

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 20, 2004
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Judith Martin (chair), Charles Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Arthur Erdman, Dan Feeney, John Fossum, Scott Lanyon, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Martin Sampson, Carol Wells

Absent: Gary Balas, Jean Bauer, Susan Brorson, Emily Hoover, Marc Jenkins, Jeff Ratliff-Crain

Guests: Professor Ron Akehurst (Tenure Committee); Senior Vice President Robert Jones

Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) presidential working groups; (2) endowed chair and faculty workload policies; (3) end-of-year report from Finance and Planning; (4) the tenure code and salary freezes; (5) budget principles; (6) biennial budget strategies]

1. Presidential Working Groups

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:15 and began by announcing recommendations for faculty to serve on a number of working groups that President Bruininks is establishing: Biennial Budget, Internal Budget Model, Budget Scenarios and Alternatives, Improved Leveraging of Internal Assets, Post-campaign Fund-raising, and Service and Continuous Improvement.

2. Endowed Chairs and Workload Policies

Professor Martin turned next to Professor Fossum for a report on endowed chairs and on workload policies.

Professor Fossum recalled that the Committee had earlier discussed endowed chairs briefly. He had received a question from a chairholder about changes in chair appointments so the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) decided to look at the matter. There is a Regents' policy ("Awards, Honors, and Recognitions") that includes provisions governing endowed chairs; he distributed copies of the pertinent part of the policy. The concerns, he related, are about the process for designating chairs initially, the identification of term of appointment, and the process for review.

The Regents' policy provides, for appointment, that "the process of appointing faculty members to a named chair must conform to the search and selection procedures generally followed in the unit in which the named chair is placed, except as noted" in another part of the policy. The exception notes that while the University "shall be the sole judge of the qualifications of candidates" for endowed chairs, "this

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

does not preclude accepting support for a named chair or professorship for a particular University professor when this appointment has been approved by the department, the college, and executive vice president and provost."

SCFA discussed the issues, Professor Fossum said, and he also brought them up in a meeting with Senior Vice President Maziar. It appears that there is little uniformity across the University in how endowed chairs are handled, especially with respect to the terms and conditions of the appointment. One concern is that if endowed chair support is moved from one faculty member to another without some kind of regular process, a faculty member who had made multi-year commitments to post-docs and graduate students is left without support for those commitments. Dr. Maziar had promised to look into the issues and to develop a policy on appointment of chairs, and said she would also work with Senior Vice President Cerra to ensure a similar policy for the Academic Health Center. Professor Fossum said he feels it is important for departments and chair-holders that the faculty members know the conditions under which they hold an endowed chair position.

Asked by Professor Martin what he expected from this Committee, Professor Fossum said he would like to see oversight of the development of process and assurance that Drs. Cerra and Maziar do develop a policy or policies with reasonable procedures, terms and conditions of appointments (including the length of time), a review procedure, and providing that the appointments are not in perpetuity. Professor Martin agreed that the Committee would do so.

Professor Lanyon noted language in the Regents' policy indicating about endowed chairs that "by providing a continuous and reliable source of support, these awards free scholars to pursue their research and teaching without the need to pursue funding." He said he was surprised to see that language written into the policy, because endowed chairholders often have a great deal of external funding.

Professor Fossum turned next to workload issues. This report is for information, he said, and SCFA and the Committee on Educational Policy will pursue one of the issues next year (Technology-Enhanced Learning). He provided the following report:

SCFA devoted most of one meeting to a discussion with CLA Dean Rosenstone, COAFES Associate Dean Ann Hill Duin, and CSOM Associate Dean Dennis Ahlburg, about faculty workload policy. The policies of the three units, while all addressing research, teaching, and service, differ on the efforts that are expected to be devoted to each.

Workload policies tend to be most explicit in the primary revenue-producing areas for the unit. Thus, they relate strongly to the source of funding. In CLA, it's primarily O&M. In COAFES, it's about half O&M and half external funding. In CSOM it's primarily O&M (without state subsidy) and outreach programs (Executive Education, etc.).

Workloads have either explicitly or implicitly increased through more emphasis on larger class sizes, more emphasis on obtaining external funding, or higher performance expectations. In some cases, there have been improvements in ancillary support to support teaching, but in others there has been a reduction or no increase in teaching assistance.

