



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 37 3-3226

Tentative Agenda

Senate Consultative Committee

November 29, 1979 12:30-1:00 p.m.
Regents Room, Minneapolis Campus

1. Fix agenda
2. Minutes of meeting of November 15, 1979 (enclosed)
3. Report of the Chair (enclosed)
4. Committee Reports
 - (a) Senate Reorganization - Professor Spring
5. Old Business
 - (a) Per-credit tuition - SCC, and Mr. Steve Carlson (enclosures)
6. New Business

Agenda items for meeting with the President (see enclosed copy of Professor Purple's letter to the President enumerating these)
7. Adjournment



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373- 3226

DRAFT

Approved 1-17-80

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of November 29, 1979

The seventh meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee of the 1979-80 academic year was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on November 29 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall on the Minneapolis campus. Members present were George Blake, Robert Brasted, Scott Carlson, Steve Carlson, Mark Davis, Marcia Eaton, Jim Gelbman, Wendell Glick, Russell Hobbie, Rich Kottke, Cleon Melsa, Fred Morrison, Sue Pribyl, Richard Purple, Chair, Vera Schletzer, L. E. Scriven, Don Spring and John Weis. Visitors were Carol Pazandak of the President's office and Maureen Smith of University Relations.

1. A motion to fix the agenda was carried without dissent.
2. A motion to approve the minutes of the November 15 meeting was carried without dissent.
3. Report of the Chair. Professor Purple reported briefly on the meeting of the Facilitative Committee earlier in the day. Professor James Terwilliger announced there that SCEP is establishing a subcommittee to consider the Report of the University Committee on the Handicapped. Professor Morrison stated that the SCC in its steering capacity should refer to a committee the President's draft document on "Institutional Planning Assumptions, Goals and Objectives for the 1980's."
4. Per-credit tuition. Mr. Steve Carlson moved that the President not take the issue of per-credit tuition to the Regents for implementation until the SCC has made its position clear. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Carlson noted that the position of the SCC two years ago was of general opposition to the per-credit concept, with the recommendation that, at least, there be banding. Since banding is part of the new proposal, it

is appropriate now for the SCC to reconsider the question. He hopes the SCC will take a position.

Professor Purple reported that the Graduate School could not supply data to the SCC for this discussion, believing that its data on the first two years of its per-credit tuition experiment were not typical or useful for SCC purposes.

The motion carried with Professors Brasted and Spring dissenting. Per-credit tuition will be a major agenda item for the December 6 SCC meeting.

5. Committee Reports.

(a) Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization. Professor Spring asked the SCC to comment on the proposal for a three-part structure and for the clustering of committees about SCC. Mr. Steve Carlson questioned why the present defined function of Business and Rules is not satisfactory. He believed that designating the steering function of the SCC to Business and Rules would weaken the SCC. He also warned against the SCC lessening its power in the Senate with respect to the President. To lessen SCC's steering function would be to impair its effectiveness in the Senate, he argued.

Professor Spring said that the SCC would assert its involvement in steering through its several members whom it would appoint yearly to Business and Rules. The SCC would look for particular expertise in its appointments.

Mr. Gelbman asked whether Business and Rules would report through the SCC, and Mr. Scott Carlson asked who would set the agenda for Senate meetings. Professor Spring replied that the SCC is the body taking the actions and Business and Rules is the body to implement the actions. In the case of a Senate agenda, Business and Rules would set it, the SCC would confirm it.

Mr. Gelbman spoke in favor of the proposed change. He would like to see the SCC relieved of some of its steering function so that it would have more time available to devote to issues. Mr. Steve Carlson disagreed, saying the SCC has a lot of issues discussion. He asked about the possibility of Business and Rules declining to bring an item to the Senate. Professor Spring acknowledged that there should be protection from conceivable autocratic behavior trying to keep issues from the Senate floor.

Professor Morrison stated, and Professor Hobbie expressed his agreement, that the broadly elected SCC has more influence than the appointed Business and

Rules Committee can have and that the SCC presently is doing a good job of delegating business. Professor Hobbie pointed out, however, that the recommendation for Business and Rules to act as floor manager at Senate meetings could be useful. Business and Rules could give a dispassionate ruling to the Parliamentarian when the need arose.

Professor Glick inquired as to the work load for Business and Rules. Professor Hobbie, former chair of Business and Rules, described the work load as episodic, responding to needs as they arise, such as proposed rule changes. Setting the agenda has ordinarily been delegated to the chair.

Professor Eaton inquired how a particular piece of business would be handled differently under the new proposal than under existing practice. Taking the example of the sexual harrasment issue, she pointed out that the SCC has steered it to SCFA. Would something different have been done had the proposed new rules been in effect? Professor Spring replied that steering could happen in the same way. The new system contains safeguards against items getting onto the Senate agenda without specific SCC approval.

Professor Purple raised a question introduced by the Committee on Committees: Should not the chairs of all Senate committees have votes in the Senate? The disparity of some not having votes arises because some committee members serve as chairs after their Senate terms have expired.

Mr. Steve Carlson reintroduced the proposal for a Senate or University Committee on Student Affairs. Professor Spring stated that the subcommittee has discussed the question but not fully.

Ms. Pribyl asked how much of a burden it is on the chair of the SCC to see that the appropriate people get everything they should get, and Professor Purple replied that with the secretary's help, it is not a heavy burden.

The meeting adjourned at 1:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

For the SCC meeting of November 29, 1979

Report of the Chair

A Facilitative Committee meeting is slated for 9:30-10:30 a.m. on November 29th and comments and suggestions received there will be reported.

One item of steering committee business will be before us with regard to the President's draft on "Institutional Planning Assumptions, Goals and Objectives for the 1980's", which we trust you have received in a mailing from the President's office. Do we wish to consider referring this to Senate committees (UCBRBR? SCRAP? SCEP? SCFA?) for possible Senate response? Perhaps it would be wise to put this on the agenda for discussion with the President before we reach any decisions on a request for Senate action.

Enclosed is what material we have been able to find in SCC files on the per-credit tuition proposal. Mr. Steve Carlson would like to have the SCC take action on the tuition proposal at this meeting. The Chair notes that Regential action is slated for December 13th and 14th, and that the SCC will have a regular, two and a-half hour meeting on December 6th. It may be more appropriate to postpone action on the tuition proposal until then, when it will be possible to hear from SCEP and SCRAP (the two committees which studied the per-credit tuition proposal previously) and to collect additional information from the administration and the Graduate School. This latter unit has been under per-credit tuition for two years now and we should be able to get some response from them by the 6th of December. The Chair also recommends that the per-credit tuition item be placed on the agenda for our discussion with the President.

Richard L. Purple



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

November 5, 1979

To: Provosts, Deans, Directors, Department Heads and Interested
University Community Members

Dear Colleagues:

This letter transmits a draft of an institutional statement outlining a series of goals, objectives, and priorities for the University of Minnesota over the 1980s.

As a draft, it is subject to change, and I hope it will be widely discussed. I am open to suggestions on how it might be improved in terms of greater specificity, different priority rankings, substantive additions or deletions, and similar revisions. Similarly, I am willing to entertain alternative approaches to the one included here, recognizing, of course, that any such document cannot reflect the views of all of us.

The collegiate deans, unit heads, and faculty should reflect upon this institutional statement in revising the unit planning documents so that their institutional plans will be consistent in the years ahead. Recommendations for possible changes in the institutional statement should be returned with the revised unit plans by December 15, 1979. Your continuing help, interest, and participation in this planning effort -- at a time when you are all busy with many objectives -- is profoundly appreciated.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:djf

Attachment: Draft of Institutional Goals, Objectives, and Priorities

cc: Board of Regents
University Vice Presidents
University Senate
Dr. James T. Borjestad
Dr. Carol Pazandak

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS, GOALS, OBJECTIVES
AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 1980s

C. Peter Magrath

I. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Over the past 128 years, the University of Minnesota has become one of the leading educational systems in the nation. There are few institutions of higher learning that do as many things as well as the University of Minnesota. We have become one of the country's largest universities in terms of enrollments, most comprehensive in terms of program variety, most creative in terms of educational and research innovations, and most respected in terms of overall quality.

To a large extent, the University's accomplishments in these endeavors stem from its tradition as a Land-Grant institution created to serve the people of Minnesota. In other words, both our broad mission and our success in carrying out that mission are intimately related to the needs and support of the people of the state. This suggests a responsibility to assess periodically those needs, to determine how they have changed over time, and to project what they might be in the foreseeable future. It also suggests the necessity to develop a common understanding of how the University will meet those needs in the years ahead.

