

Minutes*

Senate Finance Committee September 22, 1988

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), David Dittman, Arthur Erdman, Lael Gatewood, Gerald Klement, Walter Weyhmann

Guests: David Berg, Mark Brenner, Gayle Grika (Footnote), Geoff Maruyama, Phil Shively

Professor Ibele welcomed everyone to the meeting and then asked Professor Shively to discuss the current and future charges to the Senate Finance Committee. There is some concern that the business of the Finance Committee will be overloaded when the restructuring is implemented next year and, as one Committee member commented, that with this consolidation of committees some important details may be lost. An observation made in support of the restructuring was that with the new system, it would be unlikely that the work of any committee would be regarded as "minor," and that those details might be channeled more effectively.

Discussion of Draft Proposal

Professor Ibele went through each point of "Draft Proposal for 1988-89" with the Committee. The Committee took issue with several aspects of the Proposal, including the following:

Method of Review

The Committee addressed that aspect of the proposal (number 4) which plans for the event of insufficient funding from the legislature. The comment was made that it would be devastating to morale to plan for a cut. It is bad public relations, it would be bad for the legislature to know that we are planning for this and it could also result in the loss of more faculty members. The best faculty will go first because that is who has the alternatives.

Planning for a cut makes sense financially, but not otherwise. It was observed that no college would be particularly interested in engaging in a "hit list" exercise. It might actually be better for colleges to make disastrous, painful cuts than sacrificial cuts. The remark was made that a city might cut back on garbage service to make a very visible display of its disapproval for lack of funding, but the University is not in a position to do the equivalent.

Regarding the statement in proposal number 4 that colleges will not be treated uniformly in planning for 3 alternative financial assumptions, it was observed that the basis for differentiation of the colleges should be specified.

A Committee member remarked that outcomes of planning cycles have not always been implemented. There needs to be some evidence that implementation has taken place in order that

* 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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

planning proceed with the necessary commitment.

It was noted that evidence is there, but that this committee should see it and communicate it to the Senate.

Timing of Review

One Committee member commented that people will be unenthusiastic about going through this whole review again. There seems to be more planning than academic activity at the University.

It was observed, however, that this review does have to take place, the question is when it will take place. This draft proposes Winter of 1989 as the best time for the College Plan reviews to be undertaken, but presents Fall of 1989 as an alternative. Comments about these two options were these:

- The review process may not be taken seriously if it occurs before the legislative session; on the other hand it is helpful from a planning point of view.

- The main difference between doing it Winter quarter or doing it a year from now is the timing of implementation. If planning is delayed until Fall then the implementation would be delayed one year also.

SFC Agenda

Professor Ibele asked the Committee to suggest possible agenda items for the year as well as for the next meeting.

One Committee member suggested that the development of the Capital request be discussed at a future meeting, and then asked Mr. Berg how this one was formed. Mr. Berg said that this one flowed out of the previous request--it was formed from the list of projects which failed to receive funding.

In response to another question about why the Earth Sciences building went from number 20 on the priority list to number 4, Mr. Berg pointed to the "one stop shopping center" for students that is to consist of Nolte, Pillsbury and Nicholson. This transition will effect Geology.

Professor Weyhmann commented on a list of possible agenda items that he had submitted to Professor Ibele. One suggestion was that there be two lists at the bottom of each set of minutes: one list of "promises" that various administrators have made to the Committee to get back to them with reports and a list of annual routine reports that the Committee should receive. This is because historically, SFC hasn't always received important documents. One example is the report on the decentralization of fringe benefits.

Possible agenda items for the October 6 meeting with Planning were discussed, including a session with Ed Foster to discuss the coupling of planning and implementation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.

Senate Finance Committee
September 22, 1988

3

-- Kelly Craigmile

University of Minnesota