There have been discussions about whether workload policies can or should specify expectations for obtaining sponsored research. All units must pay attention to obtaining the

resources necessary to support themselves, but to what extent can or should these expectations be made explicit for the individual faculty member? Is there some minimum percentage of time that must be supported by external funding annually? Could a continuing inability to obtain external funding trigger a post-tenure review?

Another workload area concerns technology-enhanced learning (TEL). There are basically two issues that arise here. The first is, what is the effort level necessary to design and deliver a TEL-based course relative to a course that is delivered using a traditional method? (Professor Fossum said he believed the effort required is probably greater than for other courses.) The second is, how has the incorporation of TEL components into on-campus courses increased or decreased the ongoing workload associated with the course? Within that, there are two sub-questions: to what extent does the workload change at design time when these are incorporated into the way the course will be taught, and to what extent does it change the workload during the course itself? (Professor Fossum said he believes there is a shift in student contact, away from face-to-face and more to email, and the time for email more than offsets the time required for face-to-face contact.)

On the penultimate paragraph, Professor Fossum said that Senior Vice President Cerra told SCFA that there is no explicit policy in the Academic Health Center about requiring faculty to raise part of their salary in external funds. Professor Wells commented, however, that there are stated policies in some units requiring faculty to raise X% of their salaries in outside support.

Professor Fossum said there are two basic questions raised in the discussion. One, it is expected that effort levels will increase; to what extent can the University get a handle on what a reasonable effort level is and how best to use faculty resources? Two, where does the external funding part come into play?

Professor Erdman said that workload comes down to the department one is in; it might be written down, it might word on the street. He said he found it attractive at Minnesota that expectations are more about scholarship while at other institutions the expectation is about raising money; the end result may be the same, but it is not written down.

Will SCFA continue to work on the issue of requiring external funding, Professor Marshak asked? Professor Fossum said SCFA saw its role as looking at how the situation has changed and informing this Committee about what appears to be evolving policy and to ask whether an actual policy about funded research is desirable. There are two potential problems with requiring external research funding, he said: research is directed to what sponsors are interested in, rather than what is important, and what happens to faculty members who are in an area that is not funded very much any more (although it might have been at one time)--how will the transition to a new type of research be handled? Presumably cases will percolate up to the Judicial Committee, Professor Marshak said. Professor Wells said the issue has triggered post-tenure review of faculty who have not obtained external funding. Professor Clayton said the issue has reached the grievance committee. So will decisions be made on a case-by-case basis or will there be a policy, Professor Marshak asked? Professor Fossum said there needs to be a look at the department 7.12 statements and their congruence with the tenure code and how they interact with the workload and tenuring process.

Professor Feeney said another question that needs to be asked is about the relationship between generating external research funds and scholarship. He said he is concerned about the emphasis on obtaining competitive grant funds: Because one brings in more money, is that better? Departments run the risk of becoming prostitutes of industry.

These are complicated issues, Professor Martin commented, and they affect faculty differently depending on where they are in the University. The questions seem to revolve around whether there are workload policies, how explicit or implicit they are, if they are communicated to faculty, and the connection between a workload policy and promotion and tenure and merit reviews.

There are other things included in workload, Professor Fossum said. It is increasing difficult and competitive for faculty to obtain external funding. The University must be very careful to help faculty be more efficient and still deliver high quality in all that they do. That will not happen if the amount of work faculty must do is simply ratcheted up. TEL is an example: It has changed the way teaching is delivered, and it was argued that this would be more efficient (and cheaper, and it is neither, Professor Martin commented). If it can be more efficient, it would be possible to improve quality and efficiency simultaneously, he said.

Workload comes down to the individual and the administrator and agreement on what it will be, Professor Erdman maintained. In that situation, no matter the rules personalities come into play. He said he did not know where this issue would go but expressed the hope that there would not be too much legislation. Professor Fossum said that was not what he was recommending. What needs more attention in units is how faculty accomplish what they must, how it can be done efficiently, and what will allow faculty to best to their work.

How are workload policies set, Professor Lanyon asked? They must be unit-based; is it based on scholarship? Driven by finances? That seems to be the dichotomy. Professor Fossum commented that one can see financial aspects in the explicit workload policies across the units. That is not likely to change, Professor Martin commented. Professor Fossum agreed. There is also a need to see how functions fit together so that faculty can accomplish what they need to.