The purpose of this document is an attempt to promote such an understanding both within the University and among our external constituents. Presented here are my views regarding the major directions we should follow, the specific objectives we must strive to meet, and the significant environmental factors that may influence our pursuits over the next five to ten years. The document is not designed to be a final statement on the University's role in the 1980s, nor is it intended to signal an end to our on-going internal planning efforts. Quite to the contrary, by sharing this draft widely, I hope to stimulate the type of communication and discussion that is absolutely necessary in charting a common and thoroughly understood course for the next decade. In so doing, we will be better prepared to meet our obligations to serve the people of this state.

II. A COMMON PAST -- A COMMON FUTURE

Just as the Land-Grant mandate represents the single most important factor in the development of the University of Minnesota, so, too, will it be a dominant force in determining the future directions of the institution. This means that we must continue to carry out those diverse responsibilities that have historically been entrusted to us. However, it also means that we will continue to experience many of the traditional, yet creative, tensions inherent within the Land-Grant mandate. This point bears further explanation.

The Land-Grant concept of "serving the needs of the people" is a broad charge that has led to inevitable and justifiable differences in interpretation. These differences will not disappear in the years ahead and must be reflected in our long-range thinking. For example, although the importance of the University's threefold mission of teaching, research, and service is seldom questioned, there is considerable discussion, both internally and externally, as to how each of these functions should be executed. There are those who would emphasize one at the expense of the others. There are also those who question our commitment to each of the three functions or who perceive an inconsistency among them. I do not share such sentiments, finding the three roles to be compatible, complementary, and well-executed. Although certain units, colleges, or campuses do, in fact, concentrate upon one of the functions, such an emphasis is wholly consistent with the Land-Grant tradition. It is far more important to recognize our overall, institutional commitment to teaching, research, and service and the necessity to build upon those relationships during the next decade.

A second tension that has developed over the years involves what might be referred to as the University's "populist versus elitist" roles. On the one hand, we have a responsibility to provide educational opportunities and service to large numbers of students. This requires a commitment to educational access, to core curricula in the arts and sciences, and to undergraduate programs of various types at various locations. On the other hand, our graduate, professional, and research programs are characterized by great selectivity and exceptional standards. This, in turn, requires a commitment to strict admissions criteria, limited enrollments, and relatively expensive programs. Again, while some may see these functions as contradictory, I do not. Admittedly, the relationship between the two roles is complex and serves to highlight the agony and the ecstasy of our diverse responsibilities, but the relationship has also proved to be a creative and complementary one, bolstering our undergraduate as well as graduate programs.

A third tension grows out of the historic fact that there are qualitative differences both within and between programs. I agree with those members of the University community who stress the need to pursue excellence in every University activity. I also recognize the importance of having as many outstanding programs as possible, for they not only enhance the reputation of the University as a whole, but act as the leaven in promoting sound standards of scholarship through the institution. The important difference, however, is that not all good programs can be supported at levels that would make them outstanding ones. Resource considerations alone dictate difficult decisions that affect the overall quality of every program, and to ignore this simple truth is to deny the reality of limited funding and unlimited needs.

A fourth tension relates to the fact that Minnesota has experienced many changes in its post-secondary educational system over the past twenty years. We now have a more elaborate system of community colleges, an expanded network

of vocational schools, tuition reciprocity with neighboring states, a larger and better organized system of state universities including one in the metropolitan area, and a large number and variety of private colleges. While some may view the development of these institutions as a threat to the University (or vice versa, the University as a threat to these institutions), I do not. My position here reflects two beliefs. First, many of the educational programs offered at the University of Minnesota are distinct and simply do not compete with programs available at any other institution of higher learning in the state. This is certainly the case with the majority of our graduate, professional, and research programs, where the University is the only or primary point of access to be found.

Second, even where duplication of programs can be found across institutions (and this is generally restricted to the undergraduate level), there is little evidence that it is needless duplication. Different programs, different campus locations, different admissions standards, and different educational emphases characterize the post-secondary education picture in Minnesota. To single out certain similarities in programs and cite them as needless duplication is to lose sight of the different types of students who seek advanced training and who exercise their right to choose between a variety of educational programs. At the same time, for the University to forget these differences, and attempt to compete with the other institutions by lowering standards or by offering duplicative programs would ill serve either the interests of the University or the State.

To some extent, these tensions, along with many not listed here, characterize the history of most land-grant institutions, and it is quite likely that such issues will persist in the years ahead. We at the University of Minnesota will continue to be called upon to execute our teaching, research, and service responsibilities, to balance our commitment to educational access and program selectivity, to demonstrate that maintaining a high level of excellence is modest

when compared to the cost of building or rebuilding excellence, and to take cognizance of the changes in Minnesota higher education over recent years. However, we will have to address these and other challenges in a context that will be different from recent history.

III. ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE 1980s

A variety of circumstances will influence higher education and the University of Minnesota in the years ahead. Because these conditions will be subject to continuous change, our assumptions about the future must be reviewed on a frequent and regular basis. Currently, however, some of the most important and reasonable predictions we might make about the 1980s are these:

Enrollments

Higher education enrollments are a product of a number of factors; some are under the State's or the University's control, but others are not. Those under State or University control and used currently in the Management Planning and Information Services (MPIS) enrollment estimates are as follows:

1. Tuition will not increase in constant dollars.
2. Financial aid available per high school graduate will increase 1 per cent per year.
3. Existing admissions standards will not change significantly.
4. Internal increases in undergraduate tuitions will be proportional among programs and student levels.

Based on these assumptions, mean, high, and low enrollment forecasts were made as shown in the table at the end of this statement.

The different estimates indicate that there is some uncertainty regarding our enrollments over the next five years. What is probable is that there will be an eventual, and perhaps precipitous, decline by the end of the decade, if not much sooner. This decline will exert a number of effects upon the entire system, most specifically in the areas of income.

Income

The sources of University income can be discussed in terms of our three basic missions — teaching, research, and service.

Instructional funds, from both state and tuition sources, are largely a function of enrollments. If enrollment declines materialize as projected in the 1980s, then one might also expect a reduction in instructional income. This, in turn, would force us to adjust our programs, reallocate resources, and reduce the size of our faculty and staff complements. A critical issue, of course, is that many of the activities we engage in are simply not related to the number of students we enroll. While we should make every effort to persuade State officials of the inappropriateness of rigid enrollment-driven funding formulas, we cannot expect that such funding mechanisms will be entirely replaced in the immediate future.

The problems of enrollment-based funding formulas become especially clear when one considers the University's research income, a large part of which is derived from the state. If the traditional relationship between enrollment ratios and general research support from the State continues, then the University's research activities will be adversely affected. This does not mean that it will be impossible to change the current method of supporting our research endeavors, or that governors and legislatures will be unwilling to increase support for certain research-targeted activities. To the contrary it means that special efforts must be made in both areas.

Equally important, the federal government, which serves as the other major source for University research funds, is unlikely to offer additional support for research activities. While our success in obtaining grants and contracts may continue to grow, there is unfortunately little evidence that the overall federal support for basic research will increase. Most likely, it will remain at present constant dollar levels, with the possibility of incremental increases for applied research. Given this prospect and the generally unpredictable nature of federal research policies, we will have to continue to cultivate state, private, and industry support for our research ventures, recognizing again that these sources might be slow in developing.

Service income, including revenues from University enterprises, extension, special projects and contracts, and similar sources may offer some hope for offsetting declines in other income sources. Another possibility for additional revenue might be found in new instructional clienteles. Although the potential for adult and mid-career educational programs should not be overestimated, such programs do represent strong alternatives in a number of fields. We should tentatively assume that well-constructed proposals addressed to needs of specific non-traditional clientele will attract support. Furthermore, implementation of the proposals in the "Outreach Report" may increase somewhat our level of support from non-regular students and may enhance the possibility of state support for that type of instruction.

Private gifts and fund raising represent a final source of potential income growth. Last year the University ranked sixth among all public and private universities, receiving more than \$34.5 million in gifts, and there

are prospects for increasing this support if we demonstrate a strong planning effort, a coordinated fund-raising campaign, and a continuing commitment to high quality programs. Private gifts alone, however, or even a combination of increased service income and private donations, will be insufficient in addressing our overall financial difficulties.

On balance, it seems best to assume that the total real income available to the University will decline throughout the next five to six years. While certain individual units may experience increases due to demand or creativity, the institution as a whole will not. The growing public pressure to relieve existing tax burdens, the nation's troubled economy, and the more intense competition for limited state and federal revenues will simply constrain the ability of public officials to respond to all of the needs of higher education. Thus, the fundamental assumption that we must make about our future fiscal condition is that selective reallocation of internal resources will be a fact of life for the University of Minnesota in the 1980s. We will have to show both public officials and private donors that we are willing and able to help ourselves.

Inflation

Inflation has reduced the University's purchasing power more than any other single factor over the last ten years. It has taken a severe toll upon salaries, equipment purchases, construction and renovation of facilities, and virtually every other category of expenditure. Particularly hard hit by inflation are the University's supplies, expense and equipment budgets due, in part, to the inability of the Governor and the State Legislature to fully fund inflationary increases in Supply, Expense and Equipment (SEE) budgets.

