



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

March 5, 1982

To: Duane Wilson
From: Meredith Poppele *MBP*
Re: March 11 Regents/FCC meeting

The Faculty Consultative Committee believes there will be time to discuss only budget-related matters at the March 11 meeting.

(Since the Tenure Code revision will not be completed this spring, there will be a timely opportunity at the spring quarter meeting for the two groups to discuss problems in the 1973 document and the Regents' views on what they could and could not approve in a new revision.)

Here are the presentations the faculty would like to offer the March 11 meeting:

- A. Program reductions, reorganizations, and eliminations.
 1. Patricia Swan - The Finance Committee perspective: the overall process of establishing the program priorities; identification of the problem points; recommendations on how the process can be improved next time.
 2. Douglas Pratt - The Consultative Committee perspective: what the SCC has done to nurture consultation; how processes here compare with those of similar institutions--including FCC's sense that perhaps this University hasn't taken certain steps that other universities have.
 3. John Howe: describing specific policies and procedures of other universities, such as Washington and Michigan State.
 4. Other members, as time permits: reporting on how consultation worked or failed to work within their own academic units.
- B. Faculty salaries--the concern over the limited amount available for a 1982-83 increase.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE / REGENTS MEETING
March 11, 1982

MINUTES

Consultative Committee Chairman Douglas Pratt convened the FCC's winter quarter meeting with the Regents at approximately 7:00 p.m. in the main dining room of the Campus Club on Thursday, March 11.

1. The Planning Process for Establishing Program Priorities.

Patricia Swan, Chairwoman of the Senate Finance Committee, outlined the steps which led to program priorities. By the middle of 1979 each college had, with faculty participation, produced a document describing its long-range plans. Central administration requested revisions and in December, 1979, each college produced a second version in which the goals were more refined.

As the state and consequently the University financial picture worsened, central administration requested the collegiate units to order their priorities, which the colleges did in mid-1981, still without stating overtly what they could do without. In the fall of 1981, central administration ordered the colleges to identify what they could give up with the least amount of damage.

Professor Swan said she believes most faculty members have wanted to use the planning documents as much as possible, particularly after having seen what across-the-board cutting, exemplified in last summer's 2.16% retrenchment, meant. However, no public consensus had been built on what the faculty were actually willing to give up. The state shortfall left the University with little time to identify targets for cutting.

The vice presidents tried to help the deans speed up the process. Vice President Keller in his conferences pressed each dean to identify low priorities. Some deans shared those developments with their departments, and some did not, and it was mid-January before some units had public discussions on what would be eliminated because of funding cuts. A public outcry ensued. Attention now focuses on precisely how to save the money.

The Finance Committee is interested in the match-up between where savings are achieved and the budget plan. They hope that matching will get steadily closer each year. Plans and savings won't entirely match in 1981-83, for money is being saved wherever it can be saved, including some high priority programs. The Finance Committee also favors decisions being worked out in the colleges.

Professor Pratt said that the Senate Consultative Committee generally is pleased with the way the central administration has gone through these uncharted waters. Vice President Keller has met with many individuals and

units who feel disadvantaged in the prioritizing process. The SCC hopes most difficulties will be resolved at the department and college level. They want to know that everyone has a fair opportunity to be heard, and have several times asked the President and Academic Vice President to stress to deans, directors and department heads the need to consult at the collegiate level.

The Consultative Committee surveyed collegiate level consulting via senators. There have been indications that they survey has prompted increased consulting in some units. The Consultative Committee believes it lacks the data base and the authority to serve as an appeals body. The FCC recommends that the Budget Executive constitute the ultimate appeal body because the vice presidents who comprise it are accessible and informed, and will provide a formal setting and a more rational appeals process than could the FCC.

John Howe described what the FCC has learned from other universities. Howe and Swan were among a University of Minnesota group who visited the University of Washington a few months ago. That institution had declared a financial emergency but because of a reprieve from the state were in the process, after six weeks, of cancelling the state of emergency.

Washington had no planning process in place, and its experience brought home to Professor Howe that we must work very hard here to connect our less severe required cuts with our planning process; if we do not do that, he said, we are at sea.

Observations at the January 30 Midwest Faculty Governance Conference confirmed that Minnesota is far in advance of many institutions in our planning process and our sense of priorities. He stressed the importance of maintaining that process and prioritizing.

Donald Spring, speaking from the perspective of the Morris campus, said a great deal can be accomplished with very short deadlines when a consulting mechanism exists. In the Morris budget, the 85% of the retrenchment which was to come from support services caused no problems. The plan had been considered and approved last year--assessments were targeted, plans were circulated with people given two weeks to respond; the plan was passed. There were, however, difficulties in determining the 15% which dealt with academic programs.

Since Morris believes it has reached its basic mass, any academic cut presents a serious problem. The administration recommended a plan to cut one faculty member for anticipated enrollment-related reasons, and to give up one faculty position by attrition. The faculty responded that that was not a plan for retrenchment but was simply allowing it to happen. The faculty believe there has been no consultation by which to determine high and low priorities. Professor Spring thinks that prioritizing will occur in the next few months.

Discussion.

Regent Schertler reported from a recent nationwide publication on higher education that the University of Minnesota has been determined to have suffered the greatest severity of budget cuts of all public universities. She stressed that we must continue to tell the state there should be no further cuts to the University.

Professor Pratt commented that the image of the University of Minnesota projected by such an article stimulates other institutions to try to pirate our top faculty.

Professor Purple said it scared him that the Vice President for Academic Affairs believes program planning has been taken as far as it can. Vice President Keller confirmed that to be true, short of declaring financial emergency. Given the present tenure rules, and without exigency, it is not possible within a couple of years to deepen programmatic cuts.