Professor Feeney said there are related issues. One is the idea of being fair and adhering to policy. They reviewed merit evaluation procedures across the Academic Health Center a few years ago; there are policies in place but many are not followed. Some administrators appear to believe they can do whatever they wish. Another issue is the transfer of infrastructure: faculty must now do a lot of work previously done by staff, including their own enhancement, and TEL is a poster child for this change.

With respect to workload policy, Professor Wells said, she would like to see a policy requiring that faculty be involved in developing the workload policy. In some units, elements of faculty work are valued differently, in a scheme that is dictated from above. There should be a policy that there must be faculty buy-in for the workload. For example, a number of people have been hired who essentially only do research. They may give two lectures per year, and have one graduate student--and they are expected to bring in a lot of external research funding every year. What is the chance they will be able to do that for the next 20 years if they are tenured? There is nothing for them to fall back on. These kinds of developments are turning the University into a business, which will hurt it in the long term.

Professor Fossum said that he and Professor Hoover will appoint a subcommittee to deal with the TEL issues; the remaining issues depend on what this Committee wishes. Professor Marshak said it was good insight that units are very different. In the past 20 years, the amount of internal litigation has gone down as department administrators have become better trained. With new pressures, the Committee should engage the administration about professional development of department chairs and administrators because there could be a need for a new level of sensitivity about these issues. Stirring up more litigation is not in anyone's interest. Professor Martin said there have been central efforts to offer mini-professional-development courses to department chairs. Professor Fossum said they are very good programs that deal with a lot of issues. Whoever organizes those sessions is always looking for topics, Professor Lanyon said, and this Committee should consider suggesting some of the issues that have been raised in this discussion.

Professor Martin asked if the Committee wished SCFA to continue to seek alignment between 7.12 statements, faculty tasks, and tenure and promotion. It agreed that it did. Professor Fossum said he would pass the request along to Professor Kleiner, the incoming SCFA chair. Professor Martin thanked Professor Fossum for his report.

3. End-of-the-Year Report from Finance and Planning

Professor Campbell provided an overview of the activities of the Finance and Planning Committee for the year. The committee met frequently with Vice Presidents O'Brien and Pfitzenreuter, both of whom are ex officio members of the committee and terrific committee members, he reported. They dealt with capital planning and budget as well as the annual budget (and had some success in addressing the problem of graduate assistant fringe benefit rate); they also discussed the royalty income policy (which he and Professor Balas are still involved in) and regularly heard about University Services. They made significant progress on parking--there was early consultation, the committee got its oar in, and heard back on the issues twice. They also heard several times about a new stadium and continue to work on a new budget model.

4. The Tenure Code and Salary Freezes/Fringe Benefit Changes

Professor Martin next welcomed Professor Ron Akehurst, chair of the Tenure Committee, to discuss questions the Tenure Committee had raised about language in the code vis-à-vis salary freezes and increases in employee fringe benefit costs.

The most important thing this year about tenure is that nothing happened, Professor Akehurst reported. That is a good thing. The Tenure Committee, however, did look at several sections of the code, as it is charged to do, including Section 4. After discussing it, the Tenure Committee had more questions than answers.

Professor Akehurst reviewed the language of Section 4.5. "**4.5 Reduction Or Postponement Of Compensation.** If the University or a collegiate unit is faced with financial stringency that does not amount to a fiscal emergency, the president may propose a temporary reduction or postponement in compensation to be allocated to faculty in accordance with a mathematical formula or similar device. If approved by the Faculty Senate or the appropriate collegiate assembly, respectively, and the Board of Regents, the recurring salary of all faculty members in the University or in the designated collegiate units

shall be reduced temporarily in accordance with the formula or device. The reduction may not continue for longer than two years, unless renewed by the same procedure."

There are two different phrases used, Professor Akehurst said: "compensation" and "recurring salary." The Tenure Committee was not sure that they meant the same thing. In some places in the code, compensation is the more global term (including salary as well as health care, retirement, and so on). Compensation could be recurring, as is salary. Fringe benefits are provide in some instances based on status (all are provided about the same in health care) and in some on salary (e.g., retirement benefits). In Section 4.5, the only reductions envisaged are those that can be expressed as a percentage; since health benefits are not a percentage, it appears they are not touched by this section.