It is difficult to predict whether future governors and state legislatures will be more willing to fund increases caused by inflation, but it is clear

DRAFT

9

that our Biennial Requests will emphasize the crippling effects of inflation. It is equally probable that inflation will not be reduced substantially within the foreseeable future, and that, consequently, we will have to reallocate existing resources to meet future needs.

Staffing

In the next decade, I do not anticipate any significant changes in the tenure code, even though faculty personnel issues will require continued attention. For example, incentives for early faculty retirement, retraining, or transfers within the system might be examined as methods for adjusting to changing programmatic demands. Likewise, strategies for insuring the continued flow of young and exceptionally qualified faculty into the system should be developed. The mix of faculty and Civil Service staff should also be studied. However, these and similar staffing issues can only be pursued in the context of University-wide review and discussion.

Productivity

The increasing demands for accountability make it clear that publicly-supported institutions such as the University will be called upon to demonstrate certain measures of productivity. Admittedly, productivity is difficult to gauge in universities, but it is not impossible. In academic areas, we will have to consider carefully such issues as faculty workloads, class sizes, frequency of offerings, and alternative pedagogical methods, recognizing, of course, that variations in such matters are generally the logical result of differences in responsibilities. In support areas, we will have to monitor the productivity increases achieved by comparable programs in the general community. Our unwillingness or inability to demonstrate measures of effectiveness and efficiency can only hamper our efforts to maintain the public's confidence and support.

Technological Change

The next decade will witness a significant expansion in computer and communications technology. This expansion will present new opportunities for serving not only the education needs of Minnesotans, but the research and service needs of the State's high technology agricultural and business sectors. If technological changes continue to lead to increased leisure time, there may be new clienteles demanding University expertise and service. These changes will undoubtedly have a significant impact on the University and should be given close scrutiny in the long-range plans of the units and the institution as a whole.

Other Minnesota Universities and Colleges

Many of these assumptions apply to the other institutions of higher learning in the state as well. The pressures of declining enrollments, limited income, inflation, and similar matters will be as serious, if not more so, for these universities and colleges. Consequently, some individuals fear that the traditional spirit of cooperation that characterizes the relationship between the University and the other public and private institutions across Minnesota might take on a more competitive edge. We should not allow this to be the case. We have a clear responsibility to cooperate with these universities and colleges as well as with the Higher Education Coordinating Board, to consider their role in our planning activities, and to be as clear as possible in communicating to them our directions and decisions. To reduce the quality of our programs or proliferate new programs in order to compete for students at the expense of other higher educational institutions must be avoided. To recognize the importance of these institutions is absolutely essential.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 1980s

The assumptions that have been outlined serve as a guide to the institutional goals, objectives, and priorities described in Section IV. Above all else, a statement of goals, objectives, and priorities must chart a realistic course for the foreseeable future. The course I am proposing is characterized by two fundamental principles: a commitment to the Land-Grant tradition and a commitment to excellence. These two principles have long served as the cornerstone of the University of Minnesota, distinguishing this institution from many others across the nation; these two principles should continue to guide our plans and priorities over the next decade.

At a very minimum, we must maintain, and wherever possible strengthen, the quality of those University programs that are characterized by excellence. The costs of rebuilding excellence are far greater than maintaining it, and we must not permit an erosion in the quality of our most outstanding programs. We must also take advantage of those unique opportunities that avail themselves to improve potentially high quality programs. Furthermore, we must seek to protect those programs that are essential to a Land-Grant institution or that are not offered elsewhere in Minnesota. Finally, we must work to improve the overall quality of the University of Minnesota by attracting the best students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The accomplishment of these overriding goals will require difficult decisions from all members of the University community. Distinctive programs will have to be identified among and within units; selective judgments will have to be made in funding; and quality will have to be pursued within the constraints of limited resources.

DRAFT

12

Provosts, deans, directors, and central officers -- no less than the President of the University and its Board of Regents -- must provide leadership in devising methods and incentives to attract and combine existing resources as we pursue a ceaseless commitment to quality teaching, research, and service. Faculty, staff, and student participation in such decision-making and planning is essential, since it is ultimately the members of the University community who determine its quality and reputation.

The challenges are unquestionably complex. I am, however, confident we will meet our obligations and thereby continue and enhance the reputation of the University of Minnesota as one of the most creative and outstanding institutions of higher learning in the nation.

I. To promote higher standards of quality in the University's teaching activities.

1. To strive continually to improve our instruction by encouraging faculty members to self-evaluate their teaching and to experiment with innovative approaches and techniques in the classroom.

Utmost
Importance

2. To ensure that the instruction of undergraduate students in pre-professional as well as liberal arts programs will be designed to produce broadly educated individuals in the liberal arts tradition.

Utmost
Importance

3. To make special efforts to enroll high ability and mature undergraduate students through such mechanisms as merit based scholarships.

Utmost
Importance

4. To build on the levels of excellence already established in the graduate and professional schools.

Utmost
Importance

II. To improve the educational environment for all types of students.

1. By fall, 1982, to initiate ongoing educational programs for University personnel which will enhance our sensitivity to the many diverse needs of the students.
2. To maintain and support programs which build on the existing skills of disadvantaged students and provide them with the background necessary to complete successfully University degree programs.
3. To continue to seek financial aid for disadvantaged students.
4. To monitor and improve the recruitment and retention rates of minority and disadvantaged students.
5. To ensure that the services offered minority students through the cultural centers meet the needs of the minority population.
6. To ensure access for qualified, physically handicapped students.

High
Importance

Utmost
Importance

Utmost
Importance

Utmost
Importance

High
Importance

Utmost
Importance

III. To maintain, and whenever possible, strengthen the University's research activities.

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. To intensify efforts to secure external funding for research and training programs. | Utmost
Importance |
| 2. To continue efforts to attract funding from the federal and state governments. | Utmost
Importance |
| 3. To ensure that fund-raising efforts in the private sector are coordinated, yet do not constrain unit initiative or program development. | High
Importance |
| 4. To communicate to appropriate governmental authorities the growing impact of federal and state regulations on higher education. | Important |

IV. Implement a clear policy with respect to outreach activities.

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. By Spring, 1981, to complete the review of the Outreach Report. | Utmost
Importance |
| 2. On the basis of the review of the Outreach Report, to develop a plan for implementing the outreach policy of the University by Fall, 1981. | High
Importance |
| 3. To ensure the quality of expanded outreach activities by integrating them more thoroughly with the other activities of the academic departments. | Important |
| 4. To facilitate the return to higher education for those students pursuing career changes and for those seeking to enhance their general knowledge through "life-long learning." | High
Importance |

V. To develop more extensive programs for faculty enrichment in order to foster the generation of new ideas, to encourage the voluntary retraining and reassignment of faculty, and to improve the teaching, research, and service components of the University's mission.

1. To support an extended program of early retirement which will make the option attractive to faculty members who wish to take advantage of it. Important

2. By Fall, 1982, complete a study which comprehensively examines the issues influencing faculty vitality over the next decade and which suggests alternative courses of action. Utmost
Priority

VI. Within the state, to make more widely known the University's distinctive role -- including the full dimensions and complex interrelationships among its teaching, research, and service activities.

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. By the middle of 1980, to begin the development of alternative models for funding the University, which are based on the full range of University activities and not focused exclusively nor narrowly on enrollments. | Utmost
Priority |
| 2. By Spring, 1982, to develop a review of the incentive structure of the University as it relates to instruction, research, and service, contrasting that with the assumptions and priorities of students, legislators, and the general public. | High
Importance |
| 3. To continue to hold seminars for public officials where faculty members can explain their research work. | Important |
| 4. To expand both institutional and faculty efforts to explain University research activities to the general public. | Important |

VII. To intensify efforts to link the activities of the University more closely to critical segments of the state and the nation -- agriculture, business, industry, the professions, cultural fields, and units of local and federal government.

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. To develop the HHH Institute into a nationally prominent center. | Utmost Importance |
| 2. To seek expanded federal support for urban and community service programs. | High Importance |
| 3. To increase the number of high quality programs available to business and professional people who desire renewed or advanced certification and who can benefit from the multidimensional aspects of the University. | Important |

VIII. To continue to develop and strengthen the University's "international" emphases.

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Continue the University's involvement in Title XII (AID) and other federal and private sector programs that support the University's international interest. | Utmost
Importance |
| 2. To assist the state, where possible, in its quest to develop strong ties between Minnesota's agricultural, business, and industrial sectors and foreign countries. | Important |
| 3. To create an environment which is supportive of qualified international students. | High
Importance |
| 4. To continue to promote and, where possible, expand student and faculty exchange programs with other countries. | Important |

IX. To increase productivity and financial flexibility at all levels of the University so as to permit response to changing educational and societal needs.

