



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES
JOINT SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE/SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Thursday, December 9, 1981

N.B. THESE MINUTES REFLECT ONLY THE SECOND HALF OF THE MEETING, AND DO NOT COVER V. P. KEGLER'S PRESENTATION.

A joint meeting of the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee with Vice Presidents Bohlen, Hasselmo, Kegler, Keller and Wilderson was convened by SFC Chair Patricia Swan on Thursday, December 9, in the Regents Room. Committee members present were Tracy Allen, Bob Brasted, Nancy Brecht, Marcia Eaton, John Howe, Fraser Hart, Walter Johnson, Stan Lehnberg, Rick Linden, Marv Mattson, Doug Pratt, Rick Purple, Irwin Rubenstein, Tom Scott, and Donald Spring.

Each of the vice presidents described the criteria they have employed to prioritize the elements of support services they oversee, and to recommend where cuts should be made as cuts become necessary.

1. Student Affairs. Vice President Wilderson. The 0100 budget is \$10.5 to \$10.6 million, not including the larger amount that moves through from student fees. Mr. Wilderson distributed copies of a draft memo (unsent) addressed to Douglas Pratt, which prioritized the activities of Student Affairs.

- a. Activities which enable or enhance the operation of the University as an institution. These include computerized registration and computerized financial aid. Most important.
- b. Activities which maintain or improve the rate of successful completion of students' programs of study--including, particularly, counseling. Student Affairs will become a referral services for those services which are reasonably available elsewhere, such as for chemical dependency. There are likely to be adverse consequences from losing immediacy of service, particularly perhaps for protected classes of students. Student Affairs will retain other counseling services. Most important.
- c. Activities which promote the personal and social development of students. The change will be to leave students more on their own in scheduling ^{organized} activities. Service ranked Very important.
- d. Activities which enable or enhance the operation of educational programs. The change will be to withdraw some services regarding scholastic standing procedures, and shift them to the colleges. Services is ranked Important.

- e. Activities which maintain or improve the University's ability to attract and enroll students. Student Affairs will cut way back. Service ranked Somewhat important.
- f. Activities which maintain or improve the environment for scholarship. Student Affairs will withdraw support from the Film Society, from seminars, etc. Service ranked Somewhat important.
- g. Activities which maintain or enhance the University's service to the community. Student Affairs has released staff to community boards and committees. They will stop the practice where there appear to be no clear benefits to the University. Ranked Least important.

In sum, Student Affairs will eliminate certain entire budgets; they are the lower budgeted items. The types of cuts intended are reversible. Wilderson acknowledged that where both deans and Student Affairs are looking to cut identical services, one or the other will have to retain them.

2. Operations, Physical Plant, et al. Vice President Bohen, Finance. 1981-82 budget: \$46 million. The University support services constitute a large conglomerate. Three-quarters of the budget goes for operations and physical plant. Approximately one-quarter goes to other functions including over \$2 million for computer services, and contracted services and purchasing. \$2 million comprises a state special for computer support. Of the 75% for operations and physical plant, \$13 million goes for fuel and other fixed costs, \$10 million for repairs and maintenance, and \$8.5 million for custodial services. The final \$2.5 million is allotted to assorted offices under the Vice President.

There are no good operational instructions on planning for support services, Bohen said, and no planning process has existed. The unit still cannot do long-range planning because the University's long-range cuts are intended to be marginal, or as slight as circumstances will permit. Bohen plans an incontrovertible baseline budget, which can be adjusted to predicted changes. He wants to determine the minimum level of essential services in each area.

He has determined that major repairs and maintenance are down 15-20% in the last decade, custodial services down 5-7%. He is giving major maintenance priority over cleanliness. Custodial service will be cut where cleanliness is not essential.

Accounting and auditing: The University could, if forced, reduce its internal audit staff which primarily provides a double check on certain University services, but it could not reduce the accounting services without unaffordable consequences.

Administrative Data Services: Of its \$2 million budget, the \$1.5 million to maintain ongoing business such as payroll could hardly be touched.