Professor Akehurst turned next to the language of Section 11 of the code, which deals with a fiscal emergency:

"11.2 General Principles Of Priority. The following general principles of priority apply in any financial crisis.

"* (a) first, the University must fully utilize all means consistent with its continued existence as an institution of high academic quality to reduce expenses or to increase income which do not involve the termination of faculty positions or the impairment of faculty rights.

"* (b) second, the University may consider alternatives which involve only the temporary reduction or postponement of faculty compensation or the reduction of fringe benefits.

"* (c) only thereafter may the University suspend or terminate faculty positions in accordance with the section.

"11.3 First Stage: Alternative Approaches. If there has been a serious reduction in the University's income, the president will report the matter to the Senate Consultative Committee. The president will identify the magnitude of the shortfall, the measures which might be taken to alleviate it (which must not involve impairment of faculty rights), and alternative measures which have been rejected. The president will give the committee full access to all available information and will respond specifically to additional proposals suggested by the committee. At this stage, the University will consider reductions in other expenses. It will also consider increases in tuition, sales of assets, and borrowing. These steps will be implemented by the president or the Board of Regents as is appropriate.

"11.4 Second Stage: Reduction Or Postponement Of Compensation. If the University has implemented all of the measures which are required to be considered in the first stage, which are consistent with its continued operation as an institution of high academic quality, and they are inadequate to meet the shortfall, the president may, after consultation with the Faculty Consultative Committee, propose the temporary reduction or postponement of faculty compensation for a predetermined period not to exceed one year, according to a mathematic formula or similar device. The Faculty Consultative Committee will report on the adequacy of the steps taken in the first stage and make its recommendations on the proposal. If the Faculty Senate approves the proposed action (or any modification of it) by an absolute majority of its membership or by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting (a quorum being present), the Board of Regents may take that action (or any less stringent action) and, to that extent, modify the terms of the appointments of all faculty members. The Board of Regents may rescind the action at any time thereafter. Such action may be repeated by the same procedures."

Fringe benefits seem to be at risk in Section 11, Professor Akehurst said, but he was not sure the President and Regents could reduce fringe benefits without consulting the Faculty Senate. One point made at the Tenure Committee meeting was that he (Professor Akehurst) should consult with someone who knew the legislative history and intent of this language: Professor Morrison.

Professor Morrison said the legislative intent is discernible with respect to salary and compensation. Section 4.5 was written on an emergency basis, with language copied from Section 11, in order to allow units to deal with their own financial problems. He reviewed the other provisions of Section 4 of the code and concluded that the language means that recurring salary is protected, as is the term of appointment. ADDITIONAL salary is not protected by the code (e.g., summer salary). That leads to Section 4.5, which provides that the recurring salaries of tenured faculty cannot be reduced except under the circumstances described.

The most significant thing about Section 4.5 is that the action can be taken within a unit and need not be University-wide, Professor Marshak said. What the units do is less important than that the actions are not University-wide, he said.

Does this address Professor Fossum's question about endowed chairs, Professor Martin asked? If the appointment includes a recurring salary, it could not be changed without the individual's consent, Professor Morrison said. But the tenure code does not protect fringe benefits, he said.

There was a lot of discussion about base salary, increments, clinical income, and so on, during the tenure debate, Professor Feeney recalled, which is why the language about base salary is important. Part of the concern was driven by the Academic Health Center. RECURRING salary became the byword so that it could not be cut.

Professor Fossum made some points about pay in general. Pay is defined for collective bargaining purposes as any economic outcome that the employee receives (including benefits). Some benefits are person-related (e.g., health insurance) and some are wage-related (e.g., retirement contributions). He said he would not like to see benefits separated from salary; if one takes the benefits out of pay (as defined above), an employer could get rid of all benefits and provide only salary/wages and save a lot of money. It is also important to recognize, however, that while employee co-pays have gone up, it is unlikely the total University contribution has declined.

Does the Tenure Committee wish to weigh in and offer any policy changes, Professor Martin asked? Professor Akehurst said it had not decided; it raised the question about the ambiguous use of the term "compensation," and could clear that up. He said he was very conservative about touching constitutions and was inclined to wait until there was a more significant issue that had to be addressed, at which time whatever other changes are needed can be made.