1. To make more efficient use of University resources by eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort, both in academic course offerings and in the support services. Utmost Importance
2. By Spring, 1982, to conduct a study of workload and productivity throughout the University with special attention to the entire mission of the institution and the factors that affect productivity. High Importance
3. To lower bureaucratic and procedural barriers which prevent the flexible use of the University's most valuable resource -- its people. High Importance
4. To increase efforts which foster interdisciplinary teaching and research. Important

X. To build and maintain a cooperative relationship with both public and private institutions in the state and the region.

1. To cooperate with other educational institutions in establishing instructional programs and service activities.

Utmost
Importance

2. To communicate as clearly as possible to all post-secondary institutions in the state the planning decisions of the University and the directions which it intends to pursue.

Utmost
Importance

XI. To develop a more effective institutional decision-making process which is based on an on-going planning system that encourages unit initiative and consultation.

1. Together with the Regents, complete a revision of the University Mission and Policy Statement by June, 1980, with subsequent reviews scheduled at five-year intervals. Utmost Importance
2. To reexamine the institutional statement of planning assumptions, goals, objectives, and priorities approximately every two years. High Importance
3. For every college or major support unit, ensure that an up-to-date planning statement is maintained that identifies the goals, objectives, and priorities of the unit. Utmost Importance
4. By Fall, 1980, conduct a review of the University's recent efforts at improving planning and decision-making, including specific recommendations for improving the overall structure and procedures. High Importance
5. Maintain a planning data base that provides a common set of historical and projected figures for important activities of the University. High Importance
6. To develop an evaluation report that assesses periodically the University's performance in relation to its stated goals and objectives. High Importance

V. COLLEGIATE AND UNIT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 1980s

An important adjunct to the institutional statement of goals, objectives, and priorities is the development of similar statements for each college and major support unit. Last spring, some forty colleges and units developed, as first drafts, statements that described the mission of their unit, their history, planning assumptions, and a prioritized list of the unit's goals and objectives for the next five to ten years. These were subsequently reviewed by representatives from each unit and the President in a series of planning conferences. The statements will be further revised by the faculty and deans and resubmitted in December, 1979. A copy of each unit statement and my formal comments regarding them will be on file in Walter Library.

VI. A FINAL STATEMENT

As I mentioned at the outset, this statement is not intended to chart a rigid course for the 1980s, but rather to initiate discussion about the directions we should pursue. As an academic community dedicated to dialogue and debate, we must be willing to voice our views about the very nature of this academy, its goals, objectives, and priorities. I have attempted to do so here for the express purpose of generating the type of systemwide communication that will allow us to plan for the inescapable challenges of the next decade. This document should not be viewed as a presidential statement, but as an institutional statement. As such, it must reflect the values and judgments of the entire University community.

Table: Enrollment Forecasts
Through 1983 as of February, 1979

	<u>1978¹</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>
<u>Twin Cities Campus</u>							
Undergraduate							
(mean estimate) *	30,503	30,435	30,303	29,821	29,117	27,889	26,430
(low estimate)	-	28,714	27,955	26,856	25,498	23,872	22,022
(high estimate)	-	32,156	32,651	32,785	32,736	31,905	30,838
Adult Special ²	2,842	2,893	2,996	3,050	3,050	3,050	
Graduate ³	7,600	7,732	7,761	7,918	7,951	7,984	
Professional ⁴	3,883	3,965	3,975	3,990	4,010	4,010	4,010
<u>Duluth</u>							
Undergraduate							
(mean estimate) *	6,124	6,114	6,122	6,074	5,985	5,761	5,518
(low estimate)	-	5,704	5,538	5,362	5,146	4,854	4,580
(high estimate)	-	6,524	6,706	6,786	6,824	6,668	6,456
Adult Special ⁵	327	300	336	340	345	350	
Graduate ⁶	240	274	290	295	295	295	
Professional ⁷	118	120	120	120	120	120	120
<u>Morris</u>							
Undergraduate	1,381	1,381	1,376	1,350	1,305	1,238	
Adult Special	52	52	52	50	50	50	
<u>Cookston</u>							
Undergraduate	865	855	859	825	799	799	
Adult Special	218	215	216	207	201	201	
<u>Waseca</u>							
Undergraduate	841	881	925	889	850	800	
Adult Special	209	219	230	221	211	200	
<u>Total</u>							
(mean estimate)	55,203	55,436	55,561	55,150	54,289	52,747	
(low estimate)	-	53,305	52,629	51,474	49,831	47,823	
(high estimate)	-	57,567	58,493	58,826	58,747	57,670	

¹Actual enrollments.

²Adult Specials in undergraduate programs. The "Graduate" and "Professional" categories include Adult Specials in these units.

³Graduate students registered in the Graduate School plus those registered in Master's program in Education, Agriculture, and Public Health.

⁴Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Law, and Veterinary Medicine.

⁵See footnote 2.

⁶Includes Master's students in Education.

⁷Medicine, 96 plus 24 Medical Fellow Specialists who are physically at Duluth but attributable to the Twin Cities Medical School.

*The high and low forecasts are based on statistical confidence intervals developed from the enrollment forecasting model.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 27, 1979

Attachment 1

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STATEMENT OF
INSTITUTION-WIDE PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS, GOALS, OBJECTIVES
AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 1981-1990 PERIOD

C. Peter Magrath

Background

This statement has three major purposes:

- (1) It presents in general terms my view of the University of Minnesota across the next decade. This statement is intended to stimulate response from the colleges so that it may be revised.
- (2) These personal views, although subject to revision, aim to provide background information for the colleges as they develop their own statements of mission, goals, objectives, and priorities.
- (3) This statement proposes a format for stating institutional planning assumptions, goals, objectives, and priorities. Critique of the format will be useful in writing future drafts.

Before a statement of institutional planning assumptions, goals, objectives, and priorities is adopted, it will be thoroughly reviewed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning (SCRAP), and other appropriate University Senate committees.

As noted in my covering letter, it should be emphasized that the purpose of this planning effort is related fundamentally to a conviction that we must seek to plan and use our resources wisely so that we can be even more effective as one of this nation's leading land-grant universities. Although we must constantly seek needed resources from state, federal, and other sources on the basis of our genuine needs, we have an equal obligation to show how we intend to use the resources we have and to use them as effectively and intelligently as possible. Planning, I should emphasize, is not some things. It is not a means to develop a rigid blueprint that cannot be changed; it is not a tool to manage an organization more effectively for the sake of management effectiveness; it is not a means to a

set of "marching orders" to which we must all subscribe and agree; and it is not a panacea that will solve the difficult fiscal and other choices that the University of Minnesota and other similarly situated universities are facing and are going to continue to face in the 1980's. Planning is, however, if intelligently and cooperatively developed within the University, potentially some very positive things. It is a means of demonstrating to the people of our state and nation that we are committed to functioning effectively as an educational enterprise because we care about education; it is a process that sets general guidelines and directions which can be constantly examined and modified as conditions and needs, both short and longer term, change; and it is a process for reasoned discussion and dialogue about our mission and objectives in the best traditions of the academy and the University of Minnesota. And finally, this personal statement ought to be viewed as nothing more or less than what it purports to be. It is a statement of ideas and suggestions regarding the University of Minnesota, which is to be examined, critiqued, and unquestionably revised and changed in many respects. It is offered here for your background and critique, not as a last word, but as a first word on some major issues and directions affecting our University.

I. Mission and Educational Philosophy

In July, 1975, the Board of Regents adopted "A Mission and Policy Statement for the University of Minnesota." Currently this document remains the official statement of the University's mission, although a committee of the Board of Regents is presently considering the need for revision. Until a revised statement is authorized, our planning should be consistent with the 1975 statement.

Our current mission statement expresses, in rather general terms, the functions expected of the University. In part, it provides for a commitment to national and international needs, as well as state needs to the extent that resources permit. Research is viewed as essential to good teaching and learning as well as an important service to society. Further, the University's commitment to its Land-Grant responsibilities is absolute. Appropriately, the mission statement says less about the extent of these functions or about the specific activities necessary to carry out a particular function. Still less is stated about the priority of various activities that the University should undertake, although the importance of some actions is indicated. For example, the University is committed to strengthening core programs of liberal education. Further, the University has a commitment to pure and applied research as a function uniquely appropriate to the University. I feel, however, that the University can develop even more specific goals, objectives, and priorities by considering our educational philosophy and our assumptions about the present environment.

