The following paper describes a five-year budget reallocation plan for the University of Minnesota. The primary goal is a measurable improvement in the quality of the University's teaching, research, and public service -- the three-part "Land Grant mission." The primary strategy for attaining that goal is the internal reallocation of 10% of the University's state-funded, annual budget -- approximately $60 million -- to be accomplished by 1996, preferably by 1994.

The initial paper was first published in preliminary form on January 9, 1991, when it was submitted to the Board of Regents for discussion. Between the Board's January 11 and February 8 meetings, the preliminary recommendations were widely discussed in public forums sponsored by the Board and the President's Office and in a series of on-campus and off-campus meetings with interested constituencies. Consultation was also held with campuses, colleges, and operating units.

As indicated when the paper was first published, the January 9 - February 8 period of consultation was also used to develop modifications necessary before submitting formal recommendations to the Board, for information at its February meeting and for final approval action at its March meeting.
• The Board of Regents' resolution of June, 1990, stresses the need for program change as a basis for reallocation.

• $13.9 million was reallocated last year to high priorities, including academic and civil service salaries and the Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education.

• $20 million was set as the goal for reallocation for 1991-93 in the University's biennial legislative request statement, approved by the Board of Regents in November, 1990.

• The University administration now recommends that the goal for reallocation be increased to $60 million (10% of the state-funded base) for the period 1991-1996.

In response to state revenue and expenditure projections, the state government has told us not to ask for any increases for 1991-93 -- and to justify our current funding.

• Preserving the current base funding must be the University's main concern; it has enormous importance for the future of the University of Minnesota and the development of the state.

• In January, the University administration recommended, and the Board of Regents approved the immediate withdrawal of the 1991-1993 legislative request for $34 million in new program funding. In the 1991 legislative session, the University must concentrate its efforts on academic and civil service salary increases that recognize the effects of inflation.

• The needs behind the $34 million original request are very real; they can be covered only in part by intensified reallocation.

• The University administration believes that an expanded reallocation effort to enhance quality is the strongest argument to preserve our base funding.

The base reflects the fundamental importance to the state of the University of Minnesota's teaching, research, and outreach leadership,

A commitment to reallocate $60 million, approximately 10% of the University's state funding base, demonstrates a dramatic University effort to accomplish productivity improvements without making new demands on state revenues. It's essential that the University's state funding base be preserved to allow those reallocation decisions to be carried out.

The Governor and the Minnesota Legislature can rely on this administration and the Board of Regents to set priorities and make the
The 1990s decade poses extraordinary challenges to the University of Minnesota -- indeed, to all of higher education in Minnesota. We have tried to do too much -- more than we have been equipped to do -- and while Minnesota has provided broad access, especially to undergraduate higher education, quality has suffered.

Throughout the 1990s and into the 21st Century, Minnesota will inevitably face unprecedented competition in the national and international marketplaces of knowledge, talent, and economic development. "Pretty good" may be an insightful commentary on Minnesota's characteristic modesty, but it doesn't capture the kind of quality that Minnesota needs in college and university graduates, in research enterprises, and in the application of new knowledge through community outreach.

The University of Minnesota must provide leadership for quality improvement, starting with fundamental, institutional change within the University, and carrying over into fully cooperative efforts to promote higher quality throughout Minnesota's educational systems.

Two imperatives must drive decisions about the University of Minnesota at this time:

- the necessity to continue and intensify efforts to improve quality, and
- the necessity to make those quality improvements within limited resources.

Quality improvement has been, and remains, the thrust of the University's entire planning and decision-making process.

- *Academic Priorities* is the comprehensive plan that serves as the basis for decisions for the Twin Cities campus, and corresponding documents guide developments on the coordinate campuses; all have been approved by the Board of Regents within the past three years.
difficult trade-off decisions if the proceeds of reallocations are available
to achieve quality improvement objectives.

Keeping the base allows improvement through substitution; more
useful programs can be improved or introduced as lower priority
programs are phased out.

I made the University administration's preliminary proposals for
reallocation available for public discussion a month earlier than planned,
because of the state's financial situation and because I am personally
committed to a full process of consultation.

Reallocation decisions are tough choices. I served as a member of the
University's first reallocation committee in 1971-72. Eighteen of the last twenty
years of University planning and budgeting have involved some form of
retrenchment and reallocation. Ten of the twenty years have involved
retrenchment of state funds -- $30 million in total net reductions. Fifteen of
the twenty years have involved internal University reallocations, totaling about
$31 million in reallocations across units, plus a significant amount of money
reallocated within units. These virtually annual reallocation processes since
1971 have obviously exhausted the least difficult reallocation possibilities.

Reallocation decisions pose the classic chicken and egg problem.
Proposals must be based on broad consultation, but proposals must be
formulated and made public before full consultation can take place. To allow
consultation to take place, the administration's preliminary outline of
recommendations was placed on the agenda for discussion at the January 11,
1991 Board of Regents' meeting.

Through January and early February, the administration carried out
consultation with faculty, staff, students, and numerous external groups, and
the Board of Regents held an open, public forum on major proposals in late
January.

Final administrative recommendations were submitted to the Regents
for information at the February 8, 1991, meeting and for action at the March 8,
1991, meeting.

As the administration developed final recommendations for reallocation
during the January consultation process, the following principles were
foremost:

• Major changes are required to meet the challenge of improving quality
within limited resources.

• Tough choices mean that trade-offs will be necessary; the proposals are
an integrated package of additions and reductions of resources -- a
balanced budget; dropping one reallocation proposal will mean replacing it with another proposal of equivalent budget impact.

- Extensive consultation will be used, but decisions cannot be based on consensus.

- Many options have been, and must be, considered at the unit and central levels.

- Changes will be made while meeting, and, where possible, exceeding contractual obligations to faculty, staff, and students; for our students, this means allowing reasonable to time to complete programs that are to be eliminated.

- This is the first set of major changes that will be required during the next several years.

- Proposed changes will be expected to be implemented within no more than three years if at all possible.

- Productivity improvements are essential to the process:
  -- reducing administrative costs, including administration of academic programs, support services, and physical plant,
  -- creating greater flexibility in work assignments for faculty and staff to meet needs in teaching, research, and outreach,
  -- limiting the number of separate degree programs and consolidating course offerings,
  -- consolidating academic and support units to maximize usefulness,
  -- eliminating units and programs that fit the reallocation criteria less well, and
  -- curtailing non-academic activities to provide additional funding for academic activities.

- The reallocation should contribute to honing the profile of the University of Minnesota, differentiating the University of Minnesota’s unique contributions from other higher education institutions in the State:
  -- assuring a strong core of undergraduate and graduate programs in the arts and sciences, including a strong general education component,
  -- assuring that undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs are linked appropriately to the University's research, scholarly, and artistic activities,
assuring that professional programs meet state and regional needs, and

continuing the University's land-grant mission of public service and outreach that is informed by quality research and extended to the entire state.

The University administration will adhere to the same reallocation criteria approved by the Board of Regents in earlier actions on campus plans: quality, centrality, comparative advantage, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness.

**Quality:** This measure is ultimately a question of how well the values for which the University stands are expressed in its activities -- in free inquiry, effective learning, and useful service to the citizens of the State. The outcomes of research, teaching, and public service/outreach must be considered -- the professional standing of our scientists, scholars, and artists; the impact of their work on their disciplines or fields, and/or on our society; the success of our students as students and in their personal and professional lives; the satisfaction of those served by the University.

-- Some quantitative ways to assess quality:

. In teaching: successful completion of degree programs by our students, offering truly meaningful learning experiences

  **Specific measures:**

  . graduation rates appropriate to the type of student
  . retention rates (as showing we're heading in the right direction)
  . student satisfaction (surveys)
  . student success in post-graduate study and the professions

  This is a fundamental objective of reallocation: To help our students learn more, faster, and better -- and to graduate

. In research: Discovery, synthesis, and presentation of new knowledge in a way that enhances understanding, supports education, and strengthens the economic, social and cultural life of the State (various measures).

  **Specific measures:**

  . Academic program reviews
  . Growth in sponsored research
  . Patents issued and other contributions to economic development
. Faculty honors
. In outreach: Making knowledge and expertise available to the citizens of the entire State (various measures).
  Specific measures:
  . Results of surveys and evaluations that reflect contributions to resolutions of societal problems.

Centrality: Each program should be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the mission of the University of Minnesota. Centrality of research, instruction and service represents a program's contribution to a coherent whole which helps to sustain and stimulate related work elsewhere in the University. With respect to instruction, centrality also addresses the degree to which a program is an essential component of a challenging education that taken as a whole is intended at the undergraduate level to communicate an understanding of the major ideas and achievements of humankind and a sense of the values of different cultures and ages; at the graduate and professional levels, centrality in instructional programs extends this commitment beyond communicating the major ideas and achievements of humankind, to an expansion and deepening of knowledge, and to furthering its utilization for society's welfare.