Professor Morrison raised a different issue. He noted the report that two-thirds of federal employees receive bonuses. As one looks at the financial situation, would faculty be better off if they pushed for a bonus pool rather than salary increases? A performance bonus pool avoids the problem of distribution, but then there is the problem of who makes the decisions and how they are made, but the federal government does offer a model. This has already happened in CLA, Professor Martin commented. Salaries at the University are merit-based and not parallel with federal salaries, Professor Sampson pointed out. In addition, one can get a one-year increment as a kind of bonus, Professor Martin

said. That is more rare than it should be, Professor Morrison said. He said he favors merit increases, but if that is the only thing that is done, base pay will continue to sink in relationship to the market. The question he would raise with the administration is whether there ought to be some low across-the-board percentage increase in salaries, permanent increments based on merit, and one-time increments also based on merit.

This is related to the X-Y-Z formula for salaries that was discussed in the Academic Health Center, Professor Feeney said, with X the tenured salary, Y additional salary (that it is expected will continue but is not guaranteed), and Z bonuses of a kind. He said they could dredge up the information about the system and maybe it is time to discuss it again. He said he has talked with deans about the risk of giving raises--they are much more conservative if they must lock in the commitment forever.

Is the Tenure Committee willing to wade into this issue, Professor Martin asked? Professor Akehurst said that it would. Professor Martin thanked Professor Akehurst for joining the meeting.

5. Budget Principles

Professor Campbell noted that the President has said he intends to change the budget model of the University by July 1, 2005. The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) has talked about pieces of the model since its first meeting of the year, and still does not understand the entire budget, but it will learn more. The President is looking for recommendations on principles; following a very good meeting on Tuesday, SCFP has approved a draft set of principles based on a document provided by the Academic Health Center Finance and Planning Committee. SCFP removed one principle recommended by the AHC group and added two of its own (numbers one and six in this draft, below). SCFP presents the principles, which this Committee can modify as it wishes.

"The University's budget model should ...

Principle 1: Be grounded in a set of institutional values and priorities in support of the University's mission

Suggested actions:

- a. develop, articulate, and promulgate a statement of the institutional values and priorities
- b. evaluate candidate budget models based on the degree to which they support and facilitate the values and priorities

Principle 2: Be accessible, predictable, and transparent

Suggested actions

- a. use a one-year lag to determine central assessment base
- b. keep assessment rates stable
- c. eliminate multiple assessments on the same dollars
- d. use reasonable and well-understood measures to assess central costs
- e. ensure that data from which these measures are derived are available to units
- f. aim for administrative ease at the unit level
- g. make academic program subsidies explicit rather than implicit

Principle 3: Ensure the most efficient use of resources (e.g., staff, space, technology, equipment) at all organizational levels and avoid inefficient duplication of services

Suggested actions

- a. align assessments with consumption of services (e.g. cost of student services based on number of students utilizing services; cost of HR, payroll, benefits based on number of employees; cost of accounting, budget and finance, SPA based on dollar expenditures; cost of space, including facilities management services)
- b. provide incentives and demand accountability for centralized services to be cost efficient and cost effective and protect against the inappropriate shift of effort or fees to local units
- c. on an annual basis, align and justify increases in central service costs to demand for services
- d. provide cost/benefit analyses, at both the central and unit level, of proposed business practices and policies before they are implemented
- e. require local units that choose to do business in non-standard ways to pay the full cost of such choices (conversely, provide central financial support for only standard ways of doing business)
- f. provide incentives at the local level to support the generation of revenue and coordinate those incentives centrally to avoid duplication costly to the institution

Principle 4: Create additional incentives, including financial incentives, to foster collaboration and interdisciplinary activities between academic units

Suggested actions

- a. develop alternative funding models for interdisciplinary education
- b. develop principled models for sharing ICR resulting from collaborative research across colleges and centers

Principle 5: Continue to allow for reallocation and investment in strategic priorities

Suggested actions

- a. avoid across-the board reductions that erode the overall quality of the institution
- b. selectively reallocate funds to and expand investments in programs that are consistent with institutional priorities, even if other programs must be reduced or eliminated in scope
- c. resist historical practice of keeping units “whole” in a period of budget transition
- d. develop a rationale for use of state appropriation dollars and allocate based on defined institutional priorities

Principle 6: Principles 1-5 apply equally well to colleges and departments and the Committee suggests that the deans use them as well.

The Committee urges the central administration to adopt these principles and actions."