Two tenets of educational philosophy, it seems to me, characterize a major university. First, it must emphasize above all else a commitment to academic inquiry. This implies both the centrality of a strong arts and science core and an emphasis on excellence in its graduate programs. When faced with the hard choice between a broader array of programs and a higher degree of excellence in a more limited set of offerings, the University community must remind itself that the hallmark of a major university is not the breadth but the strength of its program offerings. Related to an emphasis on excellence are two additional considerations: (1) program excellence is not always directly related to program funding, and (2) the cost of maintaining a high level of excellence is usually modest when compared with the cost of building excellence. Thus, where possible, the University should protect academic programs with an established high level of excellence.

II. Planning Assumptions

A variety of factors and circumstances will influence education and the University of Minnesota in the years ahead. Assumptions about our current condition as a university and the environment will be important in our planning. Because these conditions change continually, our assumptions must be reviewed frequently and on a regular basis. The current status of a number of these important conditions is described below.

Enrollments

Higher education enrollment is influenced by such items as the tuition costs, the availability of financial aid, and the labor market for collegiate graduates.

Using data from the post-war period, Management Planning and Information Services has estimated the influence that these factors have had on the undergraduate enrollments at the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses. From this work, enrollment forecasts have been developed for each campus. The particular assumptions which are used in the estimates and which are under the University's control are as follows:*

* There are a number of other variables not under University control which must be considered in forecasting undergraduate enrollment. The assumptions underlying these variables are available from Management Planning and Information Services.

1. Tuition will not increase in constant dollars.
2. Financial aid will increase 1% per year per high school graduate in constant dollars. This assumption may need to be modified subject to the exact form of Congressional action on the Middle Income Student Assistance Act.
3. Admissions standards will not change.
4. Internal increases in undergraduate tuitions will be proportional among programs and student levels. If necessary, this assumption can be modified to reflect the University's policy on relating individual tuition levels more closely to instructional costs.

Based on these assumptions, mean, high, and low forecasts for undergraduate enrollments at the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses are shown in the Table.

Because applications for the University's graduate and professional programs substantially exceed admissions, these enrollments are determined primarily by admissions policies. These forecasts are based on the admission plans of the Graduate School and the professional colleges. Forecast ranges are not shown for these estimates since the enrollments are not produced from a statistical model.*

These different estimates indicate that there is substantial uncertainty regarding our enrollments. We should realize that we cannot ignore this uncertainty but must accept it as a fact that our planning must encompass. We shall regularly update our enrollment forecasts to include the latest available information.

Income

The sources of support for the University can be discussed in terms of our three basic missions: instruction, research and service, as well as in terms of the resources derived from gifts and endowments.

Regarding instruction, while there have been substantial fluctuations in the University's student-faculty ratio in the past, there has been no substantial change in this ratio since

* Estimates from the model for undergraduate enrollments at Morris, Crookston or Waseca have not yet been produced. Estimates for these campuses and enrollment forecasting for the individual colleges on the Twin Cities campus are being developed.

Table: Enrollment Forecasts
Through 1983 as of February, 1979

	<u>1978¹</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
<u>Twin Cities Campus</u>						
Undergraduate (mean estimate)*	30,503	30,435	30,303	29,821	29,117	27,889
(low estimate)	-	28,714	27,955	26,856	25,498	23,872
(high estimate)	-	32,156	32,651	32,785	32,736	31,905
Adult Special ²	2,842	2,893	2,996	3,050	3,050	3,050
Graduate ³	7,600	7,732	7,761	7,918	7,951	7,984
Professional ⁴	3,883	3,965	3,975	3,990	4,010	4,010
<u>Duluth</u>						
Undergraduate (mean estimate)	6,124	6,114	6,122	6,074	5,985	5,761
(low estimate)	-	5,704	5,538	5,362	5,146	4,854
(high estimate)	-	6,524	6,706	6,786	6,824	6,668
Adult Special ⁵	327	300	336	340	345	350
Graduate ⁶	240	274	290	295	295	295
Professional ⁷	118	120	120	120	120	120
<u>Morris</u>						
Undergraduate	1,381	1,381	1,376	1,350	1,305	1,238
Adult Special	52	52	52	50	50	50
<u>Crookston</u>						
Undergraduate	865	855	859	825	799	799
Adult Special	218	215	216	207	201	201
<u>Waseca</u>						
Undergraduate	841	881	925	889	850	800
Adult Special	209	219	230	221	211	200
<u>Total</u>						
(mean estimate)	55,203	55,436	55,561	55,150	54,289	52,747
(low estimate)	-	53,305	52,629	51,474	49,831	47,823
(high estimate)	-	57,567	58,493	58,826	58,747	57,670

¹Actual enrollments.

²Adult Specials in undergraduate programs. The "Graduate" and "Professional" categories include Adult Specials in these units.

³Graduate students registered in the Graduate School plus those registered in Master's program in Education, Agriculture, and Public Health.

⁴Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Law, and Veterinary Medicine.

⁵See footnote 2.

⁶Includes Master's students in Education.

⁷Medicine.

*The high and low forecasts are based on statistical confidence intervals developed from the enrollment forecasting model.

the 1930's. State appropriations for instructional purposes have varied, though not rigidly, with enrollments. Tuition income is also a function of enrollments. If these trends were to continue, the size of our faculty would shrink with enrollment declines, and the real value of these income sources would decline during the 1980's. However, these trends have been established during a period of enormous University growth, and we feel that a case for departing from this tacit funding formula can be made for a period of enrollment decline. Governor Quie has recognized this point for primary and secondary education, and there is reason to expect that the argument will be applied to some extent in higher education.

Research income is mainly a function of the emphasis placed on research activity by the federal government. While our success in obtaining grants and contracts may change, it is unlikely that such changes would alter significantly the essential relationship to federal funding policy. In the past this policy has been erratic and unpredictable, and it is not easy to arrive at assumptions about its future. Recent trends, inflation assumptions, and a conservative taxing mood suggest that federal support for basic research at the nation's leading universities is unlikely to increase dramatically over present levels. Most likely, it will remain constant at present levels of support, although there may be incremental increases in federal support for applied research.

Service income, including revenues from new instructional clientele, may offer the best hope for offsetting real declines in other income sources. Although the potential for adult and mid-career educational programs should not be overestimated, such programs are certainly viable alternatives in a number of fields. We should tentatively assume that well constructed proposals addressed to applied research problems and service needs of specific non-traditional clientele will attract support. Implementation of the proposals in the "Outreach Report" would presumably increase our level of support from non-regular students through increased enrollments as well as increasing the possibility of state support for that type of instruction. The report is currently being reviewed by the University Senate committees. We must continue to consider all of the implications of the Outreach Report, and we should not prejudge this review. I should note, however, that I believe outreach activities are an important part of our mission, and I hope that many of the policies suggested in the report will be implemented. Thus, we should encourage proposals from a college that are aimed at implementing the Outreach recommendations.

The University has been very successful in attracting gifts and endowments. Last year we ranked fifth among all public and private universities in gifts at \$34 million. Our development office feels that the probability of increasing this support is

good, particularly with a strong planning effort, and proposals that are aimed at eliciting gift support should be encouraged.

On balance, it seems best to assume that the total real income available to the University will decline slightly throughout the next five or six years. However, individual units may be able to obtain real income increases because of differing clientele demand.

Inflation

Inflation has substantially reduced the University's purchasing power over the last ten years. In estimating future rates of inflation, we must deal with substantial uncertainty regarding the causal factors which produce price change -- factors which, of course, are beyond the University's control.

Because of this uncertainty, we cannot attempt to forecast specific price indices for long periods of time. However, the consensus among economists is that the next two years will not see substantial reductions in inflation below the eight percent increase in the Consumer Price Index in 1978. The University must be ready to respond to both expected high levels of inflation as well as uncertainty about the factors that influence inflation.

One evident strategy of state administrators is to not fully fund inflationary increases in supplies. Recent reductions of this type have put the University in a difficult position. Still we must anticipate the very real possibility of retrenchment necessitated by unwillingness of the state to fund real inflation increases.

Facilities

The University's current request to the Governor and the Legislature is based on the priorities established by extensive internal consultation. Still it is a political reality that while the University may influence legislative reaction to facility proposals, we do not control it. Our emphasis will continue to be on needed renovation of existing structures to support academic programs and on renovations required by law for safety or access. While it will be difficult to obtain funds for new construction in an era of declining enrollments, we must improve our ability to demonstrate the relationship between our requests for new buildings and our plans for academic programs.

Productivity

Our assumptions about income, enrollments, and inflation, combined with the likelihood that present demand for accountability will persist and increase, lead to the assumption that the productivity of the University's efforts will receive increasing scrutiny. While our outcomes can never be perfectly measured, we must assume that those activities which can combine effectiveness with demonstrable efficiency will be the best supported. Increased productivity is difficult in universities, but it is not impossible; we must assume that efforts in that direction will be demanded of us.

In support areas, we must keep abreast of the productivity increases achieved by comparable activities in the general community. In academic areas, we must carefully consider issues of class size, frequency of offerings, and alternative pedagogical methods. Our efforts at attempting to be more productive must be tempered by our relative inadequacy to measure educational outcomes and should clearly not infringe on the tenure code.

