

Timothy J. Delmont, Ph.D.

Timothy J. Delmont is Director of the Center for Human Resource Development (CHRD) in the University of Minnesota's Office of Human Resources. In the CHRD Dr. Delmont directs education programs and consulting services in the areas of leadership development, management systems and policies, career development, and service improvement for University employees on the Twin Cities and coordinate (greater Minnesota) campuses.

Among the CHRD programs directed by Dr. Delmont are an Orientation Seminar Series for new chairs and heads of academic departments, Orientation and Supervisory Training programs for supervisors of civil service and bargaining unit employees, and training programs in financial, human resources, and grants management areas.

Prior to his present appointment, Dr. Delmont served for 18 years as a senior analyst in the University's Office of Planning and Analysis, where he provided staff assistance for the implementation of institutional planning processes, the preparation of the biennial budget request, and the development of the capital request to state authorities.

In addition to his administrative duties, Dr. Delmont is an adjunct professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration, College of Education and Human Development, where for the past 16 years he has regularly taught graduate courses in educational planning and human resources administration.

While on leave from the University for three years, Dr. Delmont developed and was director of the Master of Arts in Management Program for Saint Mary's University of Minnesota. In this program, which was delivered to adult learners in both Minneapolis and Rochester sites, he also taught graduate courses in strategic planning, budgeting, and organizational culture and change.

A management consultant to public agencies and educational institutions, he specializes in strategic planning, budget, management, and leadership development areas. His clients have included the Minnesota Department of Human Services, the Minnesota Department of Education, the Metropolitan Waste Control Commission, and the Red Wing, MN, Public Schools as well as numerous departments within the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Delmont has held leadership positions in professional associations for educators and public administrators, and has also presented numerous papers and workshops on planning and management topics in local, regional, and national settings.

Prior to assuming his present responsibilities at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Delmont was a high school social studies teacher in St. Paul and a management analyst at both NASA's John F. Kennedy Space Center, Cape Canaveral, Florida, and the Hennepin County Department of Public Works.

A graduate of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota, where he earned a B.A. in sociology, he holds a B.S. in education, an M.A. in public administration, and a Ph.D. in educational administration from the University of Minnesota.

What are the major issues the AHC FCC will be working on this year?

MB: One of the issues left over from last year is an initiative to improve faculty participation in the governance of the Academic Health Center. Last spring we held a series of workshops for deans, department chairs, and selected faculty leaders to convey Mark Yudof and Frank Cerra's strong commitment to shared governance. As Yudof pointed out, top down administrative structures--which some faculty see as dominant in the AHC--are not the tradition of strong universities and are not even characteristic of the "best-run companies". This year, the FCC wants to move down a notch, to hold workshops within departments so we clearly convey what faculty ought to be able to expect with regard to decision making that affects their work and their future.

Was the initiative successful?

MB: The series of consultation workshops was a positive initiative. Faculty who attended said they were energized by the commitment to shared governance expressed by the university's leadership and by the examples given by highly regarded administrators. But in truth, there isn't the strong tradition of shared governance in the AHC as there is in some areas of the university. It will take some time to change the culture and long established habits. Also, unless faculty become aware that their leaders will be held accountable for participatory governance, AND that they can effectively challenge decisions that have not involved consultation, we are not likely to address the perceptions that prompted Frank Cerra and Mark Yudof to hold the workshops in the first place.

So, how does that goal fit into this year?

MB: I think there's a new goal emerging. The FCC has had several discussions about the state of the AHC. When we look retrospectively, we see ourselves losing ground. We see wide-spread morale issues and it is not just about governance issues. We think the AHC lacks a vision. We are planning an FCC retreat on October 5. We plan to brainstorm ways to energize faculty to address the challenges we face.

What are the challenges and how do you respond to them?

