



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

January 22, 1987
12:00 - 3:30
608 Campus Club

12:00 LUNCH with President Keller and Rick Heydinger

MEETING AGENDA

12:30- DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER
2:00

1. Faculty voice.
2. Update:
 - PUF-endowed chairs
 - ICR distribution policy.
3. Search committee guidelines for filling central administrative offices. Attachment: Guidelines approved by Senate in April, 1980.

2:00- INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION
3:30

4. Faculty Development Committee: Progress report from FDC chair Pat Swan.
5. Planning document for service units (sent previously by Academic Affairs).
6. Old business.





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

MINUTES

APPROVED 2/19/87

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

January 22, 1987
12:00 - 3:30
608 Coffman Memorial Union

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (Chair), Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively.

Guests: Roger Benjamin (Academic Vice President), Judith Bennett (FDC staff), Richard Heydinger (Senior Assistant to the President), Kenneth Keller (President), V. Rama Murthy (Academic Affairs Associate Vice President), Mike Peltier (Minnesota Daily), Roy St. Laurent (Student SCC Chair), Maureen Smith (University Relations), Patricia Swan (FDC Chair).

DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

1. Governance and the faculty voice.

FCC members discussed with President Keller their request that one FCC member be identified as a faculty representative to each of the four committees of the Board of Regents, in a structure roughly parallel to that enjoyed by the students. Major differences would be that the students have two representatives to each committee, while the faculty would have only one and that the student representatives are not part of the student governance structure while FCC members are elected by the University's faculty. Thus these representatives would provide a direct faculty governance liaison to the committees of the Regents.

President Keller assured the FCC that he would ruminate on the points made by the FCC in the discussion and would lay out the full dimensions of the question to the Board of Regents in an upcoming session with them.

2. Chairs endowed by the Permanent University Fund (PUF).

President Keller and Vice President Benjamin described the rapid success in achieving outside pledges to match the PUF. At President Keller's request, Dr. Benjamin recently took stock of the extent of the commitment for chairs and the distribution of approved chairs. He determined that the spread of the chairs is pretty good but that some adjustments will have to be made to achieve three aims: (1) meet the needs of the Humanities and the College of Biological Sciences; (2) guarantee, as promised, at least one chair for every college and every campus; and (3) leave some room for new opportunities which might emerge in the next year. Permission will be withdrawn, for the present, from some professional schools' campaigns for external matches.

The total commitment to chairs for which pledges are in or as good as in is \$74.34 million. The value of the PUF is expected to grow over the next year or two to between \$87 million and \$90 million.

President Keller emphasized that the University wants the chairs filled with people who are going to make a difference. We must set our sights very high, he said. The University may expand representation on the search committees.

The group acknowledged the importance of excellent, although still informal, local efforts to provide employment for the spouses of the people the University seeks to attract.

3. Distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR).

President Keller has accepted the request of the Senate Committee on Research that he not report to the Regents his recommendation on the ICR distribution policy (which differs from the Senate's proposal passed last spring) until he has reported back to the Senate. He will speak to the April Senate meeting because he must be in Washington, D.C. on the date of the February Senate meeting.

(The Senate requested that a minimum of half all available ICR be returned to the colleges, in proportion to the generation of funds, and that of those returns one-third be retained by the college and one-third each go to the department and the principal investigator, unless the college by a consultative process elected a different internal distribution.

In extraordinary circumstances the president could retain more than 50% centrally and report his reasons to the Research and Finance Committees.)

President Keller anticipates that circumstances will force the exception to become the rule; therefore he will recommend that the Regents continue their current policy, which is that a minimum of one-third of ICR's be returned to the colleges; however, he will also promote a larger return to the individual investigator. It is fair, he added, for the Research Committee periodically to ask central administration how it has used the centrally-retained portion of the fund.

President Keller pressed the need for flexible budget funds in the face of very uncertain legislative appropriations on other important line items (e.g., library acquisitions).