Staffing

In the next decade I do not anticipate any significant changes in the tenure code. Yet certain faculty personnel issues will require the University's attention. For example, faculty retirement and faculty retraining and transfers will need to be discussed. The mix of faculty and civil service staff should also be carefully studied.

Technological Change

As noted in the University Senate's 1971 report "Toward 1985 and Beyond," the next decade will witness a significant expansion in computer and communications technology. These changes will present new opportunities for serving the educational needs of the state. If technological changes continue to lead to increased leisure time, there may be new clientele demanding education. These changes will undoubtedly have a significant impact on the University.

III. Institutional Goals, Objectives, and Priorities

Eventually, the University should develop goals that chart specific institutional directions, objectives which indicate desired levels of achievement, and priorities which are a clear statement of the relative importance of particular goals and objectives. Although these institutional statements do not currently exist, our current planning efforts are intended to lead the University in this direction.

A Final Comment

Whether the assumptions I have outlined will prove accurate can be determined only by the events of the next several years. Similarly, it will take time for the University community to examine and evaluate the general and programmatic objectives that will be developed in the planning process. Because of our commitment to academic freedom and our appreciation of the values of dialogue and discussion, we should look forward to discussing these and other important matters related to the future of the University of Minnesota in the months ahead. Your reactions to these "first words" of mine will be extraordinarily helpful to me and to other members of the University community, as we embark seriously on the quest of improving our ability to function effectively as an open and exciting place for teaching, research, and educational service in the 1980's and beyond.

Attachment 2

GUIDELINES FOR CRITIQUE OF THE DRAFT
STATEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS, GOALS,
OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES FOR 1981-1990 PERIOD

These guidelines suggest a framework for writing a critique of the draft statement of institutional planning assumptions, goals, objectives, and priorities. The outline below is intended to facilitate, not constrain, your critique. If you wish to provide comments which fall outside these guidelines, please feel free to do so.

Your critique will be used to assist the President in a rewrite of his draft. Also, your suggestions will help guide the Planning Council as it continues to develop proposals for refining the institutional planning and decision making process, particularly as attention is devoted to the best procedure for arriving at a final draft of an institutional statement of goals, objectives, priorities and assumptions.

I. General Appraisal of Content

Please briefly summarize your reaction to the content of this document, citing both its strengths and weaknesses.

II. General Appraisal of Format

Please briefly assess the format of the statement, commenting on the organization of the document, its level of detail, and its scope.

III. Planning Assumptions

Identify any additions, deletions or modifications that should be made to the planning assumptions. Briefly (one paragraph) indicate your rationale for the suggested changes.

IV. Institutional Goals, Objectives, and Priorities

Identify any additions, deletions, or modifications that you feel are appropriate for the institutional goals, objectives, and priorities. Include specific programmatic areas that you think should be added and the rationale for your suggested change.

V. Institutional Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Problems

Please briefly describe specific strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and problems of the University that you feel may not be adequately addressed in the current statement.

April 27, 1979

Attachment 3

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF
COLLEGIATE STATEMENTS ON MISSION, PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

The President has endorsed an evolutionary process designed to move the University toward more systematic institutional planning. As one of the initial steps in this process, each college and major support unit is being asked to draft statements of mission, planning assumptions, goals, objectives, and priorities.

These draft statements will contribute to the evolution of the University's planning and decision making processes in a number of important ways:

1. For the first time the University will have a compendium which documents the mission, the programs, and the intended results of all colleges and support units. When produced with some degree of specificity and in similar formats, these statements will highlight the similarities, the differences, and interrelationships of the many units which comprise the University of Minnesota.
2. Carefully specified statements at both the institutional and unit* level will be used in support of academic program planning and resource allocation.
3. Working from the statements developed by units, the University will create a comprehensive statement of goals, objectives, and priorities for the institution.
4. Consistent with the institutional and collegiate statements of assumptions, goals, objectives and priorities, an aggregate level University resource plan will be developed.

The development of these statements is viewed as an important first step in an evolutionary process. The initial statements will be used to inform the central administration of your intentions, but they will clearly be understood as first drafts which may not be useful for decision making. A cyclical

* The term "unit" will be used throughout to refer to all colleges and major support units.

process is planned so that the statements can be modified and their usefulness improved. Ultimately, the unit statements as well as the University-wide statement of assumptions, goals, and objectives and the University resource plan will assume a fundamental role in institutional decision making, including resource acquisition and allocation.

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING STATEMENTS ON MISSION, ASSUMPTIONS, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

It is difficult to write a single prescription for describing the mission, goals, objectives, and priorities of all colleges. Each college is somewhat different, and undoubtedly these distinctive features will be reflected in the different types of statements produced by the units. A prescription is also difficult because the University has little experience in drawing up such statements at either the institution or the unit level. After the University has completed the first cycle of this process, it will be possible to propose guidelines with more specificity than those which follow. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the Planning Council offers these suggestions to the colleges.

- To develop these statements, your college should utilize any process which it deems appropriate. Because this is only a first draft, we are encouraging units to use existing mechanisms and committees, rather than create new ones. As this process goes through successive iterations, there will be an opportunity to establish permanent mechanisms for producing and updating these statements. Appropriate consultation with departments, faculty, students, and external constituents is essential.
- An effective planning statement will strike a delicate balance between specificity and flexibility. As stated in more detail below, goals should be stated as specifically as possible and cast in terms which will be useful as a guide for program planning. Yet this draft should also be flexible. It should not be so rigid that it precludes the college from responding to unforeseen opportunities which may arise. An effective balance between specificity and flexibility may be a difficult one to strike, though it remains a necessity.
- Unit statements should build, as much as possible, on the background materials provided by the President. As President Magrath has noted, an institutional statement of goals, objectives, priorities, and assumptions requires the cooperation of many constituencies and a consultative process for its creation. Therefore, the President's materials are only intended as suggested institutional parameters. Yet units should develop their statements within these broad constraints and provide rationale for those portions which are inconsistent with the background materials.

- No cost or resource requirement data is requested as part of the initial submission of the collegiate statements of mission, goals, objectives, and priorities. This does not indicate that an understanding of the relationship between collegiate objectives and resource requirements is unnecessary. It reflects a judgment that detailed costing, especially in this first phase of producing collegiate statements is inappropriate.

However, the President and the senior officers do anticipate making some very aggregate and necessarily approximate institutional resource plans as a consequence of the interchange with the collegiate units. Thus, collegiate units must be prepared during the course of the discussion of their mission, goals, objectives and priorities statements with the president and the senior officers, to provide the general resource implications of their statements. The need for refined resource requirements in later iterations of the statement development data process will be determined as the process progresses.

- Unit statements should not exceed twenty (20) typewritten pages. Please do not include extra materials.
- College statements should be organized into three sections: (I) the mission of the college, (II) the planning assumptions used by the college, and (III) the college's goals, objectives, and program priorities.

I. The Mission of the College

The "mission" outlines the purposes of the unit and its rationale for existence. Most likely it will be more philosophical than decision oriented. It should characterize the thrust of the unit and broadly define the nature of its activities. In this statement each unit should discuss the "ends" toward which the college is striving -- for example, the educational outcomes, the services provided and the areas of knowledge to be pursued. In comparison to goal statements, a mission statement would have a longer time horizon.

A college should be able to define its mission in a few paragraphs. Most colleges already have their mission outlined in the preamble to the college constitution. In developing a mission statement colleges are encouraged to review their constitutional statement and modify it if necessary.

II. Planning Assumptions Used by the Colleges

The second section of this draft should specify the assumptions on which the college is basing its mission, goals, objectives, and priorities. This section should build on the institutional assumptions which are enclosed (Attachment 1).

If the college agrees with an institutional assumption and believes that it applies to the college without alteration or further comment, it need not be restated. However, if an assumption applies to your particular college in a way which is different from its application to the institution, this should be noted. Also, please furnish your rationale for departing from an assumption. Any significant assumptions which are not stated in the institutional statement but will influence objectives or mission of the college should be discussed. The difficulty of developing precise assumptions, particularly quantitative projections is appreciated. Colleges should feel free to indicate candidly those areas where they know that a particular assumption is critical to an objective yet they have had difficulty arriving at a precise one.

- Enrollment. Each college is requested to provide an estimate of its enrollment over the next five years. High, low, and "mean" projections should be provided as they are in the President's statement. This information will be useful not only in the review of your statement but also to MPIS in its continuing work on collegiate enrollment projections.
- Income, Inflation, Facilities, Productivity, Staffing, and Technological Change. Each college should review these assumptions for their applicability to the specific college. Only those college assumptions which differ from the University assumptions need to be discussed.
- Changes in the Discipline(s). Please indicate any projected changes in the academic disciplines which underlie the college's goals and objectives.