MB: For one thing, there is the loss of revenue to support health professions education. We're hiring more and more clinicians in order to shore up the revenue base to support the educational mission. Meanwhile, we're losing in the area of funded research. And we're seeing research faculty being recruited away. When we try to recruit for top scientists, for example, we have a hard time competing with peer institutions. We have seen ourselves slip from 20th among peer institutions in terms of NIH funding to 26th. It makes us really nervous. And it isn't only a matter of faculty salaries. There's pretty widespread disappointment, I think, in the response to last year's AHC legislative

request to address the loss of revenue to support our educational mission. For many, it feels like a lack of commitment from those with whom we are in partnership--especially given the budgetary surpluses the state enjoys. All Minnesotans lose when we lose ground as an AHC. It isn't just those of us who work here.

But, once we get beyond the grousing, something academics are particularly good at, we do need to direct our creative energy to ask what we can do. We are academic faculty because of our interest in generating new knowledge, in educating future professionals, and in being at the forefront of advances in patient care. The AHC faculty is Minnesota's best hope for staying on the cutting edge of advances in biomedical research and advances in patient care. We need to formulate a compelling mission and clearly communicate it to taxpayers. We need to ask whether we have been effective in communicating to the taxpayers of the state what we need in order to achieve joint goals. On the other hand, perhaps we have to accept the fact that we've never been particularly successful at getting funding from the state. We as faculty have to think pro-actively and positively about what we can do about it. The question is how can we take this creative group of faculty and get them really energized to focus on the real challenges that we're facing. That's what we want to address at the retreat.

Any other issues?

MB: We want to look at a the policies and procedures that support shared governance. The finance and planning sub-committee, for example, will look carefully at faculty compensation policies to see the extent to which faculty have been involved in defining the criteria for making judgments, the extent to which faculty are involved in the process, as well as the extent to which those policies have been revised and implemented as intended. Another issue the FCC will work on is the post-tenure review process. The University Senate modified the tenure code to require a process and criteria for reviewing the work of tenured professors. Some schools have developed them, some have not. We have a moral responsibility to the taxpayers to design and implement monitoring systems. We can't just ignore this fundamental obligation. Another thing we need to look at is constitutions and bylaws for each of the schools. We need to see whether there's a mesh between what is stated in those documents and what the actual practices are. We need to prompt the Vice President to hold academic leaders accountable for the implementation of policies and procedures that make the governance system work.

Has consultation improved over the last couple of years?

MB: I think it has. I think we've made some pretty dramatic improvements. Frank Cerra does seek advice. He is a good listener. When faculty complained, as they did last year, that there was no consultation, we discussed ways to not only improve the process, but to improve communication about the process. For example, we discussed

what to do when the administration does not agree with the consultation given. We pointed out that if we heard reasons why advice was not taken, even if we don't agree, giving reasons develops understanding and tends to elevate the dialogue.

Are you getting those explanations now?

MB: Yes. At each faculty assembly meeting, Frank has provided charts, which document each issue for which consultation was requested, what consultation was given, and then how the consultation was used, or not, and why. One area of grousing last year had to do with how AHC interdisciplinary grants were reviewed and awarded. We listened to the complaints, reviewed the process, suggested changes, and helped pick review committees. In addition to serving on review committees to monitor the process, we made sure we were present when the Deans Council made the allocation decisions. We wanted the Deans Council to participate in allocation decisions, but also to provide a rationale for decisions that deviated from the recommendations of the review committees. They did, and I haven't heard any grousing about that since.

What would you like to say to faculty?

MB: We really want to hear about issues and concerns. We will draw attention to them. That's our job. If the issues are of significance across the AHC, we may assign them to either Faculty Affairs or Finance and Planning. I'd like to encourage better attendance at Faculty Assembly meetings. There is always a time set aside for "Q and A" with Frank.

Improvement strategies
" " plans

Identify improv.
needs.

Are solutions tried aimed at symptoms rather than causes of the problem?

- Collect meaningful data
- Identify Root causes of problems
- develop appropriate solutions
- Plan & make changes