



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

DRAFT  
MINUTES  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
AND  
FCC CONVERSATION WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH, VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

300 Morrill Hall  
April 14, 1983  
10:30 - 12:35

Members present: P. Freier, J. Howe, P. Quie, W. D. Spring, W. B. Sundquist, J. Turner, D. Pratt.

Guests: Peter Robinson, Ann Bailly, Maureen Smith, and Dick Ericson and Rick Bale of the Daily. Later, President Magrath, Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow.

1. Faculty legislative liaison. Peter Robinson.

A. Progress on University appropriation within the House. House has accepted concepts of average cost funding basis, 5% across-the-board increase in the budget, and 5% across-the-board increase in specials. House has taken no action yet on the governor's high tech initiatives. Those various initiatives total roughly \$20 million. House is scheduled to start on April 15 picking and choosing among them.

Governor Perpich agreed to build into the base of the state university system the bargained salary increases for which the system last year had to borrow to pay. That annualization will cost \$4 million.

B. Coffee parties arranged between legislators and the faculty residents of their districts. Scant faculty attendance has been a mighty embarrassment of late.

C. Position of faculty legislative liaison. Robinson asked FCC to consider phasing out the position and encouraging faculty to join the U. of M. Faculty Association. Legislators are accustomed to dealing with political action groups, of which UMFA is one. Overlap of University faculty delegations to the legislature is confusing and results in diminution of effectiveness. Legislators are confused as to who is the faculty voice and who has clout. In addition to UMFA, the AAUP and the UMEA also send lobbyists. The faculty legislative liaison has only his voice, no power at all. UMFA or any successor to it can behave like a typical political lobbying group. Boosting it and eliminating the faculty legislative liaison would mean, however, that faculty members would be perceived in the legislature in a way some faculty members do not like.

There would be no point in making the change within this session. Robinson will come back to discuss the question at greater length with the FCC later this spring.

2. Balloting for Twin Cities campus faculty members of Senate Consultative Committee. Ann Bailly.

According to the Senate constitution, all regular faculty (those on indefinite tenure and those on probationary terms) are eligible to vote in Senate elections. (Faculty in Agricultural Extension are eligible to vote in Twin Cities Senate elections, whatever their address is in the state.) However, the master mailing list contains no key for tenure.

In the Twin Cities election, 603 faculty and academic staff members received ballots who should not have, and 238 eligible voters did not receive ballots. Total number of eligible voters is 2553. From Marilee Ward FCC learned that the number of ballots returned was 1118 (or about 45% of the approximately 2800 sent) and that 41 votes separated the third and fourth place candidates.

Pratt moved, Howe seconded, that the FCC invalidate the election.

Turner warned that a careful letter should accompany the second ballot. The faculty, perceiving that faculty governance can't even run an election, will think less than ever of it. He recommended the letter inform faculty that the error was administrative and clerical in nature, and not the fault of the Senate. Poppele reported Swan's recommendation that the letter have a wholly positive thrust, explaining that the second election is to safeguard the rights of the faculty.

Howe and Spring urged that Swan, as FCC chair, contact each candidate personally; the candidates may well be uncomfortable about the situation, and word has leaked on the results of the first ballot.

The FCC voted without dissent to invalidate the election and give directions for holding a new election.

Bailly said the question now is how can Mailing Services enter the absolutely right eligibility list off the ISI software package.

FCC members wanted to know precisely what individual would have responsibility for correcting the list. Freier volunteered for the job of making sure someone does the next ballot right. She will check with Swan.

3. Election of a vice chair for the Senate and Twin Cities Assembly. (The reporters remained and agreed to print none of this personnel discussion.) Freier moved that since FCC was discussing personnel it close the meeting temporarily. The motion failed for lack of a second.

FCC members advanced the names of three available and eligible people in whom they had the highest confidence for filling this position which includes membership on the Consultative Committee: John Turner, Shirley Clark, Marcia Eaton. Spring asked FCC members to stay available later in the day to settle on who FCC would like to approach about the position.

4. Appointments to ACIA and All University Honors. FCC will try to work on this task later in the day as well.

(The FCC at 11:15 adjourned its business for its conversation with Vice President Keller and President Magrath. FCC reconvened for five minutes at 2:30 p.m.)