In another sense, centrality means furtherance of the University's central values, including academic freedom, affirmative action, and diversity. Programs directed toward the preservation and strengthening of our adherence to those values are, to that extent, central to the University's overall mission.

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?

Demand: The direction of change in demand for each program in both the short and long term will be considered. Other indicators you might wish to consider include number of applications, quality of acceptances, services performed in support of other programs, degrees awarded, instruction of students or research undertaken for the solution of pressing problems of society.

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.
Outline of Reallocations Recommendations

The University's reallocation package is, by necessity, a complex mix of planning and budgeting decisions at all levels of the organization: programs, departments, collegiate units, campuses, and system-wide (or central). The following outline first identifies, by unit, the various combinations of reallocation decisions; it then identifies, by type of reallocation, those decisions that result in resources that will be centrally allocated among units.

I. Combinations of reallocation decisions by unit

A. The following units will receive net increases through University-wide reallocation:

1. College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities*

2. Institute of Technology, Twin Cities*

*More than 75 percent of all lower division instruction on the Twin Cities campus is provided by these two colleges and more than 60% of all undergraduate instruction. Strengthening the undergraduate experience -- as outlined in the Undergraduate Initiative and the report of the Task Force on Liberal Education -- is a major objective of the reallocation.

*Nationally prominent departments are found in these two colleges. Strengthening such departments -- which are threatened by severe underfunding-- is another major objective of the reallocation, which further supports the Undergraduate Initiative.

3. University of Minnesota, Duluth

Recent improvements in the arts and sciences curriculum must be funded.

Programs in business and social work at UMD must be funded to meet accreditation standards.

4. University of Minnesota, Morris

Funding must be provided to support curriculum innovations in general and internationalized education.
5. Carlson School of Management**
6. College of Pharmacy**
7. School of Public Health**
   **These prominent professional programs must be given some additional funding to stabilize their budgets, consistent with targets established in Academic Priorities.
8. Minnesota Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Stations
   These programs must receive additional funds to further strengthen their capabilities to bring the knowledge and expertise of the University to every county in the State to help solve many economic, social, and environmental problems.
9. Libraries
   This fundamental resource for the University and the entire state must be maintained, and if possible enhanced, in the face of severe cost increases for periodicals and books.
10. Biomedical Engineering
   This program brings together expertise from several disciplines to maintain the University of Minnesota's prominent position in a field of great importance to the economy and health care of the State.
11. College of Biological Sciences
   Identified as high priority for core programs in Academic Priorities, this college has now developed plans that call for a net increase for research initiatives, fulfilling an obligation made earlier in the implementation of Academic Priorities.

B. The units mentioned above will also retain unit resources freed up by the reallocation process for approved internal priorities, as follows:

1. College of Liberal Arts: Strengthening general education curriculum; advising staff; supporting core
departments in social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

2. Institute of Technology: Strengthening advising staff; providing equipment; expansion of master's programs (MSPAN); K-12 programs in science and mathematics; matching funds.

3. University of Minnesota, Duluth: Additional faculty for American Indian Studies, Political Science, Theater, Composition.


5. Carlson School of Management: Broadening MBA curriculum; internationalizing curriculum; undergraduate emphasis area in Management Information Systems; more classes for non-majors.

6. College of Pharmacy: Support for rural health initiatives and meeting the state's need for graduates.

7. School of Public Health: Strengthening programs of health promotion/disease prevention and environmental health.

8. Minnesota Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Stations: Enhancing and expanding interdisciplinary research and outreach programming on critical issues facing both rural and urban Minnesota.

9. Libraries: Restructuring of administration to provide more efficient service and to reflect redirection of academic programs.

10. Biomedical Engineering: As a new program, only partially funded in the initial implementation of Academic Priorities, this program was not subject to reallocation requirements.

11. College of Biological Sciences: Reallocation of faculty positions to match resources with needs and opportunities, redirection of effort of selected faculty to undergraduate programs, and reorganization of outreach efforts.
C. The following special University-wide initiatives will receive increased funding over and above that provided in individual colleges:

1. Undergraduate Initiative
2. Minority recruitment and retention
3. K-12 initiatives
4. Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives
5. International education
6. Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater Minnesota

D. The following programs will keep the funds they free up for reallocation for purposes such as those stated below:

1. Medical School: Reallocation to support areas such as cancer research, neuroscience, biomedical engineering, and biomedical ethics.
2. UMD Medicine: Increase enrollment to strengthen service to rural areas; cooperation with other UMD units and local hospitals to strengthen selected program areas.
3. University Hospital and Clinic: Patient care services, including primary care, cancer, and neurosciences.
4. College of Biological Sciences: New courses for general education, separate from courses for majors; integration of undergraduate education with research.
5. Law School: Curriculum changes to meet new legal issues and challenges.
6. College of Natural Resources: Integration of research and education programs; assure quality and efficiency in a time of rapidly increasing enrollments.
7. College of Human Ecology: Consolidation and redesign of courses and programs; advising; research productivity.
8. College of Veterinary Medicine: Strengthening dairy, swine, and poultry production medicine.
9. College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture: Restructuring curriculum to strengthen the first professional degree and the research-oriented master's degree.
E. The following will complete reallocation under Academic Priorities, but will also do internal reallocation for purposes such as those stated below:

1. College of Agriculture: Support for new undergraduate curriculum, Project Sunrise; targeted courses that contribute to general education requirements; increased research focus on interface between agricultural practices, profitability, and the environment.

2. School of Nursing: Strengthening geriatric clinical nursing and rural health education, re-establishing public health/community nursing program.

3. School of Dentistry: Support new curriculum; develop Dental Research Institute; meet most urgent equipment replacement needs and offset the loss of contracts and clinic income.

F. The following will provide funds for reallocation to other units, but will also undertake improvements as noted below:

1. Education: Strengthening master's programs.

2. Student Affairs: Program for commuter students; other community-building efforts; automation; increased services for disabled students; recruitment, orientation, and admission.

3. General College: New, more holistic approach to student support and substantial academic and administrative reorganization.

4. Continuing Education and Extension, including Summer Session: More effective delivery of programs and orientation toward unmet needs in the state.

5. Graduate School: Strengthening research and graduate programs.

6. University College: Adjustment of staffing to allow more effective program delivery.

II. Resources will be freed up for reallocation among and within colleges in the following ways:

A. Productivity improvements and/or curtailment in central administrative and operational activities (Twin Cities)
Productivity gains have been achieved, and will continue, through reorganization of units/services and improvement of management and work practices.

Included are Finance and Operations, Academic Affairs, External Relations, and the President's and Board of Regents' Offices. Central administration budgets will be reduced by 10%.

B. **Phasing out of the University of Minnesota, Waseca**

The main factors underlying this most difficult recommendation are:

1. The high cost per student -- in absolute amount and relative to other programs;

2. Inadequate outcomes -- percent of degree completions per FYE student;

3. Alternative programs are available for many students.

These factors, taken together with the severe financial constraints imposed by the State's fiscal situation, have led to the conclusion that this program should be phased out as a University of Minnesota unit. A target date of June 30, 1992, would allow students now enrolled to complete the program and allow reassignment, retraining, and in-placement or out-placement of faculty and staff. **This proposal does not involve any change in the Southern Experiment Station or the Extension Service in Waseca.**

• **A note on the University of Minnesota, Crookston**

-- UMC has critical cost and utilization issues.

-- UMC must meet distinctive needs in its region or the institution is in jeopardy.

- UMC should provide lower division arts and sciences education in the region.

- UMC should become more of a transfer institution for students from the region.

- UMC should provide better access to selected bachelor's degrees through telecommunications and provide opportunity both for
regional sharing of Crookston programs and for linkage with appropriate Twin Cities colleges.

-- An expanded role for UMC seems necessary and is justifiable for the University and in the context of higher education restructuring in northwestern Minnesota.

C. Other cases of reallocation:

1. Elimination of the following programs or units:
   a. Williams Laboratory (Nuclear Physics), Institute of Technology
   b. Mineral Resources Research Center, Institute of Technology
   c. Undergraduate major in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, Institute of Technology
   d. KUOM, Continuing Education and Extension
   e. Selected four-year B.S. teacher licensing programs in the College of Education, Twin Cities
   f. Bachelor of Architecture or Master of Architecture I, College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
   g. Major in Health Education, Morris
   h. Program in Dental Hygiene, UMD
   i. MacPhail Center for the Arts

2. Curtailment or consolidation of the following programs or units:
   a. Reduction of the number of undergraduate and graduate degree programs and majors, College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities.
   b. Consolidation of administrative, academic and support units, College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities.
d. Reduction of the number of master's and doctoral programs in clinical sciences, Medical School.

e. Some consolidation and improved coordination of the programs of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science to better serve both colleges and Minnesota's livestock industries.

f. Curtailment of administrative costs by restructuring the College of Veterinary Medicine's Veterinary Biology Department.

g. Merger of Molecular Graphics in Medical School and Pharmacy

h. Consolidation of the Hospital's publications staff with Health Sciences Public Relations Office.

i. Consolidation of administrative and support services, General College.

j. Consolidation of some of the special applied research programs to no more than two of the Branch Stations.