Professor Pratt referred to the voluntary early retirement and phased retirement options which Michigan State has offered and which have been well received in the current academic year. Minnesota has not yet been able to develop such offers. Doing so aids in reducing the areas identified to be reduced. It is essential to establish a serious program of that sort which will be attractive to faculty members, he said.

Regent McGuiggan asked the FCC to continue to get out the word that the consultative system is operating at the college level. The Regents, he said, do not want affected persons to panic and force the Regents to make political decisions.

Regent Lebedoff said it is extremely helpful for the Regents to learn about the internal process. Regents have been bombarded by calls and letters from persons in units most heavily cut. Those persons assert there is no consultative process and that the decisions are coming from Morrill Hall. He said he was glad to hear a thoughtful, deliberative process is working and repeated that it is terribly important that the rest of the faculty know it too.

Regent Lebedoff predicted that the fiscal crisis in the state is certain to worsen and will not improve for at least two years. Our long range problem, he said, is to get the state government to acknowledge that the University of Minnesota is a top priority. He believes the state is not setting priorities and that the legislature is not well politically constituted to do so.

Minnesota, he observed, has an institution of higher education within 35 miles of every household in the state--a system built up during the growth years. Closing any one institution would bankrupt one community. All legislators except those from the Twin Cities put their own constituents first. The state needs a dispassionate committee to make the eventual choice of closing institutions.

Professor Fredricks reminded the group that some malcontents are to be expected in an institution of this size. There are people insisting publicly, as in speeches to the CLA Assembly, that they were not informed of the planning process. Moreover, there are many individuals even in units with extensive consultation who are suspicious of administrators per se.

Professor Howe cited as a sign of the legitimacy of participation by those affected that the resolution which passed the CLA Assembly regarding establishment of a task force to review the Library School's case was endorsed by the director of the Library School.

The Finance Committee and the Consultative Committee, Howe said, have talked extensively with the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs about the consulting mechanisms and have challenged why they did things in certain ways. The committees, he stated, are trying to oversee the consultative process at all its stages.

Professor Eaton said that while consultation has improved, problems remain which must be considered, particularly the choice of data for evaluation. What if philosophers were to be judged by the amount of grant money they bring into the University, she inquired? She is somewhat skeptical about criteria being applied even-handedly, and fears that some programs are being assessed by inappropriate criteria.

Regent Schertler asked how internal communication will be accomplished if the Faculty Consultative Committee does not become a part of the process.

Professor Pratt said the consultative process is working better in the colleges. Persons or groups who don't think they will get a fair hearing from Vice President Keller can be heard by the entire Budget Executive, possibly with faculty members as observers. He insisted the FCC, not knowing the budget data nor the comparative data, is simply unable to assess appeals informedly and fairly.

Regent Schertler said the Regents are still flooded with protest correspondence, especially from units such as the Library School which see themselves as interdisciplinary. Is there any mechanism to consider those cases?

Professor Howe said that while most decisions are appropriately made within the collegiate units where the data have been gathered, the FCC has discussed with Vice President Keller assuring an all-University arena to review the broader units. He reiterated that the FCC can serve best as a control to be sure that some review is done, rather than to conduct it. The Consultative Committee is glad to receive, note, and forward appeals letters to the appropriate body, Professor Fredricks added. Professor Pratt as SCC Chair has also heard from individuals in targeted units; the SCC has subsequently received credit for helping some of those persons understand the process and for helping the process work better.

Vice President Keller explained that the administration has given each collegiate unit a budget target; the sum of those targets is \$2.5 million. The units can get approximately \$1.2 million or \$1.3 million from their budget priorities. Units will have to detail for the Budget Executive the budgetary ways they will meet the targets. Vice President Keller will discuss the targets with the Finance Committee within the next week.

2. Faculty Salary Increase.

Professor Pratt read the Consultative Committee's February 4 resolution against greater tuition increases than the Regents were contemplating in February (10% base increase starting in the fall of 1982, plus a 15% surcharge to begin in summer session) for the purpose of improving faculty salaries. The resolution also reaffirmed the primacy of salary improvement and urged consideration of other ways to achieve it. Professor Pratt said the SCC's

position has generated considerable faculty dissent. He added that many people dislike the focus which opposes faculty salaries and tuition. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has proposed joint sponsorship with the SCC of a forum on faculty salaries. Vice President Keller has recommended publicizing sufficient budget information in advance so faculty will know what the choices are.

It is a fact, said Professor Pratt, that higher education has suffered markedly over the past ten years with respect to the rest of public employees. In the wake of the defeat of collective bargaining for the Twin Cities faculty it would be asking for trouble, he said, if organized employees were to fare much better than the University faculty.

Professor Eaton stressed that the faculty do not have the type of information they like to have to make a rational decision. She termed holds in faculty salary increases across-the-board effects, and hence contrary to the planning and prioritizing concepts.

Professor Pratt described Professor Robert Holt's proposal for the University to adopt an official policy on faculty salary improvement, such as a goal of achieving again the purchasing power equivalent of the 1972 salaries, and to work steadily toward that goal instead of using the ad hoc approach biennially of trying for all it can get. Professor Purple recommended a dialogue between the Regents and the Faculty Senate in the development of such a policy. It would be consistent for faculty salaries to be planned just as other University development is planned, he argued.

Regent Krenik cautioned that until the state's financial situation improves, any faculty salary improvement will have to be internally generated.

Professor Pratt announced he would propose the forum on faculty salaries to the Consultative Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Secretary,
Recorder