FCC members made these points: (1) it would be helpful for the president to explain to the community what is happening to other resources which supported research in the years before the state allowed the University to retain considerable ICR's without an offset; and (2) the legislature has required the University to trade off some of the ICR increase against other budgetary needs, and since ICR's may be a dwindling resource, the loss of those other items which we will need in the future is worrisome.

The discussion with the president concluded at this point and Drs. Benjamin, Keller, and Murthy left the meeting.

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

4. Faculty Development Committee (FDC): Progress report.

Professor Patricia Swan, chair of the ad hoc FDC, introduced the committee's administrative assistant, Judith Bennett, and reported to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

FDC is doing a lot of "detective work" to locate all the good recommendations made in recent years (e.g., from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the task forces on Enhancing the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty -- the Merwin Committee -- and on Graduate Education and Research). The FDC has divided the assignments among five working groups:

- (1) Salary plans;
- (2) Programs supporting the development of faculty (leaves, career development, grants);
- (3) Support for ongoing faculty work (e.g., equipment and facilities, libraries, services, grants management);
- (4) Faculty work-loads, faculty-student ratios, A vs. B appointments, Summer Session, Extension;
- (5) Fringe benefits to faculty.

Professor Swan will make an initial report to the Faculty Senate at the February 19 meeting and a second report to FCC at the end of Winter Quarter. FDC's final report, due in May, will contain implementation recommendations as well as suggestions for next steps on uncompleted issues.

Professor Swan thought FDC might need to involve deans because of their interest in faculty development; Professor Goldstein commented that department heads are even more closely involved.

Although FDC is not certain it has to involve itself greatly with sabbaticals because of the activity of other groups, the Consultative Committee asked for FDC attention to a policy on sabbaticals.

Professor Swan asked for advice on the most effective means to solicit faculty input to FDC's work; FCC members recommended invitations to the faculty which identify the areas under study and remind faculty of the importance of their input.

FDC will welcome all suggestions on how it can get sufficient information on salaries and other faculty support both outside and inside the University system. Data are needed also on cost of living comparisons and on relative salary scales throughout the state's systems compared to those in other states. It is unclear how best to define the University's peer group which should be used consistently for all support comparisons. That group essentially encompasses "those with whom we compete for faculty and graduate students."

Professor Swan thanked FCC for the comments and suggestions and invited members to continue to think about the issues and call her or Ms. Bennett with further comments.

5. Planning Guidelines for service units.

Copies of the guidelines had been sent to FCC. Professor Shively recommended that copies be sent to department heads with a note from Academic Affairs that these guidelines have been sent to all service units.

FCC agreed that among the service units at least the Libraries, and probably also the Academic Computer Services and Systems, would need to be included in the academic planning process.

6. Membership of the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning.

FCC closed the meeting for this personnel item.

FCC has completed its amicable negotiations with the Provost and his designates regarding membership; all sides are gratified by the quality of the list.

Professor Berscheid reported that the Provost's separate working group is intended to have a permanent existence; its membership will include the FCC Chair (with Associate Chair as alternate), and the Chairs of the Finance and Planning Committees.

7. Business for future agenda.

FCC members suggested the following:

A. Schedule a meeting with Professor Andy Collins, chair of the Educational Policy Committee, to discuss the balance of SCEP attention to undergraduate and graduate education.

B. Consider administrative organization, particularly the extent of the workload in Academic Affairs, and whether the University needs a vice president for research. Seek information on the vice presidential positions of other major research universities.

C. Inquire of central administration how faculty perspectives were presented to the Peat Marwick consulting team.

D. Request the Tenure Committee to look at implementation of the new tenure code; ask for a survey to determine whether implementation of all the new rules is creating any problem. (Inform SCFA of FCC's actions.)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant

7. Business for future agenda.

FCC members suggested the following:

A. Schedule a meeting with Professor Andy Collins, chair of the Educational Policy Committee, to discuss the balance of SCEP attention to undergraduate and graduate education.