3. Reassignment of approximately 150 anticipated vacancies in faculty and staff positions from lower priority to higher priority programs and/or from relatively overstaffed to relatively understaffed programs -- to meet changing student demand. Practically all campuses and colleges will participate in this form of reallocation.

4. Elimination of subsidies from activities that can be self-supporting:
   Subsidy by the Hospital for certain clinical activities

5. Increase in enrollment in selected programs where the added tuition income can bear the full cost of expansion -- and even generate additional income.
   a. M.B.A. programs, Carlson School of Management
   b. Summer Session, Continuing Education and Extension
   c. UMD Medicine
   d. Law School
Overview of Reallocation Recommendations

Net increases through reallocation:

- College of Liberal Arts: $4,500,000
- Institute of Technology: 3,000,000
- University of Minnesota at Duluth: 1,000,000
- University of Minnesota at Morris: 500,000
- Carlson School of Management: 400,000
- College of Pharmacy: 250,000
- School of Public Health: 500,000
- MN Extension Service and Experiment Stations: 1,500,000
- University Libraries: 1,000,000
- Biomedical Engineering: 500,000
- College of Biological Sciences: 200,000
- Special system-wide initiatives: 7,560,000
- Undergraduate Initiative
- Minority recruitment and retention
- K-12 initiatives
- Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives
- International education
- Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater MN

Total net increases: $20,910,000

Net decreases through reallocation:

- Central administration, services, operations: $8,950,000
- University of Minnesota, Waseca: 6,430,000
- Health Sciences Units: 600,000
- General College: 510,000
- College of Education: 1,880,000
- Continuing Education and Extension: 1,760,000
- Graduate School: 210,000
- Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology: 370,000
- University College: 60,000
- Special State Appropriations: 140,000

Total net decreases: $20,910,000
Internal Reallocation (within units):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$4,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Technology</td>
<td>4,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Duluth</td>
<td>4,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Morris</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Crookston</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology</td>
<td>5,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1,090,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture and Landscape Arch.</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Institute</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total internal reallocation** $36,950,000

**Summary:**

- Reallocations among major units
  - Net increases $20,910,000
  - Net decreases $20,910,000

- Internal reallocation (within units) $36,950,000

- Total reallocation:
  - Among major units $20,910,000
  - Internal (within units) $36,950,000

**Grand Total** $57,860,000

- **Special System-Wide Initiatives**

These initiatives reflect the major institutional program themes of the last several years, some as far back as the early 1980s.

Specific allocations decisions have not been made.

A central pool of $7,560,000 will be available University-wide, through competitive proposals, and allocated through the regular annual budget process to ensure coordination of academic planning and annual budgeting decisions.
Undergraduate Initiative

I gave this the title, the "Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education," but the groundwork was well along before I left for Arizona in 1983. Under the leadership of Professor John Wallace, the Task Force on the Undergraduate Student Experience produced, in 1984, a remarkably comprehensive study of the problems caused by overextension and underfunding. That was followed by the 1985 report of the Committee on the Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, chaired by CLA Associate Dean Roger Page.

The emphasis on improving undergraduate education in President Ken Keller's "Commitment to Focus" may have been misunderstood or underestimated, but the fact is that this plan put in motion a series of wide-ranging quality improvement efforts that remain the foundation of what is now the Undergraduate Initiative. These include the reorganization of the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering under the leadership of the Vice Provost, the efforts to coordinate lower division education, the development of a common entry point, a variety of important improvements in student support services, and efforts to improve coordination and cooperation with Minnesota's other higher education systems.

In the last two years, we have invested several million dollars in improvements in our largest courses, advising, TA training, and in the quality of our classroom and study space. The Task Force on Liberal Education, whose draft report is now being discussed, has proposed important new ideas. The system-wide pool will provide some resources for these needs over and above the funding provided to individual colleges.

Minority recruitment and retention

Serious institutional diversity efforts date back to the 1960s and 1970s, but the most comprehensive planning document was the "Taborn Report" in 1987, the Final Report of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus. That led directly to the appointment of the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs with special responsibility for minority affairs. Two years later, in the summer of 1990, Dr. Dolores Cross presented her comprehensive report, outlining the measurable goals to which we are now committed:

- Improving minority retention by 50% by 1994
- Doubling the hiring of minority faculty by 1994
- Increasing minority enrollment to 10% of total enrollment by 1994.

Dr. Cross's report also detailed the entire range of institutional, campus, and collegiate programs, and that office has developed the communication and management mechanisms to coordinate minority programs among themselves and, most importantly, with the full range of
programs among themselves and, most importantly, with the full range of teaching, research, and public service programs of the University. The system-wide pool will provide funding for these initiatives over and above funding set aside by internal campus or college reallocation.

K-12 initiatives

The University must play a leadership role in Minnesota's total educational effort -- all levels, public and private. The decision to strengthen secondary school preparation requirements (the Collins Report, 1986) was a major step toward better prepared students who need less remedial work when they reach the college level.

Based on a recent inventory, the University now has more than three dozen programs cooperating with K-12 schools, and efforts are underway to weave these into an appropriately coordinated whole. A report will be made to the Board this spring for the purpose of establishing priorities for further efforts, especially in mathematics and science.

Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives

Current University initiatives, which have made very encouraging progress, are grounded in three key planning efforts:

The Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy of the State (the "Lilly Report," 1983)

The Steering Committee to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty (the "Merwin Report," 1983)

The Task Force on the Quality of Graduate Education and Research (the "Holt Report," 1984)

These have led to significant growth in sponsored research, the reorganization and development of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer, and outstanding success in expanding patents, licensing, and relationships with industry. Additional funding for the General Research Fund in the Graduate School, for faculty set-ups, and for the matching of federal grants will be provided from the system-wide pool in order to help sustain the high level of faculty entrepreneurship that has been achieved in recent years.

International education

Initiatives from the colleges, the Office of International Education, the China Center, the International Study and Travel Center, and the Continuing Education and Extension Global Campus supporting expanded opportunities for study abroad have all contributed to an international awareness and an
appreciation of the need for expanded global understanding. An Associate Vice President position was established in Academic Affairs, recognizing this priority. This effort was described in a special section of the Undergraduate Initiative materials presented to the Board last spring. The system-wide pool is expected to provide some additional funding for the internationalization of the curriculum and for study abroad opportunities.

Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater Minnesota

The complete revamping of the Twin Cities campus telephone and telecommunication system, coupled with other technological advances, continues to open new opportunities to provide television links among our campuses and serve audiences in Greater Minnesota. Project UNITE, serving Rochester and some Twin Cities locations with engineering instruction, has been an effective model, and support from the system-wide pool for other instructional and outreach efforts will be considered.

Summary Comment on Special System-Wide Initiatives

These initiatives, by their nature, are too dynamic to permit fixing very specific budget allocations for a five-year period. They are all on-going, firmly rooted in the total institutional planning efforts, and producing real and encouraging outcomes. They are all at different stages of maturity; they all must be carefully monitored for mid-course corrections based on experience we gain and opportunities that arise. It will be critical to maintain both the ability and the flexibility to make strategic allocations for these initiatives, and doing that in the regular, annual budget process is the key to ensuring that change for the better is institutionalized.

• Reallocation -- a responsibility for the entire University community •

These reallocation initiatives are the first and most important steps toward achieving our $60 million target. Improving quality is a never-ending task. We are committed to involving all our faculty and staff in seeking innovative solutions that raise quality and improve productivity. We will need the support of the whole University community to achieve these objectives.

Inevitably this process will raise anxiety about job security. We know that many jobs must be modified and others discontinued. Our primary strategy will be in placement within the University. Our commitment is to rely on attrition to the maximum degree feasible. We will offer transfers, retraining, updating of professional credentials and individual assistance to each person affected by these changes. There will be occasions where individual preferences and skills suggest that the only viable alternative is outplacement. In those instances, we will provide support in helping those persons find satisfying employment elsewhere.
The following paper describes a five-year budget reallocation plan for the University of Minnesota. The primary goal is a measurable improvement in the quality of the University's teaching, research, and public service -- the three-part "Land Grant mission." The primary strategy for attaining that goal is the internal reallocation of 10% of the University's state-funded, annual budget -- approximately $60 million -- to be accomplished by 1996, preferably by 1994.

The initial paper was first published in preliminary form on January 9, 1991, when it was submitted to the Board of Regents for discussion. Between the Board's January 11 and February 8 meetings, the preliminary recommendations were widely discussed in public forums sponsored by the Board and the President's Office and in a series of on-campus and off-campus meetings with interested constituencies. Consultation was also held with campuses, colleges, and operating units.