At 2:30 the FCC agreed to send the three above names together to Pat Swan (Turner, Clark, Eaton).

FCC named John Turner, Paul Quie, and Virginia Fredricks to consult with Swan to settle on the appointments for ACIA and the nominations for All University Honors (President makes the appointment to Honors).

CONVERSATION WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH AND VICE PRESIDENT KELLER.

P. Swan's April 8 letter to President Magrath put the questions which constituted the agenda for the conversation.

1. Intended reallocation of funds retrenched from the colleges in 1983-85. Are support units included in R&R? If so, in which direction is net reallocation? What sorts of budgeted deficits exist and how much are in each category which must be covered? How does one create flexible funds at each level and how does one decide how much flexible funding should be held centrally, how much in colleges?

Vice President Keller said he has discussed reallocation with the Finance Committee only in the most general terms; he is prepared to discuss it further with SFC today, although the information is not yet all in.

People want to know what central administration will do with the \$4 million described as "University reallocation needs."

Retrenchment: Health Science units have been directed to make a specific percentage cut; all other units have been given a range. Up to three percent will be returned to each planning unit which submits a really good programmatic plan.

Keller reported University needs (in millions) as follows:

Reallocation needs (\$3.0 in 83-84)	\$4.0
Base reduction by legislature (Dec. '82)	\$3.0
Carry-forward '82-'83 deficit	<u>\$2.5</u>
Sub-total	\$9.5 (\$8.5) needed next year,

even if there is no shortfall from legislative action or tuition income. But the University's model does project a shortfall of \$7.0 in 1983-84 and \$7.5 in 1984-85, primarily in state appropriations and tuition.

If the legislature funds some items the University has expected to have to fund itself, the University will have to reallocate less; similarly, if the University recovers money in its suit against its insurer for legal fees, its reallocation need will decrease. At best, said Keller, our minimum need will be about half of what we have requested from the units for next year.

Pratt called Vice President Keller's April 5 letter to the faculty (on how the retrenchment is being carried out) timely and very well done. He asked if there is to be reallocation between units. Keller replied that there is. Administration already knows there will be reallocation to IT and the School of Management.

Keller distributed four documents: (a) "Schedule I: Known Recurring Needs: Candidates for Re-allocation (1983-84)", (b) "Schedule II: Recurring Commitments Currently Funded (or Planned) non-Recurring", (c) "General Operations and Maintenance Fund Budget Update (as of March 1, 1983)" and (d) "General Operations and Maintenance Fund--Current Planning to Balance Budget."

Shifts between academic units and support units. Keller said there will be no direct transfers. The budget executive is looking at individual activities rather than organizational structures; it has not yet aggregated all the activities. B.E. has no pre-inclination for a net shift among any units. While many support unit needs are central needs, many of those have impact upon the academic units.

From the list of "Known Recurring Needs."

No. 2. U of M Foundation (\$1,160,000). Sundquist told Keller that several faculty members have said they agree in principle with moving some support to the Foundation, but question whether the real source of the effort and work is not out in the units themselves. Keller told FCC that the Foundation states the \$1,160,000 (between 1/3 and 1/2 of their operating budget) is what they need from the U to run a \$50 million foundation. Their operating expenses are 6-7¢ on the dollar. Many University units look to the Foundation for help in starting up their own fund raising efforts. The \$1,160,000 is to replace the tax applied this past year to all collegiate units at the time the decision was made to fund the Foundation centrally. It is mostly a "people budget." Keller and Magrath said they could provide more information on the Foundation.

No. 4. Recurring Allotments (enumerated on Schedule II) (\$690,239). Neither these items nor the income streams feeding them have been budgeted in the past. Vice President Bohlen has urged rationalization of the expenses so that people can decide whether or not they want to pay for these items.

No. 5, Re-allocation, IT (\$250,000). The penultimate increase. Increases will become part of the enlarged base.

No. 6, Re-allocation, Accounting Operations (\$135,000). This is to provide on-line posting of expenditures and will give departments up-to-date information. Should save them money since most departments will no longer need full-time accounts specialists to post entries. Actual realized savings will be up to each department. Pratt applauded the project but asked for efforts to educate departments to make the best use of the system as soon as it is available. Keller agreed departments will need advice, such as on what equipment they should acquire.