B. Consider administrative organization, particularly the extent of the workload in Academic Affairs, and whether the University needs a vice president for research. Seek information on the vice presidential positions of other major research universities.

C. Inquire of central administration how faculty perspectives were presented to the Peat Marwick consulting team.

D. Request the Tenure Committee to look at implementation of the new tenure code; ask for a survey to determine whether implementation of all the new rules is creating any problem. (Inform SCFA of FCC's actions.)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant

JAN 20 1986



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) ~~873-2025~~ 626-1616

January 14, 1987

To: Professor Ellen Berscheid
From: Kenneth H. Keller 
Subject: Advisory Task Force on Planning

You recently received a second draft of the charge letter to the advisory committee from Ed Foster. I understand that in forwarding the new draft, Dr. Foster indicated that some changes had been made at my suggestion. The changes I suggested dealt with emphasizing the issue of quality in the review of unit plans and indicating that we did not expect the task force to provide detailed comments on each and every priority recommendation in the collegiate plans.

The second draft also changed the proposed signatures on the charge letter. That was not done at my behest. I am open on the question of how that ought best to be handled. On the one hand, the academic vice president is, and remains, the chief academic officer of the University. He is also the chief operating officer of the Twin Cities campus. On the other hand, the other two "academic" vice presidents should and do play an important role in academic planning and the deans and their respective units report through them to the academic vice president. Whatever advice is given us by the task force would certainly be shared immediately by the academic vice president with the other two and they would work closely with each other in evolving a final set of recommendations.

The way the letter is signed would have little influence on the process and would not and should not be taken as any shift in administrative structure from what I have outlined above. If the Consultative Committee has strong feelings about the matter, obviously it is one we can discuss. However, I do want to be clear that I had not raised the question of how the charge letter ought to be signed.

KHK:mr



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

January 16, 1987

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

FCC is delighted you and Rick will join us for lunch next Thursday, the 22nd, preceding our monthly meeting together. We hope you won't mind going through the fourth or the sixth floor cafeteria line (as I don't cook on Thursdays). Our room reservation is for #608 at noon.

Besides the items you'll bring to FCC, we'd like you to discuss with us:

- Our proposal to the Regents;
- Your plans to address the February 19 Senate meeting regarding your response to the Senate's vote last spring on a new ICRF distribution policy;
- The status of PUF-endowed chairs;
- Senate guidelines for central administrative searches (copy attached).

Please just give me an update on this; I know now you won't attend the 2/19 meeting.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

EB:mp

c: Rick Heydinger

Attachment

PUF SUMMARY

"PUFSUM" IN SYM2

1/15/87

UNIT	(1)	(2)	(3-5)	TOTAL (MINIMUM)
AGRICULTURE	3.50	2.13		5.63
BIOLOGICAL SCI	1.00	1.00	2.50	4.50
CROOKSTON		0.50	0.50	1.00
DENTISTRY	0.25	1.00		1.25
DULUTH	2.00	0.25	2.25	4.50
EDUCATION			3.00	3.00
FORESTRY	0.40	1.00		1.40
GRADUATE SCHOOL	8.00	1.00	3.00	12.00
HOME ECONOMICS	0.25	0.40	0.60	1.25
LAW	2.75			2.75
LIBERAL ARTS	5.50	0.50	9.53	15.53
MANAGEMENT	9.75			9.75
MEDICINE-UMD			0.50	0.50
MEDICINE-T.C.	8.88	3.50	2.25	14.63
MINN EXTENTION		0.50	0.50	1.00
MORRIS			0.25	0.25
NURSING				0.00
PHARMACY	1.00	0.50		1.50
PUBLIC AFFAIRS		1.94		1.94
PUBLIC HEALTH	0.50		0.50	1.00
TECHNOLOGY	16.00			16.00
VETERINARY MED	0.20	0.13		0.33
WASECA			0.50	0.50
TOTAL	59.98	14.34	25.88	100.20
TOTAL OF (1) & (2)	-----			74.32
TOTAL OF (1), (2) & (MINIMUM)	-----			76.82