III. Goals, Objectives, and Priorities

Goals are the college's vision of its future over the next few years (e.g., 4-6 years). Goals are the plans which the college is striving to accomplish. They add programmatic specificity to the mission statement by depicting the activities which the college will undertake to fulfill its mission. Goal statements may also cite those activities which will not be pursued or those which will be de-emphasized in the future. Specifically, it is suggested that college goals address at least the following areas.

1. What are the instructional goals of the college? These could be stated in terms of degree programs, level of instruction (e.g., undergraduate), or skills which graduates would possess.
2. What are the research goals? These could be stated in terms of types of research (e.g., basic), specific fields (e.g., population biology, applied linguistics), or organizational units (e.g., specific research centers).

3. What are the service goals? These could be stated in terms of clientele to be served or specific services to be provided.
4. What other activities/outcomes does the college support? Colleges may have goals which span the three types cited above. For example, a goal of the college may be "to improve the environment of Minnesota through a combination of instruction, research and service." Or, the college may provide certain support services to its students through selected student affairs offices (e.g., career counseling, academic advising).

In addition to these four "product" goals, there could also be a series of "support" goals which the college may elect to specify. Support goals contribute to the accomplishment of the product goals cited in #1-4 above, as in the following:

5. Does the college have any goals with regard to the type of environment it is seeking to maintain? For example, a college might consciously seek to establish and maintain a climate which promotes scholarly inquiry, protects academic freedom, or fosters instructional innovation. The college might also include statements on the type of governance which is preferred such as decentralized decision making. The college might also strive for a climate characterized by intellectual excitement or one which encourages student and faculty involvement in intellectual and cultural activities.
6. Does the college have goals which address efficiency and productivity? Can some current activities be done just as effectively at a lower cost? Can better performance be attained without cost increases?
7. What are the goals regarding the college's relationship to activities of other colleges or support units within the University? For example, does the college view itself as supporting the educational activities of other colleges or perhaps the college consciously depends on the instruction provided by another unit. These goals place the college in the context of the University community.
8. What are the goals regarding the college's relationship to external constituencies? Colleges may have goals which define their relationship to educational programs outside the University, funding agencies, or the professional and business community.
9. Does the college have other essential support goals? These would be important support goals not subsumed by the items noted above.

In toto an inventory of goals should define the boundaries of the college's activities. (Some examples of goals statements are attached at the end of these guidelines.)

Objectives translate the college's vision of its future (i.e., its goals) into a set of operational measures. Ideally, objectives are specific, measurable, and have a definite timetable. All objectives should relate to a goal and translate directly into decision making criteria. The focus of the objectives is determined by the areas cited in the goal statements. The following characteristics are proposed as a checklist for the development of objectives.

1. Objectives should state the accomplishments which the college hopes to attain within a defined time period. For the purposes of this initial draft, the overall time horizon should be set at the end of 1989. In other words, the objectives should lay out the accomplishments which the college seeks to attain by specific points in time through June, 1989. It is expected that a greater number of objectives will be included for the earlier years in this period. The college must ask itself what it can realistically accomplish in this period of time. For example, as a general goal the college may seek "to expand its research program through the attainment of grants from regional foundations." This could lead to an objective which states, "By June 1984, the college will show a 10% increase in its annual research budget."
2. Objectives should be as specific as possible. Continuing the example above, the college might specify the department or academic field in which it intends to seek these new grants.
3. Objectives should be stated in terms which are measurable. For the purposes of assessing progress it is often useful to state objectives which imply a comparison or measure. For example, a statement such as "expansion of the undergraduate population" does imply a measure using the current enrollment as a benchmark. However, "two hundred additional undergraduates" explicitly states a measure.
4. Objectives should emphasize the product rather than the process. For example, "seeking two grants" would be a process but "submitting proposals to at least five foundations" is a product.
5. Objectives should be stated for major units within the college. If a unit or department will be maintained at the same level of operation, this should be stated and may be done so briefly. If significant changes are planned for a unit, detailed objectives should be provided which outline the thrust of the envisioned changes.

The development of objectives is further illuminated in the examples attached at the end. After development of the collegiate objectives, it may be useful to review them by asking the question, "If our college accomplished these objectives (by the dates specified), would it be fulfilling its mission?" -- or at least making progress toward it. This will ensure that objectives relate to goals which in turn are built on the collegiate mission.

Priorities categorize the objectives and goals according to their degree of importance. The process of setting priorities anticipates the real world constraints of limited resources by indicating which objectives will take precedence.

All these goals and objectives will be important or they would not be incorporated into this document. Yet in requesting funds and allocating time, colleges will make choices either consciously or unconsciously. This section requests colleges to make these choices consciously, a priori. Certainly it is both impossible and unwise to rank numerically a set of objectives as broad as these. Therefore, the colleges are requested to assign one of three weights to each objective:

- (1) of utmost importance -- these objectives are assigned the highest priority by the college; they will take precedence over all other goals and objectives; (some objectives may be included here which are essential for maintaining the fundamental character of the college).
- (2) of high importance -- these objectives occupy a position of central importance in the priority scheme of the college; however, they rank perceptibly lower than the (1) items.
- (3) important -- these objectives will receive the attention of the college, but only after programs and activities are planned and funded which ensure the accomplishment of the objectives in (1) and (2).

To assist the colleges in developing their statements, sample statements of goals, objectives, and priorities are presented on the next three pages. Hopefully these examples will further illuminate the distinctions made above. To facilitate comparison among unit statements, this format should be followed as nearly as possible.

FINAL WORD

As stated at the outset, it is difficult to write a set of guidelines which are equally meaningful to all colleges. If further discussion is needed to clarify this request or if procedural suggestions on producing these statements would be useful, please feel free to contact Vice President Stein, Chairperson of the Planning Council. He can arrange meetings with members of the Planning Council who have deliberated these issues.

EXAMPLES OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

Goals and Objectives

Following are three examples of goal statements, related objectives, and priorities. The first example has been taken from the planning materials under development by the Health Sciences Planning Council. These examples are only in draft form and have not been approved by the Health Science units. Yet they are a good illustration of a goal and related objectives.

The other two examples are fictitious and are included to demonstrate the relationship between goals, objectives, and priorities. (Priorities were purposely omitted from the Health Science example because these units have not yet addressed this facet of planning.)

GOAL: ANTICIPATE, IDENTIFY AND RESPOND TO NEEDS OF A CHANGING SOCIETY THROUGH CURRICULAR EMPHASES

Objective A: Support the development and expansion of interdisciplinary team experiences through the establishment of Health Sciences requirements for core interdisciplinary offerings by 1983, and through the maintenance of "time windows" common throughout the Health Sciences.

Objective B: Within the coming year, review the University outreach report and develop recommendations for implementing those aspects relevant to the Health Sciences.

Objective C: During the next academic year, provide staffing for the College of Pharmacy to develop a model for identifying and validating professional competencies, and to devise mechanisms for dissemination of ideas and processes to other Health Science units.

Objective D: By the fall of 1981 the Health Sciences will make available to all its enrolled students appropriate courses in techniques of peer review and cost containment which will prepare them to function appropriately and effectively upon employment in the health services field.

GOAL: ASSIST STUDENTS IN THE SELECTION AND PURSUIT OF THEIR POSTGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Objective A: During the 1981-82 academic year, the college will assess the effectiveness of its career counseling and placement services by commissioning an external review of the Placement Office. The result of this review will be forwarded to the college's executive committee for action.

Priority: Important

Objective B: During the 1982-83 academic year, the college will create and approve a six-year detailed plan (including staffing and budgeting projections) for the Placement Office. It is assumed that this plan will build on the results and recommendations of the external review. Priority: Important

Objective C: Throughout the 1981-83 biennium, the college will offer counseling and job placement services at the same level and scope that it does currently. Funding for the Placement Office will be maintained at a constant level (in real dollars), regardless of budget expansion or contraction experienced by the college. Any expansion or contraction in

these services is being postponed, pending the external review and development of the six-year plan. Priority: Utmost Importance

GOAL: MAINTAIN AN EFFECTIVE BALANCE BETWEEN A CURRICULUM WHICH IS COMPREHENSIVE AND UP-TO-DATE AND ONE WHICH MAKES MAXIMUM USE OF THE LIMITED RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO THE COLLEGE

Objective A: Throughout the 1981-83 biennium the college will offer the same instructional program in departments A, B, and C. Specific courses will be updated but no major shift in curricular emphasis is anticipated. Priority: Utmost Importance

Objective B: During the 1981-82 academic year, a plan will be developed for consolidating the course offerings in department D. Consensus on this plan will be reached by the college's administrative executive committee. This plan will take effect during the 1982-83 academic year. Priority: Utmost Importance

Objective C: Department E will expand its offerings in the field of XYZ by initiating four additional graduate courses during the 1982-83 academic year. These courses will be developed during the 1981-82 academic year by providing release time for two full time equivalent graduate faculty.