No. 7, Re-allocation, student registration (recurring) (\$300,000). Putting computerized registration in place was costly. System is working well but keeping it going costs more than anticipated. Computer supplier did not provide the single unit it promised in advance; instead the University got 3 units. There is no legal opinion yet that the University has a case for recompense.

No. 8, Re-allocation, Patent Office (\$125,000). Administration predicts the project will be self-sustaining after three years. President Magrath called the support "seed money."

No. 9, Commitment, School of Management (\$150,000 - 300,000) is the total remaining from the 1978 commitment to bring the school to accredited status.

No. 10, Academic Personnel Office (no discussion).

Possibly also: \$250,000 - 300,000 to provide approximately one month FTE for faculty on 'B' appointments providing departmental advising during the summer.

V. P. Keller told FCC he would spend more time on both schedules with the Finance Committee later in the day.

Budgeted deficits? V. P. Keller said no budgets are in deficit. The sources of the deficits are largely legal expenses and a significant shortfall in tuition income. The net non-recurring deficit anticipated is \$6,364,283. However, that includes the cost of the reduced state contribution to the faculty retirement plan, which the University will reduce by an equal amount in 1983-84. Allowing for that make-up, the net deficit anticipated is under one percent of the annual budget.

Freier asked where the \$750,000 library back pay award will be budgeted, and the vice president said that will be added to the bill. He called that settlement equitable and said we have to deal with a situation not of our making.

2. The place of the arts and sciences in the University's mission and in its current activities, the way this place is reflected in the biennial request and current program planning and budgeting for 1983-85, and in our seeking of resources other than state funds, and in the history of how we have budgeted our resources. John Howe elaborated on the question, as follows in A, B, and C.

A. We do not inform on the kind of planning we are doing beyond collegiate lines. The decision-making criteria for program planning are Quality, Connectedness, Integration, Uniqueness, Demand, and Cost-effectiveness. They are, possibly with the exception of "connectedness," value-neutral respecting the nature of a university. What kinds of activities lie at the center of a university's mission and its activities?

B. The arts and sciences are being replaced from their once central position in the University. One no longer hears in public quarters the traditional language about the centrality of the arts and sciences. The pamphlet on the biennial request and other evidence indicate the arts and sciences have lost their priority. Items targeted in budget directives don't mostly point to strengthening arts and sciences. The outcome is unclear at this point how closely current planning and budget targets will match. We don't yet know what reallocation will actually be part of carrying out Second Cycle Planning.

C. Salaries. Recent tables show a nearly \$10,000 difference in U.S. universities between beginning salaries in the letters and those in the professions. Howe said we need to think and talk together about what the gaps mean, what they say about relative worth within the University, and how big a gap is tolerable. The concern is more than a matter of narrow self-interest.

(In this discussion, the arts and sciences were not being identified administratively, but wherever they reside, especially in CLA, CBS, and IT).

President Magrath responded. He agreed there is a general malaise in the country concerning the arts and sciences; market data reflect it, and the problem is an old one. A second national pattern which compounds the problem is the look for the quick fix and for Universities to do immediately applicable work.

However, many of the University's official documents contain the appropriate language. Yet in the various contexts in which he as president comments on the value of the arts and sciences, the message does not attract news attention. The University participates together with the liberal arts colleges in the state

in a modest Project to Improve Public Understanding of Liberal Learning (IMPULL). Magrath recently spoke out firmly that UMD should not become a high tech, applied science center at the expense of their arts and general education.

He called the biennial request "sparse," said it is for the whole University, and noted the salaries request. The BBR also contains a proposal for a humanities institute.

Among capital requests the University has taken a very strong position regarding the primacy of the music building. The University needs a very strong chemistry department and Smith Hall renovation ranks in the "critical" list.

Vice President Bohlen and the other vice presidents are giving serious thought on how to energize to attract private support for the general purposes of the University, the arts and sciences broadly defined.\* He called the arts and sciences the base upon which all else depends. Seeking private support for the general purposes will have important ancillary effects in the state and the legislature. It is ironical, he said, that it is easier to attract private funds for the same programs for which federal funds are more readily available.