As indicated when the paper was first published, the January 9 - February 8 period of consultation was also used to develop modifications necessary before submitting formal recommendations to the Board, for information at its February meeting and for final action at its March meeting.

Modifications are noted in the following paper, using strike-through for text deleted and bold italics for text added.
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RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION;
IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF
LIMITED RESOURCES

The 1990s decade poses extraordinary challenges to the University of Minnesota -- indeed, to all of higher education in Minnesota. We have tried to do too much -- more than we have been equipped to do -- and while Minnesota has provided broad access, especially to undergraduate higher education, quality has suffered.

Throughout the 1990s and into the 21st Century, Minnesota will inevitably face unprecedented competition in the national and international marketplaces of knowledge, talent, and economic development. "Pretty good" may be an insightful commentary on Minnesota's characteristic modesty, but it doesn't capture the kind of quality that Minnesota needs in college and university graduates, in research enterprises, and in the application of new knowledge through community outreach.

The University of Minnesota must provide leadership for quality improvement, starting with fundamental, institutional change within the University, and carrying over into fully cooperative efforts to promote higher quality throughout Minnesota's educational systems.

Two imperatives must drive decisions about the University of Minnesota at this time:

• the necessity to continue and intensify efforts to improve quality, and
• the necessity to make those quality improvements within limited resources.

Quality improvement has been, and remains, the thrust of the University's entire planning and decision-making process.

• Academic Priorities is the comprehensive plan that serves as the basis for decisions for the Twin Cities campus, and corresponding documents guide developments on the coordinate campuses; all have been approved by the Board of Regents within the past three years.
The Board of Regents' resolution of June, 1990, stresses the need for program change as a basis for reallocation.

$13.9 million was reallocated last year to high priorities, including academic and civil service salaries and the Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education.

$20 million was set as the goal for reallocation for 1991-93 in the University's biennial legislative request statement, approved by the Board of Regents in November, 1990.

The University administration now recommends that the goal for reallocation be increased to $60 million (10% of the state-funded base) for the period, 1991-1996.

In response to state revenue and expenditure projections, the state government has told us not to ask for any increases for 1991-93 - and to justify our current funding.

Preserving the current base funding must be the University's main concern; it has enormous importance for the future of the University of Minnesota and the development of the state.

In January, the University administration recommended, and the Board of Regents approved that the immediate withdrawal of the 1991-1993 legislative request for $34 million in new program funding be withdrawn immediately. In the 1991 legislative session, the University must concentrate its efforts on academic and civil service salary increases that recognize the effects of inflation.

The needs behind the $34 million original request are very real; they can be covered only in part by intensified reallocation.

The University administration believes that an expanded reallocation effort to enhance quality is the strongest argument to preserve our base funding.

The base reflects the fundamental importance to the state of the University of Minnesota's teaching, research, and outreach leadership.

A commitment to reallocate $60 million, approximately 10% of the University's state funding base, demonstrates a dramatic University effort to accomplish productivity improvements without making new demands on state revenues. It's essential that the University's state funding base be preserved to allow those reallocation decisions to be carried out.

The Governor and the Minnesota Legislature can rely on this administration and the Board of Regents to set priorities and make the
difficult trade-off decisions if the proceeds of reallocations are available to achieve quality improvement objectives.

Keeping the base allows improvement through substitution; more useful programs can be improved or introduced as lower priority programs are phased out.

I am making made the University administration's preliminary proposals for reallocation available for public discussion a month earlier than planned, because of the state's financial situation and because I am personally committed to a full process of consultation.

Reallocation decisions are tough choices. I served as a member of the University's first reallocation committee in 1971-72. Eighteen of the last twenty years of University planning and budgeting have involved some form of retrenchment and reallocation. Ten of the twenty years have involved retrenchment of state funds -- $30 million in total net reductions. Fifteen of the twenty years have involved internal University reallocation, totaling $31 million in reallocations among across units, plus a significant amount of money reallocated within units. These virtually annual reallocation processes since 1971 have obviously exhausted the least difficult reallocation possibilities.

Reallocation decisions pose the classic chicken and egg problem. Proposals must be based on broad consultation, but proposals must be formulated and made public before full consultation can take place. To allow consultation to take place, the administration's preliminary outline of recommendations has been was placed on the agenda for discussion at the January 11, 1991, Board of Regents' meeting.

Through January and early February, the administration will carry carried out consultation with faculty, staff, and students, and numerous external groups, and the Board of Regents will hold held an open, public forum on major proposals in late January.

Final administrative recommendations will be were submitted to the Regents for information at the February 8, 1991, meeting and for action at the March 8, 1991, meeting.

As the administration developed developed final recommendations for reallocation during the January consultation process, the following principles will be were foremost:

• Major changes are required to meet the challenge of improving quality within limited resources.

• Tough choices mean that trade-offs will be necessary; the proposals are an integrated package of additions and reductions of resources -- a
balanced budget; dropping one reallocation proposal will mean replacing it with another proposal of equivalent budget impact.

- Extensive consultation will be used, but decisions cannot be based on consensus.
- Many options have been, and must be, considered at the unit and central levels.
- Changes will be made while meeting, and, where possible, exceeding contractual obligations to faculty, staff, and students; for our students, this means allowing reasonable to time to complete programs that are to be eliminated.
- This is the first set of major changes that will be required during the next several years.
- Proposed changes will be expected to be implemented within no more than three years if at all possible.
- Productivity improvements are essential to the process:
  -- reducing administrative costs, including administration of academic programs, support services, and physical plant,
  -- creating greater flexibility in work assignments for faculty and staff to meet needs in teaching, research, and outreach,
  -- limiting the number of separate degree programs and consolidating course offerings,
  -- consolidating academic and support units to maximize usefulness,
  -- eliminating units and programs that fit the reallocation criteria less well, and
  -- curtailing non-academic activities to provide additional funding for academic activities.
- The reallocation should contribute to honing the profile of the University of Minnesota, differentiating the University of Minnesota's unique contributions from other higher education institutions in the State:
  -- assuring a strong core of undergraduate and graduate programs in the arts and sciences, including a strong general education component,
  -- assuring that undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs are linked appropriately to the University's research, scholarly, and artistic activities,
-- assuring that professional programs meet state and regional needs, and

-- continuing the University's land-grant mission of public service and outreach that is informed by quality research and extended to the entire state.

The University administration will adhere to the same reallocation criteria approved by the Board of Regents in earlier actions on campus plans: **quality, centrality, comparative advantage, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness.**

**Quality:** This measure is ultimately a question of how well the values for which the University stands are expressed in its activities — in free inquiry, effective learning, and useful service to the citizens of the State. The outcomes of research, teaching, and public service/outreach must be considered — the professional standing of our scientists, scholars, and artists; the impact of their work on their disciplines or fields, and/or on our society; the success of our students as students and in their personal and professional lives; the satisfaction of those served by the University.

-- Some quantitative ways to assess quality:

. In teaching: successful completion of degree programs by our students, offering truly meaningful learning experiences

   *Specific measures:*

   . graduation rates appropriate to the type of student
   . retention rates (as showing we're heading in the right direction)
   . student satisfaction (surveys)
   . student success in post-graduate study and the professions

   *This is a fundamental objective of reallocation: To help our students learn more, faster, and better — and to graduate*

. In research: Discovery, synthesis, and presentation of new knowledge in a way that enhances understanding, supports education, and strengthens the economic, social and cultural life of the State (various measures).

   *Specific measures:*

   . Academic program reviews
   . Growth in sponsored research
   . Patents issued and other contributions to economic development
Faculty honors

In outreach: Making knowledge and expertise available to the citizens of the entire State (various measures).

Specific measures:
- Results of surveys and evaluations that reflect contributions to resolutions of societal problems.

Centrality: Each program should be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the mission of the University of Minnesota. Centrality of research, instruction and service represents a program's contribution to a coherent whole which helps to sustain and stimulate related work elsewhere in the University. With respect to instruction, centrality also addresses the degree to which a program is an essential component of a challenging education that taken as a whole is intended at the undergraduate level to communicate an understanding of the major ideas and achievements of humankind and a sense of the values of different cultures and ages; at the graduate and professional levels, centrality in instructional programs extends this commitment beyond communicating the major ideas and achievements of humankind, to an expansion and deepening of knowledge, and to furthering its utilization for society's welfare.

In another sense, centrality means furtherance of the University's central values, including academic freedom, affirmative action, and diversity. Programs directed toward the preservation and strengthening of our adherence to those values are, to that extent, central to the University's overall mission.

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?

Demand: The direction of change in demand for each program in both the short and long term will be considered. Appendix IV gives enrollment targets. Other indicators you might wish to consider include number of applications, quality of acceptances, services performed in support of other programs, degrees awarded, instruction of students or research undertaken for the solution of pressing problems of society.