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 625-0051

January 12, 1987

TO: Neil Bakkenist
Carol Campbell
David Lilly
Jean Lupton

Cherie Perlmutter
Eldred Smith
Neal Vanselow
Frank Wilderson

FROM: Ed Foster

RE: Draft planning document for service units

Here is a generic planning document that I hope would be appropriate for most service units, when supplemented with individual questions to the specific unit.

I would appreciate your reviewing this document in order to answer the following questions:

- Does the document in general make sense for your unit(s)? Can you recommend specific changes?
- For which units under your jurisdiction would it be appropriate to participate in this exercise? For which would it be inappropriate?
- Assuming that the document is ready in final form by January 23, do you consider it feasible for service units to submit their responses by March 31, 1987, when the colleges submit their plans?
- Will you be able to propose specific individual questions to units under your jurisdiction? If so, when could you supply those questions to me?

I would appreciate your response by Monday, January 19. Call me at 624 6567 if you have questions.

Thank you very much for your help.

cc: Roger Benjamin
Rick Heydinger
Ken Keller
Tom Noonan
Chancellors
Senate Consultative Committee
Senate Planning Committee

DRAFT

January 12, 1987

A STRATEGY FOR FOCUS

GUIDELINES TO SERVICE UNITS*

* In this document, "service unit" represents a unit with primary responsibility for support services, reporting directly to one of the vice presidents or through an assistant or associate vice president. "Department" means a subordinate service unit which reports administratively to the unit director who in turn reports to a vice president.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PRINCIPLES TO INFORM THE ANALYSIS.....	1
CRITERIA TO CONSIDER IN SETTING PRIORITIES.....	3
INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORMULATING THE UNIT STRATEGY.....	5
ISSUES TO ADDRESS IN THE UNIT STRATEGY DOCUMENT	5
PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE (To be supplied)	

APPENDICES (To be supplied)

Introduction

The organization that takes charge of its own future by defining important social needs and filling them well has the possibility to maintain its autonomy, enjoy public support, and at the same time provide deep rewards and satisfaction for its members as the organization helps them to accomplish their own goals. The organization that drifts, without focusing its energies, is likely sooner or later to become captive to the agendas of others, better organized and more ambitious. President Keller's *Commitment to Focus* may be interpreted as the first step in assuring that the University of Minnesota will take charge of its own future.

A Strategy for Focus is the second step in that process. It will give each academic department and college in the university, and each service unit that supports the academic functions, an opportunity to review its most recent plans and formulate new goals in the light of *Commitment to Focus* and of recommendations from recent university Task Forces, assess the barriers that must be overcome, and decide on a course of action designed to accomplish its goals. Once we are agreed on a mission and goals for the unit as a whole and for each of its constituent parts, each unit, and each department, will be primarily responsible for its own future. By focusing energies and resources on a limited number of programs consistent with its mission, each academic unit can achieve the high level of overall performance to which we all aspire. In the process the university will preserve programs of nationally recognized excellence, improve programs that have already demonstrated high quality and potential, and initiate new programs capitalizing on opportunities in a changing environment.

To provide comparability among units in this effort, you are asked to follow uniform guidelines in presenting your analysis. Below are a set of principles that should inform your analysis, a set of criteria to consider in setting priorities, instructions for the process to be followed in arriving at your strategy, issues to address in the document that summarizes your analysis, and a timetable.

Principles to inform the analysis

1. *A Strategy for Focus* represents a shift in orientation for program development at the University of Minnesota. *Growth* in resources is not the primary means to improvement of our programs; *change* is the primary means to improvement. Development of better programs

need not require increases in size, and our analysis of the opportunities that face us must recognize that *redirection* of resources, rather than *increased* resources, provides our best opportunity to achieve excellence. We need to focus on quality rather than quantity.