Sundquist remarked that it would be important in our current retrenchment and reallocation exercise for someone to keep a book on what we are doing to the arts and sciences. For example, within the College of Agriculture, one decision seems to be to eliminate the literature portion of the Rhetoric Department and to keep the technical writing portion. Retrenchment is likely to go hard on the decentralized arts and sciences programs precisely because each one is not central to its administrative home.

President Magrath said a very balanced master plan could be done "from the top down," but since we plan from the bottom up, it is incumbent on all of us involved (particularly the budget executive, SCC and SFC) to keep the large questions in mind. He wants us to use the reference points for the arts and sciences which are in the documents. In our committees we have discussed specifics more than generalities and have not reflected on the broad implications.

Pratt asked if this University is exacerbating the acknowledged national trend. The comparisons of graduate programs show remarkable erosion in this university's arts and sciences, which means we are doing comparatively less well in supporting those disciplines than are others. He said we must make sure that what we do now doesn't further the decline.

President Magrath emphasized that a good part of the erosion occurred well before fiscal problems hit the University, and that different departments within a college have moved differentially. The problems are not necessarily fiscally related.

Pratt said that while fiscal difficulties were not the cause for the erosions, we should be aware of how current budget decisions can affect the possibility of strengthening.

Turner recalled that President Magrath had discerned weakness in CLA when he first came to Morrill Hall. Now, said Turner, we are beginning to see the dimensions of the problem. We always have to be working away on the public perception of the centrality of the arts. Among the things we can do, he recommended:

---

\* See support materials included in this section: "A New Dimension for Private Fund Raising for the University of Minnesota" (4/4/83, Pres. Magrath to Deans et al.)

- Move the curriculum back to the hub of the University instead of leaving it on the spokes and permitting a student to do all his work at the periphery. We've become a "pluraversity" instead of a "university."
- As we reallocate to IT, move some of those funds to the basic sciences where the slippage has occurred.
- Administrators can be expected to adhere to an all-University plan.
- There can be judicious reallocation within the colleges. Some departments can be brought up to speed more easily than can others (depending upon the retirement profile, in particular). Strengthening can be done selectively within units. When slippage has occurred, the situation should be monitored. (It is possible some of the slippage resulted from reallocations made under previous presidents.)
- Planning and budgeting by objectives is good. Now we must evaluate to see if the units have achieved their objectives. Where they have not, we should cut off the extra help or change administrators.

President Magrath said we should make sure that a function does not get lost from the University as units trim through decentralized decision-making.

Professor Spring expressed the view that the morale problem is caused more by the waning of the centrality of the arts and sciences than by shortage of money.

The President said he and V. P. Keller are eager to have the FCC's advice and judgment on this question.

The conversation concluded at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith B. Poppele*

Meredith B. Poppele,  
SCC Executive Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

April 8, 1983

President C. Peter Magrath  
202 Morrill Hall  
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Peter:

I write to suggest some topics for your conversation with the Faculty Consultative Committee at the regularly scheduled meeting on the morning of Thursday, April 14th. We have reserved an hour of your time, and ours, 11:15-12:15, for this conversation.

1. We wish to ~~hear~~ hear from you a statement as to your view of the place of the arts and sciences in the University's mission and its current activities. Further, it would be good to comment on the ways in which this place is reflected in our biennial request, in our current program planning and budgeting for 1983-85, in our seeking of resources other than state funds, and in the history of how we have budgeted our resources.

2. We wish to have some discussion about the intended reallocation of the funds retrenched from the colleges in 1983-85. (We assume that Vice President Keller has already sought advice on this subject from the Finance Committee. We simply want to hear current thinking, but, of course, we will freely offer advice if given any chance at all.)

First, will support units be included in the retrenchment and reallocation? If so, will there be net reallocation of funds from the colleges to the support units, or vice versa? What sorts of budgeted deficits exist that must be covered? How much in each category? We have said that part of the retrenchment is to create flexible funds (contingency funds). In what ways, generally, does one create flexible funds centrally, in colleges, and in departments? How does one decide how much flexible funding should be held centrally and how much in colleges?

I regret that I will not be able to join you in this conversation because I feel in need of some answers to some of these questions. However, as I am an elected officer of my professional society (The American Institute of Nutrition) and because three of my students are presenting some of our research,

C. Peter Magrath  
April 14, 1983  
page two

I will be attending society meetings in Chicago next week. I shall have to rely on my colleagues to "fill me in" when I return next Friday.