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.
Outline of Reallocation Recommendations

The University's reallocation package is, by necessity, a complex mix of planning and budgeting decisions at all levels of the organization: programs, departments, collegiate units, campuses, and system-wide (or central). The following outline first identifies, by unit, the various combinations of reallocation decisions; it then identifies, by type of reallocation, those decisions that result in resources that will be centrally allocated among units.

I. Combinations of reallocation decisions by unit

A. The following units will receive net increases through University-wide reallocation:

1. College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities*
2. Institute of Technology, Twin Cities*

*More than 75 percent of all lower division instruction on the Twin Cities campus is provided by these two colleges and more than 60% of all undergraduate instruction. Strengthening the undergraduate experience -- as outlined in the Undergraduate Initiative and the report of the Task Force on Liberal Education -- is a major objective of the reallocation.

*Nationally prominent departments are found in these two colleges. Strengthening such departments -- which are threatened by severe under funding-- is another major objective of the reallocation, which further supports the Undergraduate Initiative.

3. University of Minnesota, Duluth

Recent improvements in the arts and sciences curriculum must be funded.

Programs in business and social work at UMD must be funded to meet accreditation standards.

4. University of Minnesota, Morris

Funding must be provided to support curriculum innovations in general and internationalized education.
5. Carlson School of Management**

6. College of Pharmacy**

7. School of Public Health**

**These prominent professional programs must be given some additional funding to stabilize their budgets, and to complete our obligations under consistent with targets established in Academic Priorities.

8. Minnesota Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Stations

These programs must receive additional funds to further strengthen their ability capabilities to bring the knowledge and expertise of the University to every county in the State to help solve many economic, social, and environmental problems.

9. Libraries

This fundamental resource for the University and the entire state must be maintained, and if possible enhanced, in the face of severe cost increases for periodicals and books.

10. Biomedical Engineering

This program brings together expertise from several disciplines to maintain the University of Minnesota's prominent position in a field of great importance to the economy and health care of the State.

11. College of Biological Sciences

Identified as high priority for core programs in Academic Priorities, this college has now developed plans that call for a net increase for research initiatives, fulfilling an obligation made earlier in the implementation of Academic Priorities.

B. The units mentioned above will also retain unit resources freed up by the reallocation process for approved internal priorities, as follows:

1. College of Liberal Arts: Strengthening general education curriculum; advising staff; supporting core
departments in social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

2. Institute of Technology: Strengthening advising staff; providing equipment; expansion of master's programs (MSPAN); K-12 programs in science and mathematics; matching funds.

3. University of Minnesota, Duluth: Additional faculty for American Indian Studies, Political Science, Theater, Composition.


5. Carlson School of Management: Broadening MBA curriculum; internationalizing curriculum; undergraduate emphasis area in Management Information Systems; more classes for non-majors.

6. College of Pharmacy: Support for rural health initiatives and meeting the state's need for graduates.

7. School of Public Health: Strengthening programs of health promotion/disease prevention and environmental health.

8. Minnesota Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Stations: Enhancing and expanding interdisciplinary research and outreach programming on critical issues facing both rural and urban Minnesota.

9. Libraries: Restructuring of administration to provide more efficient service and to reflect redirection of academic programs.

10. Biomedical Engineering: As a new program, only partially funded in the initial implementation of Academic Priorities, this program was not subject to reallocation requirements.

11. College of Biological Sciences: Reallocation of faculty positions to match resources with needs and opportunities, redirection of effort of selected faculty to undergraduate programs, and reorganization of outreach efforts.
C. The following special University-wide initiatives will receive increased funding over and above that provided in individual colleges:

1. Undergraduate Initiative
2. Minority recruitment and retention
3. K-12 initiatives
4. Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives
5. International education
6. Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater Minnesota

D. The following programs will keep the funds they free up for reallocation for purposes such as those stated below:

1. Medical School: Re-allocation to support areas such as cancer research, neuroscience, biomedical engineering, and biomedical ethics.
2. UMD Medicine: Increase enrollment to strengthen service to rural areas; cooperation with other UMD units and local hospitals to strengthen selected program areas.
3. University Hospital and Clinic: Patient care services, including primary care, cancer, and neurosciences.
4. College of Biological Sciences: New courses for general education, separate from courses for majors; integration of undergraduate education with research.
5. Law School: Curriculum changes to meet new legal issues and challenges.
6. College of Natural Resources: Integration of research and education programs; assure quality and efficiency in a time of rapidly increasing enrollments.
7. College of Human Ecology: Consolidation and redesign of courses and programs; advising; research productivity.
8. College of Veterinary Medicine: Strengthening dairy, swine, and poultry production medicine.
9. College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture: Restructuring curriculum to strengthen the first professional degree and the research-oriented master's degree.
E. The following will complete reallocation under Academic Priorities, but will also do internal reallocation for purposes such as those stated below:

1. College of Agriculture: Support for new undergraduate curriculum, Project Sunrise; targeted courses that contribute to general education requirements; increased research focus on interface between agricultural practices, profitability, and the environment.

2. School of Nursing: Strengthening geriatric clinical nursing and rural health education, re-establishing public health/community nursing program.

3. School of Dentistry: Support new curriculum; develop Dental Research Institute; meet most urgent equipment replacement needs and offset the loss of contracts and clinic income.

F. The following will provide funds for reallocation to other units, but will also undertake improvements as noted below:

1. Education: Strengthening master's programs.

2. Student Affairs: Program for commuter students; other community-building efforts; automation; increased services for disabled students; recruitment, orientation, and admission.

3. General College: New, more holistic approach to student support and substantial academic and administrative reorganization.

4. Continuing Education and Extension, including Summer Session: More effective delivery of programs and orientation toward unmet needs in the state.

5. Graduate School: Strengthening research and graduate programs.

6. University College: Adjustment of staffing to allow more effective program delivery.

II. Resources will be freed up for reallocation among and within colleges in the following ways:

A. Productivity improvements and/or curtailment in central administrative and operational activities (Twin Cities)
Productivity gains have been achieved, and will continue, through reorganization of units/services and improvement of management and work practices.

Included are Finance and Operations, Academic Affairs, External Relations, and the President's and Board of Regents' Offices. Central administration budgets will be reduced by 10%.

B. Phasing out of the University of Minnesota, Waseca

The main factors underlying this most difficult recommendation are:

1. The high cost per student -- in absolute amount and relative to other programs;

2. Inadequate outcomes -- percent of degree completions per FYE student;

3. Alternative programs being available for many students.

These factors, taken together with the severe financial constraints imposed by the State's fiscal situation, have led to the conclusion that this program should be phased out as a University of Minnesota unit. A target date of June 30, 1992, would allow students now enrolled to complete the program and allow reassignment, retraining, and in-placement or out-placement of faculty and staff. This proposal does not involve any change in the Southern Experiment Station or the Extension Service in Waseca.

* A note on the University of Minnesota, Crookston

-- UMC has critical cost and utilization issues.

-- UMC must meet distinctive needs in its region or the institution is in jeopardy.

. UMC should provide lower division arts and sciences education in the region.

. UMC should become more of a transfer institution for students from the region.

. UMC should provide better access to selected bachelor's degrees through telecommunications and provide opportunity both for
regional sharing of Crookston programs and for linkage with appropriate Twin Cities colleges.

-- An expanded role for UMC seems necessary and is justifiable for the University and in the context of higher education restructuring in northwestern Minnesota.

C. Other cases of reallocation:

1. Elimination of the following programs or units:
   a. Williams Laboratory (Nuclear Physics), Institute of Technology
   b. Mineral Resources Research Center, Institute of Technology
   c. Undergraduate major in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, Institute of Technology
   d. KUOM, Continuing Education and Extension
   e. Selected four-year B.S. teacher licensing programs in the College of Education, Twin Cities
   f. Bachelor of Architecture or Master of Architecture I, College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
   g. Major in Health Education, Morris
   h. Program in Dental Hygiene, UMD
   i. MacPhail Center for the Arts

2. Curtailment or consolidation of the following programs or units:
   a. Reduction of the number of undergraduate and graduate degree programs and majors, College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities.
   b. Consolidation of administrative, academic and support units, College of Liberal Arts, Twin Cities.
   c. Reduction of concentrations in MBA, MA in Industrial Relations, and B.S. in Business, Carlson School of Management.
d. Reduction of the number of master's and doctoral programs in clinical sciences, Medical School.

e. Some consolidation and improved coordination of the programs of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science to better serve both colleges and Minnesota's livestock industries.

f. Curtailment of administrative costs by restructuring the College of Veterinary Medicine's Veterinary Biology Department.

g. Merger of Molecular Graphics in Medical School and Pharmacy

h. Consolidation of the Hospital's publications staff with Health Sciences Public Relations Office.

i. Consolidation of administrative and support services, General College.

j. Consolidation of some of the special applied research programs to no more than two of the Branch Stations.