Asked if the University has investigated the possibility of contracting out custodial services, Bohen said reportedly no local agency can provide the necessary number of workers. He said the impact on students of cuts in the custodial force would be no more than proportional to the whole. In answer

to the question of why the University's janitorial services cost more than those of other enterprises, he listed higher wages, pride in the University's appearance, and the higher standards, especially for the health science facilities.

3. Administration and Planning. Vice President Hasselmo.
 - a. Personnel. \$1.7 million: Employment referrals, benefits, payroll and human services development. The information offices will be consolidated into one office, and Human Resources Development will take some cuts.
 - b. Police. \$1.5 million. The force of 60 includes foot and bike patrols, escort service, ambulance and emergency service. Security level services will be preserved. Changes:
 - reduce the command structure
 - reduce bounced check surveillance
 - shift escort of fund deliveries
 - shift emergency services
 - promote interaction with Minneapolis and St. Paul departments
 - replace special duty officers with regular patrolling officers for special event traffic control
 - employ student monitors where appropriate, to report any disturbance to the police.

These planned cuts will not release a large amount of money.

4. General discussion. Vice President Hasselmo said the planning process includes (1) measuring workload and determining what is directly related to enrollment; (2) determining in each case whether to use internal or external delivery; (3) determining what is appropriate to charge to the 0100 budget and what should be paid by user charges.

Vice President Bohen said that there are little things one can do in the short run to tighten up efficiency, but that the level of service will decline. The proposed changes are feasible, but not neutral, he said. There will be perceptibly lower levels of amenities and of some important services. He also said there is an overwhelming inclination to cut small, fixed pockets for retrenchment, when instead managers should be looking at the big operations where, for instance, two directors might be reduced to one.

Prof. Brasted asked whether, if the University had a year ago gone through the state-requested exercise of designing a hypothetical 90% budget, it would have been any better off now. Keller replied that the request promoted responsible thinking about what programmatic shifts the University could make over time. But, he said, there is no logical solution to the problem now facing us. The University needs to be able to demonstrate with certainty that it could not absorb a \$28 million cut. Should financial exigency be declared, the cost to the University of executing the cuts might be ten times the cost of making lesser cuts.

Professor Swan thanked the Vice Presidents for their participation.

Because of the late hour, the remainder of the agenda was carried over to the December 17 meeting.

Prof. Purple asked committee members to urge colleagues to telephone their legislators. The Senate presently proposes cutting the University appropriation by an even larger percentage than that of other higher education institutions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Meredith Poppele, Sec.,
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

*distributed at SFC/SCC meeting with VP's
12-9-81*

Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

December 4, 1981

HIGH ADD
9 MINORITY
5 HANDICAPP
HIGH DROP
1 Computer Regist.
2 Computer FINANCIAL AID
3 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
6. PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Doug Pratt
Senate Consultative Committee

FROM: Frank B. Wilderson, Jr.
Vice President for Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Retrenchment Guidelines used in the Office for Student Affairs

Recently you inquired about the criteria that are used by Student Affairs Administrators to determine where retrenchable funds might be found within our departmental budgets. In the course of our planning efforts, this particular question is one that I and my staff have struggled with. Last year, we were able to achieve consensus about the following criteria and their relative importance:

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------------|
| <i>HIGH</i> | 1. Activities which enable or enhance the operation of the University as an institution. | MOST IMPORTANT |
| <i>HIGH</i> | 2. Activities which maintain or improve the rate of successful completion of programs of study by students. | MOST IMPORTANT |
| <i>HIGH</i> | 3. Activities which promote the personal and social development of students. | VERY IMPORTANT |
| <i>LOW</i> | 4. Activities which enable or enhance the operation of educational programs. | IMPORTANT |
| <i>LOW</i> | 5. Activities which maintain or improve the institution's ability to attract and enroll students. | SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT |
| <i>LOW</i> | 6. Activities which maintain or improve the environment for scholarship. | SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT |
| <i>LOW</i> | 7. Activities which maintain or enhance the University's service to the community. | LEAST IMPORTANT |

By applying these criteria to each of our programs we are able to gain a relative ranking of each program's importance (centrality) to OSA and to the University. Presumably, this would provide us with a meaningful source of information and