As always, we would be happy to discuss topics you wish to place on our agenda.

Sincerely yours,

  
Patricia B. Swan, Chairman,  
Senate Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp

cc: Faculty Consultative Committee  
Carol Pazandak



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

April 8, 1983

Report of the Chair to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

I am sorry I won't be with you on April 14th, but I will be attending the annual meeting of my professional society. However, Don will manage you very well, I am sure. Don, don't let them get too unruly.

My questions to the President reflect conversations with about half of you. The press of time precluded individual conversations with the entire committee. I have the sense that the President and his vice presidents should be pressed very hard on budgeting and planning issues. Some of that conversation needs to get wide coverage.

The election of Rubenstein, Stuthman, and Merwin was flawed in that the ballots went to some people who should not have received them and didn't go to others who should have received them. Meredith will provide some background information on this. You must decide whether or not the election was valid in your view.

The election of a vice chairman of the Senate is an important task for the health of this committee next year. The person elected must be a member of the Senate this quarter. Meredith has attached a list of Senate members. Please think and choose carefully. Be sure the individual selected is wise, experienced, articulate, has the courage of her/his convictions, and walks on water! We can't be satisfied with less.

We will handle our proposed change in meeting regulations by telephone and by mail. You received earlier a suggestion from Don Spring and John Howe in this regard. We will not discuss the issue at our April 14th meetings.

I hope your meeting is productive and stimulating. I shall think of you, in between metabolism of various nutrients, and will look forward to Meredith's report on Friday.

Pat Swan.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

April 11, 1983

Professor Patricia B. Swan  
Chairperson  
Senate Consultative Committee  
166 Food Science and Nutrition  
St. Paul Campus

Dear Pat:

First, I hope that this letter reaches you! As you know, I totally share your concern about the irritating foul-up in the matter of campus mailings, and we are working to get this straightened out. I, no less than you, find such matters irritating and time-consuming in that they make it impossible for us to get about our important work.

The attached is a memorandum for internal discussion that I prepared a few days ago and that Ken will be sharing with the deans to elicit their thoughts and reactions. It is a matter that I regard as important, and that I would like to discuss, initially on a relatively private basis, with you and the Faculty Consultative Committee -- perhaps through the kind of meeting we had a couple of weeks ago and which I found to be extraordinarily useful.

Fred Bohlen has been providing the leadership on this in close consultation with Ken Keller, Neal Vanselow, Dave Lilly and me. I am sending along

*File: April Conversation w/ President*

date April 18 1983

university  
of  
minnesota  
**memo**

to FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
from Meredith

Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum which President Magrath has provided for the FCC.

PLEASE CONVEY YOUR REACTIONS TO PAT BY APRIL 21.

*Meredith*



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

April 4, 1983

TO: Deans and Selected Others

FROM: C. Peter Magrath

SUBJECT: A New Dimension For Private Fund Raising For the University of Minnesota

Please regard this as a draft statement of a major concern and thrust that I think we should get under way, but with the details and tactics still open to reaction and advice from key leaders within the University of Minnesota.

The problem, briefly, is this. In recent years our private development activities, principally concentrated through the University of Minnesota Foundation which I hope to see strengthened and intensified as the clear lead agency for all of our development efforts, have been highly successful. The basic strategy that we have followed has been to encourage a rather large but selected group of colleges and programs to raise funds with the assistance of the Foundation staff and with the support and encouragement of the Central Administration of the University and the Board of the University of Minnesota Foundation. In many ways, this strategy, which has focused particularly on professional schools, was the vision of the late Julie Davis, one of the leaders in the early 70's of the Foundation. Upon coming to the University of Minnesota in 1974, I strongly endorsed this strategy and this emphasis. It has been successful without a doubt as the amounts of money raised have skyrocketed and placed us among the leading public universities in the United States in private development. Concurrently, a major new emphasis has been given to the Presidents Club, whose membership has dramatically increased. Much of this increase, however, has been tied to the focus on specific professional schools and targeted programs.

I regard these outcomes as highly beneficial and do not wish to see them reversed in any way. Nevertheless, there are other fundamental concerns that simply are not addressed by this strategy, which, among other things, has failed to exploit the potential for other fund raising through the Foundation, fund raising which in my judgment must include unrestricted support for the University of Minnesota.