3. Reassignment of approximately 150 anticipated vacancies in faculty and staff positions from lower priority to higher priority programs and/or from relatively overstuffed to relatively understaffed programs -- to meet changing student demand. Practically all campuses and colleges will participate in this form of reallocation.

4. Elimination of subsidies from activities that can be self-supporting:
   Subsidy by the Hospital for certain clinical activities

5. Increase in enrollment in selected programs where the added tuition income can bear the full cost of expansion - and even generate additional income.
   a. MBA programs, Carlson School of Management
   b. Summer Session, Continuing Education and Extension
   c. UMD Medicine
   d. Law School
Overview of Reallocation Recommendations

Net increases through reallocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Unit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota at Duluth</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota at Morris</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson School of Management</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN Extension Service and Experiment Stations</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| College of Biological Sciences                   | $200,000  *
| Special system-wide initiatives                  | $7,920,000 |
| - Undergraduate Initiative                       |         |
| - Minority recruitment and retention             |         |
| - K-12 initiatives                               |         |
| - Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives |         |
| - International education                        |         |
| - Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater MN |       |
| Total net increases:                             | $21,070,000 |

Net decreases through reallocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Unit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central administration, services, operations</td>
<td>$8,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Waseca</td>
<td>$6,430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Units</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General College</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$1,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education and Extension</td>
<td>$1,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special State Appropriations</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net decreases</td>
<td>$21,070,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Allocation to fulfill earlier commitment in "Academic Priorities."

** Revised to reflect actual progress made toward earlier "Academic Priorities" reallocation commitment by the College of Agriculture.

*** Revised to reflect net increases, net decreases, and net funds available for special system-wide initiatives after making the two changes noted above.
**Internal Reallocation (within units):**

- College of Liberal Arts: $4,740,000
- Institute of Technology: $4,890,000
- University of Minnesota, Duluth: $4,080,000
- University of Minnesota, Morris: $1,150,000
- University of Minnesota, Crookston: $720,000
- Carlson School of Management: $1,430,000
- Health Sciences: $8,800,000
- Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology: $5,640,000
- University Libraries: $1,360,000
- College of Biological Sciences: $1,090,000
- Law School: $250,000
- College of Architecture and Landscape Arch.: $240,000
- Humphrey Institute: $140,000
- Information Services: $1,200,000
- Student Affairs: $1,130,000
- Graduate School: $30,000

**Total internal reallocation: $36,890,000**

**Summary:**

- Reallocation among major units
  - Net increases: $21,070,000
  - Net decreases: $20,910,000
  - Net decreases: $0

- Internal reallocation (within units): $36,890,000

- Total reallocation:
  - Among major units: $21,070,000
  - Internal (within units): $36,890,000

**Grand Total: $36,890,000**

- **Special System-Wide Initiatives**

- *These initiatives reflect the major institutional program themes of the last several years, some as far back as the early 1980s.*

- *Specific allocations decisions have not been made.*

- *A central pool of $7,560,000 will be available University-wide, through competitive proposals, and allocated through the regular annual budget process to ensure coordination of academic planning and annual budgeting decisions.*
Undergraduate Initiative

I gave this the title, the "Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education," but the groundwork was well along before I left for Arizona in 1983. Under the leadership of Professor John Wallace, the Task Force on the Undergraduate Student Experience produced, in 1984, a remarkably comprehensive study of the problems caused by overextension and underfunding. That was followed by the 1985 report of the Committee on the Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning, chaired by CLA Associate Dean Roger Page.

The emphasis on improving undergraduate education in President Ken Keller's "Commitment to Focus" may have been misunderstood or underestimated, but the fact is that this plan put in motion a series of wide-ranging quality improvement efforts that remain the foundation of what is now the Undergraduate Initiative. These include the reorganization of the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering under the leadership of the Vice Provost, the efforts to coordinate lower division education, the development of a common entry point, a variety of important improvements in student support services, and efforts to improve coordination and cooperation with Minnesota's other higher education systems.

In the last two years, we have invested several million dollars in improvements in our largest courses, advising, TA training, and in the quality of our classroom and study space. The Task Force on Liberal Education, whose draft report is now being discussed, has proposed important new ideas. The system-wide pool will provide some resources for these needs over and above the funding provided to individual colleges.

Minority recruitment and retention

Serious institutional diversity efforts date back to the 1960s and 1970s, but the most comprehensive planning document was the "Taborn Report" in 1987, the Final Report of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus. That led directly to the appointment of the Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs with special responsibility for minority affairs. Two years later, in the summer of 1990, Dr. Dolores Cross presented her comprehensive report, outlining the measurable goals to which we are now committed:

- Improving minority retention by 50% by 1994
- Doubling the hiring of minority faculty by 1994
- Increasing minority enrollment to 10% of total enrollment by 1994.

Dr. Cross's report also detailed the entire range of institutional, campus, and collegiate programs, and that office has developed the communication and management mechanisms to coordinate minority programs among themselves and, most importantly, with the full range of
teaching, research, and public service programs of the University. The system-wide pool will provide funding for these initiatives over and above funding set aside by internal campus or college reallocation.

K-12 initiatives

The University must play a leadership role in Minnesota's total educational effort -- all levels, public and private. The decision to strengthen secondary school preparation requirements (the Collins Report, 1986) was a major step toward better prepared students who need less remedial work when they reach the college level.

Based on a recent inventory, the University now has more than three dozen programs cooperating with K-12 schools, and efforts are underway to weave these into an appropriately coordinated whole. A report will be made to the Board this spring for the purpose of establishing priorities for further efforts, especially in mathematics and science.

Research initiatives and technology transfer initiatives

Current University initiatives, which have made very encouraging progress, are grounded in three key planning efforts:

The Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy of the State (the "Lilly Report," 1983)

The Steering Committee to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty (the "Merwin Report," 1983)

The Task Force on the Quality of Graduate Education and Research (the "Holt Report," 1984)

These have led to significant growth in sponsored research, the reorganization and development of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer, and outstanding success in expanding patents, licensing, and relationships with industry. Additional funding for the General Research Fund in the Graduate School, for faculty set-ups, and for the matching of federal grants will be provided from the system-wide pool in order to help sustain the high level of faculty entrepreneurship that has been achieved in recent years.

International education

Initiatives from the colleges, the Office of International Education, the China Center, and other units supporting expanded opportunities for study abroad have all contributed to an international awareness and an appreciation of the need for expanded global understanding. A new Associate Vice
President position was established in Academic Affairs, recognizing this priority. This effort was described in a special section of the Undergraduate Initiative materials presented to the Board last spring. The system-wide pool is expected to provide some additional funding for the internationalization of the curriculum and for study abroad opportunities.

**Intercampus telecommunications serving Greater Minnesota**

The complete revamping of the Twin Cities campus telephone and telecommunication system, coupled with other technological advances, continues to open new opportunities to provide television links among our campuses and serve audiences in Greater Minnesota. Project UNITE, serving Rochester and some Twin Cities locations with engineering instruction, has been an effective model, and support from the system-wide pool for other instructional and outreach efforts will be considered.

**Summary Comment on Special System-Wide Initiatives**

These initiatives, by their nature, are too dynamic to permit fixing very specific budget allocations for a five-year period. They are all on-going, firmly rooted in the total institutional planning efforts, and producing real and encouraging outcomes. They are all at different stages of maturity; they all must be carefully monitored for mid-course corrections based on experience we gain and opportunities that arise. It will be critical to maintain both the ability and the flexibility to make strategic allocations for these initiatives, and doing that in the regular, annual budget process is the key to ensuring that change for the better is institutionalized.

- **Reallocation -- a responsibility for the entire University community** -

These reallocation initiatives are the first and most important steps toward achieving our $60 million target. Improving quality is a never-ending task. We are committed to involving all our faculty and staff in seeking innovative solutions that raise quality and improve productivity. We will need the support of the whole University community to achieve these objectives.

Inevitably this process will raise anxiety about job security. We know that many jobs must be modified and others discontinued. Our primary strategy will be in placement within the University. Our commitment is to rely on attrition to the maximum degree feasible. We will offer transfers, retraining, updating of professional credentials and individual assistance to each person affected by these changes. There will be occasions where individual preferences and skills suggest that the only viable alternative is outplacement. In those instances, we will provide support in helping those persons find satisfying employment elsewhere.
This is a SUMMARY of the recommendations presented to the University of Minnesota Board of Regents for discussion January 11, 1991. For a complete copy, call External Relations. (612-624-2855)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATING:
IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES

CONTEXT
• The University must continue and intensify efforts to improve quality.
• The University must make quality improvements within limited resources.

CRITERIA
• Quality -- Centrality -- Comparative Advantage -- Demand -- Efficiency and Effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS AS AN INTEGRATED PACKAGE
• Designed to strengthen core programs in undergraduate, graduate and professional education; research; and outreach.
• Designed to do more with existing resources.
• Involves trade-offs -- what is given must be taken from elsewhere.
• Involves reduction of administrative and operational cost in order to fund academic programs.