Priority: High Importance

Attachment 4

PLANNING: STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

A Status Report

One of the Planning Council's responsibilities is to advise the President on the appropriateness of planning structures that exist in the University. A necessary first step in carrying out this responsibility is to catalog the planning structures and processes that are currently used by the colleges. At the outset there is a clear recognition that structures and processes do and should vary from unit to unit.

This brief questionnaire requests each college to summarize the characteristics of its existing planning process. It should be completed and returned along with the unit mission, goals, objectives and priorities statement.

For the purposes of this survey, planning is defined comprehensively to include physical, programmatic, and budgetary planning. If these are handled by different groups within your college, please indicate on the questionnaire or if necessary fill out separate surveys for each.

PLANNING: STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES
A Status Report

College/Campus: _____

1. Has any individual or group(s) been designated as responsible for "planning"? If so, please indicate the title of the individual or list the name of the group(s) and describe its composition (e.g., students, faculty, deans, civil service staff, alumni).

2. If a group, how often does it meet?

3. How are members of this group selected (e.g., elected appointed) and by whom?

4. Briefly describe the types of activities which are the responsibility of this individual/group.

5. Does the individual/group responsible for planning have advisory or decision making authority? Please explain. Please provide a statement of charge to the group if appropriate.

6. Does this individual or group have staff support? If so, how many FTE's and at what level?

7. Is the "planning group" directly involved in preparing the annual budget or biennial request? Please explain.

8. List other groups who consult with the planning individual/group on a regular basis.

9. List any reports or analytical studies which have been undertaken on behalf of planning in your unit (in the last two years).

10. Include other comments which would assist the Planning Council in understanding how planning occurs within the college.

11. Specify a person who could act as a liaison with the Planning Council if more information is desired.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone: _____

Attachment 5

COLLEGIATE UNITS PROVIDING PLANNING STATEMENTS

The following units will provide planning materials and discussion as suggested in the guidelines (Attachment 3).

1. College of Liberal Arts
2. Institute of Technology
3. College of Agriculture
4. College of Forestry
5. College of Home Economics
6. Medical School
7. School of Public Health
8. College of Pharmacy
9. School of Nursing
10. School of Dentistry
11. College of Biological Sciences
12. College of Veterinary Medicine
13. Law School
14. College of Education
15. College of Business Administration
16. University College/Center for Educational Development
17. General College
18. Graduate School
19. College of Letters and Science, Duluth
20. School of Fine Arts, Duluth
21. College of Education, Duluth
22. School of Business and Economics, Duluth
23. School of Social Development, Duluth
24. Medical School, Duluth
25. Agricultural Extension Service
26. Agricultural Experiment Stations
27. University of Minnesota, Morris
28. University of Minnesota, Crookston
29. University of Minnesota, Waseca
30. Continuing Education and Extension
31. Summer Session
32. Twin Cities Libraries
33. University Computer Services



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

November 21, 1979

Professor C. Arthur Williams
Chairman, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
868 Business Administration Tower
West Bank Campus

Dear Professor Williams:

When the Senate Consultative Committee asked that a subcommittee of SCFA discuss and make recommendations by March 1, 1980, concerning ways of dealing with sexual harrasment at the University, we hoped that we could get President Magrath's assurance that Senate action on grievance procedures in general could and would be sent on to the Regents. I am enclosing a copy of the President's letter to me (November 8) responding to my request for such assurance. As you can see, he is unable to make any definite promises at this time.

SCC remains reluctant to ask people to spend a great deal of time working out detailed recommendations when it appears less than probable that they can receive the necessary Regental attention. However, we feel equally strongly that sexual harrasment cannot be ignored. At the very least, we hope that your committee can recommend ways in which the University community can be sensitized to and educated about the moral and legal issues involved. Please let me know if my subcommittee or SCC as a whole can be of help to you and SCFA's subcommittee as this important matter is dealt with.

Very sincerely,

Marcia M. Eaton

Marcia M. Eaton, Chairman
SCC Subcommittee on Grievances
and Legal Concerns

MME/mbp

November 8, 1979

Ms. Marcia M. Eaton, Chairman
SOC Subcommittee on Grievances
and Legal Concerns
5-257 Millard Hall
435 Delaware Street, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Marcia:

You asked on behalf of the SOC Subcommittee on Grievances and Legal Concerns whether there has been any change in the strictures of Regental consideration of grievance policy issues, since that could be a consideration in discussions of grievance procedures by Senate Committees. The specific issues include the report by the Task Force on grievances, and the question of grievances related to sexual harassment. The best answer that I can give you is that we are working on it.

We have received the opinion of Counsel as to the procedures to be followed by the Regents in their consideration of revisions to the faculty tenure code and the Regents' Policy on Professional Consulting. Revision in the grievance procedures might be construed to be changes in the terms and conditions of employment and therefore subject to the same considerations as the policies that are the subject of the legal opinion.

We believe that we are developing appropriate procedures for Regental consideration of these policies, but since these matters are governed by legal authorities and have not been completely clarified, we simply cannot give you the complete assurance you would like that the Regents would be able to act on any recommendations the Senate brings forward. We are, as I indicated, working on the development of procedures to permit this result.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath
President

CFM:ec

*This is the version approved
by the Senate on 11/29/79*

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE'S
RECOMMENDATION ON ACADEMIC STAFF "E" POSITIONS

12
15
18
22
51
91

1. That the Senate approve the principle of "E" (Academic Staff) appointments for appropriate groups.
2. It is understood that individuals currently employed at the University of Minnesota on a basis other than "E" will not be changed to an "E" basis without their permission. Individuals on regular probationary academic appointments should be considered for tenure on the basis of performance expectations as of the time of their initial appointment. A person who chooses to retain faculty status shall not be discriminated against or subjected to sanctions as a result of this choice.
3. The question of whether categories of positions should be classified as "E" (Academic Staff) is one that shall require consultation and advice by the Faculty Senate in order to ~~insure~~ ^{secure} academic freedom ~~where it is appropriate.~~ The Faculty Senate shall also be consulted as to the provision of academic freedom for individuals in professional positions on "E" track. The Senate designates the Tenure Committee as its representative for this consultation, and recommends that the Tenure Committee consult with affected groups.
4. There must be procedures and protections for review, job security, promotion, salary increases, and appeals for individuals on an "E" appointment. Faculty and affected groups should be clearly involved in establishing and reviewing these procedures--because---~~they work in such close conjunction with persons on such appointments.~~ Until the procedures and protections are established, the Tenure Committee is further hereby charged with assisting with the establishment and review of proposed procedures and protections for individuals on "E" appointments.
5. Under the present constitution and bylaws of the Senate, individuals who are employed at the University of Minnesota on an "E" basis are not eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate. ~~Consideration of a change in this status is premature at the present time.~~ Although consideration of a change in this status is premature at this meeting, the matter shall be referred to the appropriate Senate committee to be considered and reported back to the Faculty Senate by the end of this academic year.

Sheldon Goldstein
Senator
Continuing Education & Extension

Nov. 21, 1979

ATTENTION, MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE :

1. The next meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly is Thursday, NOVEMBER 29, 1979, not November 15, as shown in the agenda that appeared in the Minnesota Daily last week. Time, 3:15 p.m.; place, 25 Law Building, West Bank.

2. Item VII on the Senate agenda for November 29 as it was printed in the Minnesota Daily last week was incorrect. The MOTION should read as follows:
 1. That the Senate approve the principle of "E" (Academic Staff) appointments for appropriate groups.
 2. It is understood that individuals currently employed at the University of Minnesota on a basis other than "E" will not be changed to an "E" basis without their permission. Individuals on regular probationary academic appointments should be considered for tenure on the basis of performance expectations as of the time of their initial appointment. A person who chooses to retain faculty status shall not be discriminated against or subjected to sanctions as a result of this choice.
 3. The question of whether categories of positions should be classified as "E" (Academic Staff) is one that shall require consultation and advice by the Faculty Senate in order to insure academic freedom where it is appropriate. The Senate designates the Tenure Committee as its representative for this consultation.
 4. There must be procedures and protections for review, job security, promotion, salary increases, and appeals for individuals on an "E" appointment. Faculty should be clearly involved in establishing and reviewing these procedures because they work in such close conjunction with persons on such appointments. Until the procedures and protections are established, the Tenure Committee is further hereby charged with assisting with the establishment and review of proposed procedures and protections for individuals on "E" appointments.
 5. Under the present constitution and bylaws of the Senate, individuals who are employed at the University of Minnesota on an "E" basis are not eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate. Consideration of a change in this status is premature at the present time.

There is no COMMENT. The balance is correct as printed.

Marilee Ward, Clerk