2. Analysis must encompass entire programs, addressing the possible advantages of completely eliminating some in order to create or strengthen others, when major changes are required to attain a threshold of excellence. *Incremental changes that do not lead to clear improvement in quality of the high priority programs will not accomplish our goals.*
3. Across the University, faculty development, both for the present faculty and by means of new hires as opportunities occur, must have the highest priority. The quality of the university can be no better than that of its faculty.
4. Research is central to the mission of each academic department at the university. From a base of strong departments with active research programs, attention must be paid to interdisciplinary research. This requires that programs seek opportunities for synergism; they cannot be satisfied with insular activities, and they cannot succeed with strategies that sustain academic enclaves. Each program must consider the opportunities to improve its own quality and strengthen the institution as a whole by looking beyond its own boundaries.
5. With regard to enrollments, analysis should proceed on the assumption that the premise of *Commitment to Focus* will hold: undergraduate enrollment will decline by eight thousand, and relatively, there will be a shift of enrollment from lower division to upper division and graduate education. Planning assumptions for individual college enrollments are proposed in Appendix IV (attached). With regard to financial resources, analysis should proceed on the assumption that state funding (0100 budget and state specials) will remain unchanged.
6. The nature of this university -- research-based, international, metropolitan (in its Twin Cities campus), land grant, committed to equal opportunity and affirmative action -- should permeate our programs.
 - The university will maintain and strengthen its commitment to improve the lives of Minnesota residents through its research, teaching and service mission, including analysis of pressing social problems, enrichment of the state's cultural environment, and effective transfer of technology to provide intellectual, cultural and economic returns for

the investment made in our programs by the State.

- The kind of student who chooses to come to the university depends on the kind of program we offer: to attract those students who can benefit most from an environment of research and scholarship, we must tailor our instructional programs to them. Especially undergraduate programs should emphasize intellectual engagement, social awareness, ethical involvement and participation in an intellectual community. The idea that education is a continuum should underlie each unit plan. Education must be cumulative; programs need to be coordinated with those of secondary schools and community colleges, and among units within the university; professional programs must have a foundation on strong programs in the basic arts and sciences.
- The university is committed to serve the international community and to assist our local community as it becomes more actively engaged with the world outside our borders. International activities and objectives must be identified in the strategy.
- All adjustments to our programs brought about by changing priorities, especially shifts of enrollment, must be undertaken with full attention to the importance of maintaining the institution's commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action.

Criteria to consider in setting priorities

A unit's basic priorities will be defined by its mission and planning statement. When reviewing and revising your own mission statement, your unit should give special attention to the principles outlined above, and to the fact that academic programs are central to the University's mission, so the priorities of those service units that support the academic enterprise must grow out of the needs of the students and faculty and the priorities of the academic units that they serve.

Academic units have been asked to address all five of the following criteria in setting priorities among programs and services. For some service unit programs, these criteria will all be relevant; for others, not all may be appropriate. In setting priorities among your own programs and services, please use the following criteria; if some are not relevant to your unit, include a brief note to indicate why.

- a. **Quality:** Inevitably subjective, this measure includes the quality of professional staff (including any measures of national recognition for professional contributions), the quality of services provided (preferably demonstrated by objective evidence), and other indices that you might consider relevant for your special circumstances.
- b. **Centrality:** Each program should be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the mission of the University of Minnesota. Centrality represents a program's contribution to a coherent whole which helps to sustain important aspects of the mission of the university.
- c. **Comparative Advantage:** What are the unique characteristics of each program that make it particularly appropriate to this university? It is not sufficient that programs meet an important local or national need, or that they be unique within the state. Many important programs can and should be the responsibility of others, in Minnesota or elsewhere. What is the rationale for the program at the *University of Minnesota*?
- d. **Demand:** The direction of change in demand for each program in both the short and long term will be considered. There are presumably indicators unique to your unit that describes demand for your own services. Appendix IV gives enrollment targets, which should be considered in projecting future changes in demand.
- e. **Efficiency and Effectiveness:** Because aspirations are always limited by the resources available, programs must be continually examined to see if more economical or more efficient ways are possible to accomplish the same ends. Yet, cost alone must not govern the decision; the effectiveness of the program must also be weighed. When taken together, efficiency and effectiveness provide an important measure of whether funds are being put to the best use.