Under this heading, our record is very poor. There are many reasons for this, which I will not take the time to detail in this memorandum. They include the large and diversified nature of the University; the fact that until very recently the Minnesota Alumni Association was uninterested and certainly not organized to support such an effort; and finally the fact that we have never really attempted a major annual giving program aimed at the literally tens of thousands of alumni of the University of Minnesota, a campaign that to be successful must engage the personal time and attention

of the President of the University and other senior officers and leaders. Many other universities, including public universities with rather diverse missions, have demonstrated that annual giving programs can be mounted and can be successful -- and can be undertaken without cutting into the resources developed by the more specialized approaches; indeed, there is evidence that strong annual giving campaigns can complement and indeed intensify some of the targeted approaches for priority programs in the professional and graduate areas.

As you know, I believe the future of the University of Minnesota as a quality institution is now on the line. It is for this reason that we are undertaking a painful and very difficult retrenchment program, a program that is intended, among other things, to generate resources so that we can make selective and qualitative decisions in an environment where our best estimates show that constant dollar support from the State is very likely to continue eroding significantly in the years ahead. Even if the latter were not the case, there are compelling educational reasons for the University to give attention to its quality, its priorities, and its absolute need to have discretionary money available to serve critical but fiscally starved programs.

In recent months, I have been discussing these matters with a number of the leaders of the University of Minnesota Foundation, many of whom have themselves encouraged me to examine these matters -- as they are deeply troubled by the evidence of what the cutbacks are doing to the University and our need to set priorities. In fact, many of these leaders, while closely tied to and highly supportive of the targeted approach we have been focusing on, are now convinced that the general health of the University and some of its programs need attention and help -- such as, for instance, and this is not intended to mean that any decisions or priorities have been even remotely set, in the humanities and in certain general education areas. I personally regard such an effort as an external extension of the internal retrenchment and reallocation effort we are currently about. I am further convinced that by hard work, the engagement of key members of the Foundation Trustees, and the support of Deans and other senior University officials, such a campaign can succeed and can be beneficial to the total health of the University of Minnesota -- whose health is ultimately a vital concern to all of the University's professional and graduate programs.

Accordingly, building on the current very immediate interest of Foundation leaders, the fact that the Alumni Association has been reorganized and revitalized, the fact that there is a public perception of need at the University of Minnesota, and the fact that, very likely, untapped alumni and private source resources have not been approached, I intend to ask the University of Minnesota Foundation Board at its forthcoming April 29 meeting to commit itself in general terms to a campaign to raise private funds for unrestricted purposes to meet the current needs as identified by the President in his role as Chief Executive Officer. The goal I am setting is no less than \$1 million of new private money for 1983-84, building to at least \$2.5 million annually by 1985-86. Although there are some sensitive issues here that need to be carefully reviewed so that these efforts do not harm other efforts currently under way, I am convinced that this can be accomplished.

There are various tactical questions and issues that need to be explored. Among these are the precise nature of the appeal; the division of labor in emphasis and in approach between a more generalized annual giving campaign and the targeted approach primarily focused upon professional schools; the question of whether or not we seek a broad base of contributors as opposed to targeting more selectively on individuals who can make larger gifts; the question of who the current and projected membership of the Presidents Club might be used in this campaign; and the precise mechanism by which I as President would work with Deans and University Vice Presidents to assure that this campaign continues to generate support for selected professional schools and programs that are high priority University programs. I might add my own personal willingness to give intensified attention to some of the professional school thrusts where this is complementary to the annual giving effort. Thought is being given to calling the annual giving campaign something such as the President's Fund For Excellence, and, perhaps, building it around a President's Council For Excellence drawn from the leadership of the University of Minnesota Foundation.

There are many other questions and issues to be considered of course, but I believe this memorandum highlights some of the major ones. I have discussed these ideas at some length with the University Vice Presidents, and, particularly, with Vice President Fred Bohlen who has special responsibilities in this area, and Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow, as well as Dean Lilly who is now serving as a Special Consultant to me. I am eager to receive the ideas and suggestions of the University Deans.