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONNEL
• Placement within University is primary strategy.
• Rely on attrition to maximum degree feasible.
• Offer complete program of retraining and outplacement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
• Withdraw 1991-93 legislative request for $34 million in new program funding.

• Concentrate 1991 legislative efforts on preserving current level of funding and on increasing academic and civil service salaries in recognition of the effects of inflation.

• Reallocate $60 million over the next five years for high priority programs.
  (10 percent of the state-funded base)
  $20,910,000 will be shifted from one college or unit to another.
  $36,950,000 will shift from one program to another within colleges.
Where $20,910,000 will come from:
- Central administration
- Univ. of MN, Waseca
- Health Sciences units
- General College
- College of Education
- Continuing Education and Extension
- Graduate School
- Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology
- University College
- State specials

Where $20,910,000 will go:
- College of Liberal Arts
- Duluth
- Morris
- College of Pharmacy
- Biomedical Engineering
- MN Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Stations
- College of Biological Sciences
- Institute of Technology
- School of Public Health
- University Libraries
- Carlson School of Management
- College of Biological Sciences
- Special System-wide initiatives

(These units teach 84% of all undergraduates)

Some effects of $36,950,000 reallocation within colleges:
- Liberal Arts: Add faculty and class sections, improve large classes, strengthen general curriculum, improve advising.
- IT: Strengthen advising; provide equipment; expand master's programs and K-12 programs in science and math.
- Duluth: Accredit social work and business degree programs; add faculty for American Indian studies, political science, theater, and composition.
- Medical School: Support areas such as cancer research.
- Biological Sciences: New courses for general education; integration of undergraduate education with research.
- Veterinary Medicine: Strengthen dairy, swine and poultry production medicine.
- Agriculture: Support for new undergraduate curriculum, Project Sunrise; increase research focus on agricultural practices.
- Student Affairs: Program for commuter students; automation; recruitment, orientation, and admission.

TIMETABLE FOR FINAL ACTION
- January 11: Overview for discussion
- January 11-February 6: Consultation
- February 8: Recommendations to Regents for information
- March 8: Action by Board of Regents
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION; IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES

Reallocation Worksheets and Case Statements

Reallocation Worksheets were requested from the offices of the Vice Presidents, the Chancellors, and the Deans, providing brief summaries of:

Mission - What does the unit do?
Vision - What does the unit aspire to be?
Major strategic objectives and reallocation strategies, justified in terms of University planning criteria:

Quality
Centrality
Comparative Advantage
Demand
Effectiveness.

Case Statements were requested, where appropriate, to provide relatively brief explanations of major program changes recommended in the University's reallocation and restructuring plan:

Reasons for the change, with relevant summary of data and reference to University priorities and criteria.
How the needs previously covered by the unit will be met, by other University units, by other institutions in the state or outside the state, or, if not at all, what the implications are.
Brief description of the program change.
Background of the decision.
Source for further information.

Additional information on reallocations worksheets and case statements is available from the appropriate Vice Presidents, Chancellors, and Deans.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION:
IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF
LIMITED RESOURCES

Reallocation Worksheets and Case Statements

Vice Presidents' Offices
OFFICE OF EXTERNAL RELATIONS
REALLOCATION WORKSHEET

Unit Mission
External Relations units act in partnership with the other central administration offices to facilitate internal and external institutional communications, constituency involvement, and the acquisition of resources. They also provide resources and develop policies to enable the colleges and other University units to meet their objectives in these three areas.

Vision
Our aim is to inform our internal and external publics in a forthright and timely way, and to foster positive attitudes toward the institution, both within the University and throughout the state. We are striving to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness in all our activities, primarily through improved coordination, identification of priorities, and realization of our human resource potential.

Major Strategic Objectives

Communications:
• Improve on-campus communications
• Review broadcast communications alternatives
• Conduct a publications review
• Refine our short- and long-range issues management

Constituency involvement:
• Develop more active alumni chapters across the state
• Continue to develop the University in the Community program
• Conduct an alumni survey
• Continue to develop the Faculty Tour program
• Enhance our Twin Cities area outreach programs
• Facilitate outreach activities of units across the institution
• Improve the impact and effectiveness of special events/promotions

Acquisition of resources:
• Pursue additional automation of gift receipting and telemarketing
• Develop a plan for increasing effectiveness in the Twin Cities Metropolitan area.
• Increase cultivation of out-of-state donors and alumni
• Strengthen corporate matching gift program
• Expand alumni and donor base
Reallocation Strategy for the Unit

While each unit within External Relations will employ its own strategies for reallocation, we will work together to achieve greater coordination among units for improved efficiency and cost effectiveness. Joint programs in many areas (e.g., publications) will enhance quality while conserving resources.

Our units will also improve management effectiveness by emphasizing long range planning, priority setting, and the development of specific outcome measures for our activities. Accountability will be emphasized through an accelerated schedule of unit reviews.

Resources will be reallocated to high priority activities within our three areas of responsibility. Staff development and training will be emphasized to direct our human resources to achieve these priorities.

We anticipate realizing savings in the areas of document production and distribution, special event restructuring, and redeployment of staff support across units. These funds will then be redirected to meet our strategic objectives.

Total state dollars available for reallocation: $430,000
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
REALLOCATION WORKSHEET

1. Unit mission

The mission of the Office of Academic Affairs is to provide leadership in setting the University's overall academic mission, and actively to support the faculty, staff, and students of the University of Minnesota to accomplish the university's goals for instruction, research, and public service with a continually improving level of quality. The mission of the Office of the Provost is to provide oversight of the administration of the Twin Cities campus of the University.

2. Unit vision

We strive to help faculty, staff, and students achieve their own academic and professional goals, and continually reduce the instances in which university policies and practices interfere with that objective. Maintaining and improving the quality and diversity of the university's faculty, its most important resource, and of academic administration throughout the institution is our highest priority. Our actions must be consistent with protection of such central values of the institution as academic freedom, affirmative action, fairness in application of rules, the maintenance of high standards for academic credentials, and responsible stewardship of the university's resources.

3. Major strategic objectives for the unit

a. Direct the unit's resources, including Twin Cities campus physical facilities, toward the University's highest priorities in teaching, research and public service. (Criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Maintain and improve search procedures and retention actions so as to provide a diverse group of faculty and academic administrators of the highest quality for all university programs. (Criteria: quality, centrality).

c. Clarify, rationalize and, where possible, simplify policies and processes administered by Academic Affairs and those units that report to it. This goal applies especially to faculty evaluation and the processes for determining salary increases, but it also includes the goal of introducing methods for continuing quality improvement in all that we do. (Criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness).

d. Work with other Minnesota higher education systems to ease student transfer and improve curricular articulation. (Criteria: demand, efficiency and effectiveness).
4. **Reallocation strategy for the unit**

Budgets administered by the office of academic affairs fall into two classes: those that support the staffs and office expenses of administrative and support units reporting to the Senior Vice President and those that represent support funds passed through to other units in support of their academic goals.

a. With limited exceptions, identified below, units reporting to the Senior Vice President will reduce their combined 0100-based expenditures by 10% over the next 3 to 5 years, accomplishing this through staff reduction, combined with reassignment of responsibilities, improved efficiency, and reduced emphasis on some functions. Offices that will be subject to this reduction include the Academic Advising office for Intercollegiate Athletics, the Academic Personnel office, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, the Minority Affairs Office (with a reduction of 6%), the Office of International Programs, and the office of the Senior Vice President. (Criteria: centrality, efficiency and effectiveness).

Support units receiving state funds that are not subject to reduction in expenditures include the China Center, the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, the Patent Office, and the University Art Museum. (Criteria: quality, centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Support funds passed through to other units in support of their academic goals include two basic components. Funds used for salary support of female academics under the Rajender settlement will become available as women receiving those funds leave the university or retire; by the terms of the negotiation leading to the Rajender settlement, reallocation of these funds will be limited to programs that support the interests of academic women. Other pass-through funds now administered through Academic Affairs will be reduced by 10% so that the funds can be provided directly to high priority programs for their own allocation. (Criteria: quality, centrality, efficiency and effectiveness).

Total 0100 dollars available for reallocation: $1,160,000
Total System special dollars available: 110,000

Total dollars available for reallocation $1,270,000
FINANCE AND OPERATIONS
REALLOCATION WORKSHEET

1. Unit Mission

The Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations is committed to providing a broad array of quality administrative and support services that advance the University's mission of teaching, research, and public service. As stewards of the assets of the University of Minnesota, our mission is to serve the faculty, staff, and students in ways that exceed their expectations; and to meet institutional obligations that serve the long-term interests and needs of the University and the State. We best serve our customers as a diverse work force, using teamwork and employee involvement in ways that offer the opportunity for rewarding work.