Instructions for formulating the unit strategy

To a considerable extent, service unit plans depend on academic unit plans which are still in process of discussion, so there will be inevitable adjustments to priorities proposed here. However it is important to consider the needs of service units at the same time as major commitments are being made to academic priorities. Therefore we ask each unit to submit a document which shows its preliminary decisions on program priorities for the next five years.

These submissions will be reviewed by an Advisory Task Force* and will later form the basis of discussions between each unit and the appropriate Vice Presidents. The purpose of these discussions is to reach agreement on a set of goals and objectives, as well as measures to be used in assessing progress towards them. It is anticipated that the outcomes of these discussions and agreements will be reviewed every two years and extended to the following five-year planning period.

To ensure success of this process, broad participation is of the utmost importance; each department is encouraged to design its own future within the context established by its unit administration. Each unit will, of course, follow normal University policies to assure appropriate consultation; beyond that normal consultation, each unit is asked to make sure that there is opportunity for students and faculty to be informed and to comment on its proposals and those of its departments.

Issues to address in the unit strategy document

As part of its document, each unit will evaluate and rank in groups its present and proposed new programs** as they relate to the structure of the university as a whole. Programs central to the university's mission should be given relatively high priority. Inasmuch as overall needs of society are often greater than any single institution's capacity to fulfill them, special weight should be given to those programs that not only fulfill needs of society but are appropriate to the University's academic strengths, resources, and mission.

The document should be based on an assumed steady state budget at current levels and should include a supplement which shows how, after appropriate internal reallocation, additional resources would be used to strengthen existing programs and to support new programs of highest priority. One purpose of this effort is to develop agreed-upon priorities so that requests for funding and reallocations can be considered in the context of university-wide needs.

* It is not yet determined whether or not the Task Force that reviews your plan will be the same group as will review college plans; that will depend on time constraints.

**"Programs" can be defined to suit the circumstances of the individual unit. See the instructions to Table 2 for limited further discussion.

Recessions and fiscal deficits may of course confront the state from time to time in the future; in such cases, the university will surely be asked to share in coping with such emergencies. However, *it must be emphasized that A Strategy for Focus is not an exercise in across-the-board budget retrenchment. It is an attempt to provide the basis for funding of high-priority programs and initiatives.*

The elements of the strategy document are identified below. It is not intended that questions already resolved be reopened for this document, except in those cases where yesterday's answers are no longer appropriate to today's circumstances. To the extent that the mission statement, goals and objectives, or priorities already established for your unit continue to be appropriate, you need only report them in this document. As you consider the issues identified below, please make special note of the questions to individual units (Appendix I); in some cases those questions appropriately might be considered in reviewing your mission and setting your own priorities. The document should include the following elements:

- a. **Give a concise mission statement** which addresses the overall purpose of the unit and its component departments.
- b. **Describe the functions** performed by each department in your unit; attach an organization chart and give the names and titles of department managers.
- c. **List the goals and objectives** of the unit. For this document, *goals* describe the future to which the organization aspires; *objectives* describe in concrete terms what you can realistically hope to accomplish during the five-year planning period. Your goals and objectives might appropriately be described in terms of the structure and functions of the unit, program quality, enrollment, staffing and so on, under the budgetary assumptions described below in g and i.