  
CPM

CPM:kb

cc: University Vice Presidents  
Dean David Lilly, School of Management  
Associate Vice President Robert J. Odegard, Development  
Mr. Stephen S. Roszell, Executive Director, Minnesota Alumni  
Association  
Mr. Bruce Flessner, Development Officer, University of Minnesota  
Foundation

University  
of  
Minnesota  
memo

date April 8 19 83

to Faculty Consultative Committee

from Pat Swan

ROUGH AGENDA  
FCC  
April 14  
300 Morrill Hall  
10:30-12:30

1. Minutes of 3/31 (to be sent later or distributed on 4/14)
2. Election of Vice Chair of Senate
3. Finish committee appointments.
4. Recent election of Consultative Committee members.
5. Conversation with the President (11:15-12:15)

cc: President, vice presidents,  
C. Pazandak, M. Smith, Minnesota Daily.

date April 11 1983

to Maureen Smith, Stacey Milavetz

from Meredith Poppele

CONVERSATION TOPICS BETWEEN SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMM. AND PRESIDENT MAGRATH  
FOR AFTERNOON OF APRIL 14:

- a) administration's policy on augmentation of salary for administrative duties;
- b) progress report on collegiate budgeting and planning for 1983-85:  
How can colleges and departments make commitments for next year when they won't know which of their funds are available to them until the end of May? (esp. re commitments to graduate students); SCC interested in hearing about process and timing of planning activities, plus actual plans to the extent possible at this date.

*same sent to Maureen Smith*



date March 25 19 83

to Stacey Milavetz

from Meredith Poppele

NOTICE OF EXTRA MEETING

Faculty Consultative Committee

Thursday, March 31, 10:30 - 12:00, 626 Campus Club

Agenda:

1. Nominations to Senate and Assembly committees.
2. Proposed amendment to Senate by-laws.





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

*Cur 7-11 4/84*

March 30, 1983

*also c: Peter Robinson  
Phillips Shively  
Pat Swan*

The Honorable Eugene T. Waldorf  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education  
24H State Capitol  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Dear Gene:

*c: Salaries file  
1983 Inv File*

As you and your associates in the Legislature continue to work on the University's 1983-85 Biennial Request, I am extremely anxious, again, to call your attention to -- and to seek your support for -- the overriding priority in our request. This is for some improvement in our faculty salary situation, which has drastically eroded in the past ten years and will soon hurt the University's quality and ability to contribute to the State if the erosion cannot be altered and in some way reversed. We have data conclusively demonstrating that University of Minnesota faculty salaries are seriously slipping in comparison with the other public Big Ten Universities; in six of eight academic rank comparisons we dropped between 1981-82 and 1982-83. Similar results show in comparisons with the major public research universities -- with whom we compete -- in the Association of American Universities.

The University's request to the Legislature is for a faculty salary increase of 8 percent in the first year of the biennium and 9 percent in the second. If we could accomplish this, or something approximating it, I am convinced that the impact on University of Minnesota morale, quality, and vitality would be enormous. We are all eager to cooperate in any way possible with the new initiatives being discussed in the State to help improve our economy, our agriculture, and our technological competitiveness. These ventures, however, will not pay off if the University of Minnesota's quality erodes, if we lose our best faculty and fail to attract bright new researchers and teachers, and if we do not have a solid base of State appropriation support.

As you know, we have absorbed severe retrenchments at the University in recent years, have made every effort to be cooperative with the State and its needs, and have tried to make our cuts on as selective a basis as possible. We are now further engaged in a massive effort to retrench and reallocate our resources during the next two years so that we can protect our quality, target particular programs and areas that are essential to the State and its quality, and remain a ranking American major University -- an invaluable asset for our State. There is no single thing that would do more to accomplish these objectives than for the faculty of the University to receive a significant salary increase. Every other request that we have made or is being discussed pales into insignificance compared to this issue, and it is for this reason that I again emphasize it for your most serious consideration.

The Honorable Eugene T. Waldorf  
March 30, 1983  
Page Two

You know that I appreciate the support and understanding you have consistently given to the University of Minnesota, and I ask that you give the thoughts in this letter your most serious consideration. Stan Kegler and I are ready to meet with you at any time to discuss this matter further or to provide any additional information or documentation you might wish.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath  
President

CPM:kb

cc: Vice President Stanley B. Kegler, Institutional Relations