These principles are for information, Professor Martin said, because SCFP is still talking about them. Professor Feeney was quick to caution, however, that the Committee not delay acting because things could happen quickly and they did not want decisions made these principles being included in the discussions.

What was removed, Professor Marshak asked? A principle calling for full revenue and cost attribution, Professor Campbell said. Whether one likes that principle or not depends on one's paradigm, Professor Feeney said; he said he still thought it was a good idea, but the discussion at Finance and Planning got tangled up in worry about spreadsheets and overhead assessments.

What is missing is review and control of non-revenue-producing central units, Professor Morrison said--the places where money flows from the internal taxes. Unless there is a principle that calls for a review of the value, and the comparative value, of those units by people who are outside the units, more and more money flows to the units. All are likely worthwhile, he said, but only central administrators look at them, and they need to have additional evaluation. Are there any not considered by a Senate committee, Professor Erdman asked? None are as budget issues, Professor Morrison said. There need to be questions asked about the value of improvements in systems versus the value of another faculty member in an academic unit (although review and oversight would not reach that level of detail). The Finance and Planning Committee cannot perform this function. Professor Campbell said that SCFP does so to a modest extent but that he agreed completely with Professor Morrison that there are decisions made about millions of dollars without consultation.

There should be a budget committee, including faculty and deans, that reviews the entire administrative budget, Professor Morrison said, and administrators should need to appear before it to justify their budget requests. The President would make the decisions, but such a committee should be an integral part of the budget process. Professor Campbell said that the administration's philosophy is openness about the budget, and both Drs. Bruininks and Maziar are calling for more tools to engage in the kind of analyses that are needed, so this suggestion should be consistent with their views. They want more openness about what is decided, why, where the money goes, and what subsidies exist (so they are not hidden, engendering suspicions about things being done under the table).

If this recommendation were implemented, what would be the level of analysis, Professor Erdman inquired? Spread among Senate committees? Finance and Planning? Another committee? Professor Campbell said that if Professor Morrison's suggestion is another budget principle, that raises the question about whether there should be another committee that includes both faculty governance and the deans. What Professor Morrison is suggesting, Professor Martin said, is a more regularized, stable, and accountable Budget Advisory Committee. This year the Budget Advisory Committee has received a lot of information, but that is only step 1. Step two is that the vice presidents must come to the committee and say what funding they need next get and receive explicit comment on the request from the committee. Is this a version of the compact process, Professor Martin asked? It is, Professor Morrison said, with the involvement of the units that are being taxed. Faculty and deans can ask if the tax money is being spent wisely or simply because it is what the administration wants. The difference from the compact process is that there is no oversight on the compact process, Professor Campbell said.

Professor Marshak said that there are two options. One is take state money off the stop for central services and then allocate the rest to the colleges. Another is to allocate ALL the money to the colleges and then tax them for central services. Right now the University is doing half of each, he asked? It is, Professor Morrison agreed. The budget principles do not say which way it should be done, only that the decisions should be reviewed by the faculty and deans.

The Finance and Planning Committee, when it deleted the principle calling for attribution of all revenues and costs, rejected the notion of management by spreadsheet, Professor Campbell related. SCFP believes there must be recognition that the University is a complex system and that there are non-quantifiable interdependencies that exist that the budget system should not undermine.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of Professor Morrison's proposal to add a new principle about oversight of central/service unit budgets. Professor Martin said the revised set of principles would be sent back to SCFP for further review, and that this Committee would then vote on adopting them at its June 3 meeting.

6. Biennial Budget Strategies

Professor Martin now welcomed Senior Vice President Robert Jones to the meeting to discuss draft principles and strategies related to the biennial budget request. Dr. Jones distributed a one-page list of principles and strategies and explained that he asked to speak with the Committee about them. The President wanted to start to think about the biennial budget earlier than has been the case in the past and asked him to pull together a small group of the vice presidents to think about these principles and strategies. They have been shared with the deans and chancellors and are now being brought to this Committee; Dr. Jones said he did not know if there would be an opportunity to bring them to the Finance and Planning Committee.

Committee members spent about half an hour reviewing and commenting vigorously on the strategies and principles. Professor Martin promised to send a summary of the Committee's views to Dr. Jones.

She adjourned the meeting at 3:20.

-- Gary Engstrand