards the administration's budget proposal. I therefore urge you to consider generating an additional \$2.5 million for the strategic investment pool by increasing tuition from 4.2 percent to 5 percent.

In short, if you are committed to seeing change for the better here at the University, then you need to act

with wisdom and courage to increase tuition to the limit that the legislature allowed and make this long-term investment.

In the past, I have also brought to your attention our concern that the University is beginning to decline. Deterioration is evident in the University's physical structures and possibly in its human capital. We are deeply concerned about the recent report that faculty salaries for full professors rank 30 out of 30 among the top-ranked public universities. For associate professors the rank is 25 out of 30.

We assume that the quality of an institution is reflected in the level of faculty salaries, and these low ranks do not bode well for the University of Minnesota. Figure 1 (see page 4) shows a list of self-defined top 30 public universities, based on the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) of 1993-94.

Although private universities such as Harvard, Stanford, or Johns Hopkins are not included in this list, these are nonetheless outstanding universities. But the University of Minnesota is gradually losing ground as these and other outstanding universities are recruiting our most talented faculty and our most promising prospective students.

It is easy to picture ourselves among the top public universities, but much harder to face a reality of not being included among them. To demonstrate a piece of that reality, Figure 2 (see page 4) lists universities in the same AAUDE data base that did *not* make the top 30.

If the goals of U2000 and other efforts to move the University of Minnesota into the ranks of the leading research universities by the end of this century fail because of lack of commitment or resources, then this is some of the company we will be keeping.

**We are deeply concerned
that our salaries for
full professors rank
30 out of 30
among the top-ranked
public universities.
For associate professors
our rank is
25 out of 30.**

A mediocre university may be tolerable for some people, but it is not acceptable for many of the faculty. I urge you to consider the consequences of the decisions you make today and in the future about the University of Minnesota, and to consider whether your actions will help to achieve the excellence envisioned in the goals of U2000.

In closing, let me say that I have appreciated the time and attention you have given to the Faculty Consultative Committee over this past academic year. It has been an honor to serve as FCC chair this year, and I am pleased to introduce to you next year's chair, John Adams, professor of geography in the College of Liberal Arts on the Twin Cities campus. The vice chair will be Carl Adams, professor and chair of information and decision sciences in the Carlson School of Management. Their terms begin July 1. ■

1 Top 30 Public Universities (Self-defined, 1993-94)*

Arizona
Berkeley
Buffalo
Colorado
Cornell
Florida
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Iowa State

Kansas
Maryland
Michigan
Michigan State
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska-Lincoln
North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Ohio State
Oregon

Penn State
Pittsburgh
Purdue
Rutgers
Texas-Austin
Toronto
UCLA
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin

2 Not in the Top 30 Public Universities (Self-defined, 1993-94)*

Alabama
Arkansas
Florida State
Idaho
Kansas State
Kentucky
Louisiana State
Maine
Massachusetts-Amherst
Mississippi

Montana
Montana State
Nevada
New Hampshire
North Dakota
North Dakota State
Oklahoma
Oregon State
South Carolina
South Dakota

South Dakota State
Tennessee
Texas A & M
Texas Tech
Utah
Utah State
Vermont
Washington State
West Virginia
Wyoming

* Data from the Association of American Universities

FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota
6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

IN THIS ISSUE

Now we say 'outreach'
Voice mail changes

Next Footnote—July

This publication is available in alternative
formats. Please call 612-624-6868.

400531220
ASSOC PROF PENELOPE J KROSCHEK
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATIONS
10 WA LIB
MINNEAPOLIS MN
55455