As part of your discussion of goals and objectives, please consider the contribution that your unit can make toward the overall institutional goal to become one of the best public universities in the country. To achieve that goal will require:

- strong programs throughout the basic arts and sciences
- centers of excellence among our professional programs

- an environment that supports the academic aspirations of students and faculty
- centers that provide outstanding contributions to the cultural and economic enrichment of the state's environment.

What programs in your unit can contribute to the elements identified here, and what can you do to strengthen them?

- d. **Give a set of criteria** to measure and evaluate success in achieving agreed-upon goals and objectives. Criteria should emphasize results rather than effort. Discussions with the vice presidents will conclude with agreement about the criteria that will be used to evaluate progress toward goals and objectives.
- e. **Project the resources** that you expect to be available to the unit, as summarized in Table 1 (Appendix II). A planning effort should include a projection of the resources available, as well as decisions as to where those resources should be spent. In order properly to appreciate your unit plans and priorities, the Advisory Task Force and the vice presidents need to review the full planning problem that you face, rather than the part of it that is reflected in state funds alone. In reviewing these figures we will be aware that many income items are tied to specific associated expenditures and cannot be reallocated, and similarly that expenditure decisions for many funds coming to the department or unit remain at the discretion of the unit.

Please append to Table 1 an explanation of the prospective source of any projected increases in income. Detailed instructions for completion of the table accompany the table.

- f. **Classify expenditures by program** for 1985 - 86 to 1991 - 92, if feasible. The Advisory Task Force and the vice presidents will be most fully informed of your current and past priorities, as reflected in current spending decisions, and of your future priorities, as reflected in your targets for changes in spending decisions, if you can classify your expenditures by program. Programs for your unit should be defined so as to illuminate the issues that you find important, and at the level of generality you consider most appropriate; the final test of whether or not programs are appropriately defined comes when you attempt to summarize the unit's priorities: if priorities can be described in terms of the programs you have defined, the definitions are appropriate. We believe that your internal planning would also benefit from such a program budget, and urge you to consider its construction, at least

for 1985 - 86 and 1991 - 92. Because the accounting information presently provided to you is not tailored in a convenient form to do this, we will not request formally that you construct your own version of Table 2, but we would be pleased to receive it; the academic vice presidents will be happy to consult on its construction if you wish, and the Vice President for Finance and Operations will offer a training program for your staff. Construction of such a program budget will help to answer the questions addressed in **g** and **h** below.

Parts g and h, below, ask for priorities under the assumption of a constant budget.

- g. Rank your priorities at the current level of expenditure.** For the purpose of this document the assumption is made initially that the total budget of the unit will be constant at current levels of support (apart from adjustments for inflation). Programs of the unit are to be ranked in terms of their relative priority using the criteria listed above: quality, centrality, comparative advantage, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness. Where relevant, please answer the questions directed specifically to your unit in Appendix I.

On the basis of your evaluation, please list programs in Table 3A (Appendix II) as follows: new programs that should be started, existing programs that should be accorded increased support, those that should have steady state budgets, those that should be reduced in size or merged with other programs within the unit or other parts of the university, and finally, those programs that should be phased out. This priority ranking within a steady state budget and the consequent identification of possibilities for reallocation is a necessary precondition for serious consideration of requests for additional funding.

Provide a narrative explanation for your priority ranking and your classification. As part of your discussion of priorities, will you please address the following issue: There is a risk in simply allocating funds to a program that a unit decides should be improved. Under unfavorable conditions, modest increases in funding may not make a noticeable difference. Under favorable conditions, though, even modest increases may have a dramatic effect. If particular expenditures that you recommend have special strategic value, please give a brief explanation.

- h. Identify funds expected to be available for reallocation, and how you propose to allocate them;** record your response in Table 3A. This discussion is intended to identify the extent to which reallocation will be feasible over the five-year planning period. If your

total budget were to remain constant to 1991 - 92, apart from the effect of inflation, your unit might have two possible sources of funds for internal reallocation:

- (i) If enrollment declines, resources may be released for reassignment as a consequence. (If such resources are left in the same program to improve its quality, for the purpose of this document those resources are "reassigned". The purpose of using this perhaps strained language is to emphasize that such use should be made by conscious decision, not by inertia).
- (ii) Whether or not enrollment declines, there will be opportunities to redirect funds or effort from low- to high- priority programs. As a guide, each unit should have sufficient flexibility to redirect at least 10% of its 0100 budget in this way over the five-year planning period, in addition to funds freed due to enrollment declines.

First, please identify the resources that you expect to be able to redirect toward higher priority programs over the next five years, and record the sources of the funds in Table 3A. If the total does not represent at least 10% of the unit 0100 budget in addition to resources freed due to enrollment declines, please explain why funding is not more flexible.

Second, based on your narrative discussion of priorities, identify the highest priority programs to which you would want to reassign those funds. Rank in priority order, with an indication of the total new resources you would expect to assign to each item by 1991, if you were limited to the funds identified in this discussion; record the result in Table 3A.

Note 1: You are specifically requested to plan to set aside funds for unexpected contingencies in each year's budget, with the objective to build up a fund equal to 5% of your budget by the end of the planning period.

Note 2. If as a result of institution-wide priorities or economic circumstances it is determined that your unit budget must be reduced, it is assumed that the programs marked for reduction or elimination in your strategy statement will be the source of funds for overall budget reduction.

Part i, below, asks for priorities under the assumption of an increased budget.

- i. **Identify your priorities for increased funds.** Your total budget might increase, apart from the effect of inflation, due to either your own efforts (future increases in funds other than state funds, identified in Table 1) or due to allocation or reallocation of funds held centrally. For planning purposes, assume that a reallocation from central funds of more than 10% of your 0100 budget will be highly unlikely.

Based on your discussion of priorities, identify the highest priority programs to which you would want to assign additional funds, after the internal reallocation described in **h**, above. Rank in priority order, with an indication of the total resources you would expect to assign to each item by 1991, if you were limited to the funds you raise through unit efforts plus the possible reallocation of 0100 funds described above. Summarize the information requested here in the form given by Table 3B (Appendix II), labelled "increased budget".

- j. **Evaluate the following aspects of each of your programs, and suggest actions or policies which, if adopted by other units, would help you to do your job better:**
 - (i) Identify the departments outside your unit performing similar or related functions, with which your departments should communicate; how good is that communication now?
 - (ii) Are there other units that might more efficiently undertake tasks that your unit must now do? Are there tasks done by others that your unit might more efficiently do (with an appropriate budget adjustment)? Or should departments now in different jurisdictions be combined in some other way for economy or improved service?
 - (iii) What methods do you now use for communication with academic programs or other clients that you serve? How good is that communication now? If it needs improvement, what changes, by whom, do you suggest to improve communication? Include discussion of methods to evaluate whether your rules, policies or administrative practices impose undue hardships on the users of your services.
 - (iv) Describe one to three major strengths and major weaknesses of each of the services your unit provides to other parts of the University. If your proposed priorities do not address the major weaknesses, please give a brief indication of why.

- k. **Answer the questions addressed specifically to your unit, if not answered in the above narratives.**

- l. **Describe the prospective impact of the changes you have proposed on the programs of other units, and on your needs for space, if relevant.** This is not a request for a detailed analysis, but simply an early warning of those implications, obvious to you but perhaps not obvious to others, of the issues that will be raised for other parts of the university by your proposed actions.

The strategy document should not exceed 25 pages of text. In addition, it should include Table 1 and two versions of Table 3, for constant and increased budgets; Table 2 is optional. Please provide a cover summary of no more than five pages. The report may include as many appendices as appropriate. Included among the appendices should be copies of reports by other review bodies that inform this process.

Timetable

To be supplied after discussion with relevant vice presidents