2. Unit Vision

Units in Finance and Operations support students, faculty, staff, and Twin Cities campus visitors by providing a safe, and inviting environment in which to learn and work. Our goal is to constantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the services offered, while enhancing the University's credibility through careful stewardship of our assets.

3. Major Strategic Objectives

a. Enhance financial management systems, procedures, and information to ensure the most effective application of and accountability for the University's resources.

b. To ensure physical facilities are effectively managed to provide appropriate physical environment to accomplish the teaching, research and public service missions of the University.

c. Ensure reliable, cost effective, long term solutions for the delivery of utility services on the Twin Cities campus.

d. Undertake quality management program designed to maximize the effectiveness of the services.

e. Redesign human resource services to ensure a qualified, adequately compensated, secure, and productive work force.

4. Reallocation Strategy

Funding appropriation and reallocation targets are assigned to unit managers after review by the Vice President. All units have reallocation targets, representing a minimum of 10% state funds, excluding fixed costs such as fuel and utility, repair and replacement, and retirement benefits.
While each unit's strategy is somewhat different, all have the common theme of examining the value of services performed and the efficiency with which we perform those services. Quality management representing employee involvement, and increased use of technology also play significant roles in improvement strategies. The same strategies are being applied to non-state funded operations, which will result in service improvements or reduction in internally billed service costs.

Examples of actions being taken to meet our reallocation target include:

• Reorganization to reflect stronger customer orientation and streamline service delivery. (Physical plant, personnel, campus mail, stores and the controller's office fall into this category).

• Utilize UBEEP (University Building Energy Efficiency Program) and code surveys to manage physical assets.

• Institute planning and scheduling of shops work to realize cost effectiveness.

• Reduction of telecommunication service charges, which over a 5 year period results in $500,000 per year in reduced charges to units.

• Alternating Bursar teller services on the West Bank and St. Paul.

• Automating accounting validation and data entry of routine transactions.

• Eliminating Metrodome shuttle.

• Eliminating Campus Club contract.

• Automating student billing and financial aid distribution.

It is acknowledged that these strategies may mean fewer people to deliver services. In recognition of the University's belief that employees are our most valued resource, we are committed to offering staff training and transfer opportunities for continued employment within the University.

Total State dollars available for reallocation: $6,155,120
REALLOCATION PLAN
Office for Student Affairs

1. Unit Mission. The University of Minnesota's Office for Student Affairs provides services, programs, activities and co-curricular education designed to increase opportunities for students to access the University, adjust and succeed while at the University and prepare for productive citizenship upon leaving the University.

2. Unit Vision. The Office of Student Affairs strategic plan calls for a number of fundamental changes over the next five years. Underlying these changes is the desire to build a new identity which will replace the reactive mode of program planning with a student development vision which anticipates needs of students and of the University community and demonstrates the capability to design and deliver responsive and timely customer service-oriented programs.

Critical to this strategy is a continuing commitment to innovative management strategies to maximize existing resources. Additionally efforts will be made to identify alternative funding and service delivery strategies to augment current funding sources. Current reallocation plans include administrative reorganization and redesign in selected areas, focusing on high priority services, and strategies designed to reduce operating and personnel costs and/or improve productivity in all areas.

Immediate and mid-range administrative and programmatic changes which should result from this plan include designing community building programs, creating student development opportunities to promote diversity, initiating a commuter student program, redesigning the admissions process, introducing student development strategies in the Greek system, initiating aggressive targeted recruitment efforts, expanding and upgrading recruitment efforts, expanding and upgrading services for disabled students, strengthening retention programs, and encouraging greater involvement by students in developing and delivering volunteer programs and services which respond to needs in the greater metropolitan community.

3. Major Strategic Objectives.

   a. Design community building programs with special emphasis on underserved student groups including students of color, commuter students, graduate students, disabled students, gay/lesbian /bisexual students and fraternity and sorority members (Criteria: Centrality, Comparative Advantage).
   b. Initiate new efforts and refocus existing services and resources to promote diversity within the University Community (Criteria: Centrality, Comparative Advantage).
   c. Work with University units to redesign the admissions process including both recruitment and orientation as needed to assure responsiveness to students and support for the Undergraduate Initiative (Criteria: Quality, Efficiency and Effectiveness, Demand).
   d. Implement strategies such as aggressive targeted recruitment to assure that the goal of achieving increased enrollment of students of color is addressed (Criteria: Quality, Centrality, Comparative Advantage).
   e. Identify all disabled University students and provide access to all University programs and facilities for these students (Criteria: Centrality, Comparative Advantage, Demand).
   f. Maintain and improve existing student affairs activities which support the University's mission and goals (e.g. health services, student unions, counseling services and recreational programs and facilities) (Criteria: Quality, Centrality).
   g. Work with coordinate campuses to assure continuity in policy development and system-wide initiatives (Criteria: Quality, Centrality, Efficiency and Effectiveness).
h. Identify and invest in automation projects with attractive pay-back periods (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

4. Reallocation Strategy for Unit.

The plan provides for a reallocation of 10 percent of the Office for Student Affairs 0100 budget of $1,630,000 consistent with the Strategic Plan of the Office and University priorities. Of this total $500,000 will be reallocated to support high priority objectives outside of Student Affairs and $1,130,000 will be reallocated to enhance existing programs and fund new initiatives consistent with the University's stated priorities. Strategies proposed to achieve this reallocation are as follows:

a. Evaluate and prioritize existing services and activities within Student Affairs (Criteria: Comparative Advantage, Demand, Efficiency and Effectiveness).

b. Review services to eliminate duplication both within Student Affairs and between Student Affairs and other University organizational units (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

c. Redesign the administrative structure of selected organizational units within Student Affairs to optimize the delivery of programs, services and student development education to the campus communities (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

d. Identify changes in process and procedure and/or alternative means of service delivery which can reduce operating costs (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

e. Reallocate personnel and other resources to services that demonstrate crucial need (Criteria: Demand, Efficiency and Effectiveness).

f. Utilize existing staff to implement new programs wherever possible (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

g. Review all positions as they become vacant and hold vacant positions open to identify funds (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

h. Strengthen financial management resources throughout Student Affairs to provide increased coordination and oversight over fiscal activities (Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness).

i. Pursue alternative sources of funding for new student development program initiatives (Criterion: Effectiveness).

j. Explore the use of quality-management teams to identify more efficient and effective means of delivering services and programs (Criteria: Quality, Efficiency and Effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for reallocation without regard to how those resources will be used is $1,630,000. Of that total $500,000 to be reallocated to units outside of Student Affairs and $1,130,000 is planned for reallocation to high priority services and activities and new initiatives within Student Services.
MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGE CASE STATEMENT
OFFICE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

ADMISSIONS

1. Reasons for Change:
   a) Enrollment management goals have been instituted.
   b) Preparation requirements will be implemented beginning in 1991.
   c) The University must provide information that is concise and relevant, administering an admissions process that, for the student and the University, is cost efficient, responsive, and simple, e.g. readily understood and complied with, and select students who are prepared and able to perform successfully at the University (source: Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education, June 1, 1990).

2. Meeting Needs Previously Covered by Unit. Currently, admissions activities are performed by multiple collegiate units within the University as well as by the Admissions Office. Successful implementation of this program change will not only improve university-wide admissions programs but will also enhance the effectiveness of collegiate efforts and/or cause a reduction in resources currently dedicated by some colleges. Resources to effect these changes will be generated from existing funds allocated to Student Affairs by a combination of reducing lower priority functions, eliminating unnecessary duplication, and redesigning and restructuring existing service delivery systems to take advantage of more efficient and effective alternatives.

3. Description of Program Change. This program change will alter the ways prospective students are attracted, admitted and oriented to the University.

4. Background of the Decision. This change is an integral part of the emphasis on undergraduate education at the University during the last decade. Currently the Office of Admissions has completed an internal review, the collegiate units are participating in the second phase of that review and an all university review panel has been named with the intent of an external review before the end of 1991 academic year.

5. For More Information:
   Dr. Laurie Hayes
   Interim Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
   110 Morrill Hall
   624-5054
MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGE CASE STATEMENT

OFFICE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

TARGETED RECRUITMENT

1. Reasons for Change:
   a) The University of Minnesota is committed to increasing the number of minority students to 10 percent of total enrollment by 1994 (source: Task Force for Strengthening Excellence through Diversity Recommendations, November 28, 1990).
   b) Although the percentages of minority students have increased in many of the University's undergraduate colleges, these increases do not always reflect a rise in the total number of minority students (source: Task Force for Strengthening Excellence through Diversity Recommendations, November 28, 1990).
   c) The need to meet this challenge is complicated by recently instituted enrollment limits and uniform preparation requirements.
   d) To foster informed choices, by students and by the University, targeted recruitment must become a partnership among students, parents, high school faculty and counselors, and university faculty and staff (source: Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education, June 1, 1990).

2. Meeting Needs Previously Covered by Unit. Currently, targeted recruitment activities by collegiate units are sporadic and uncoordinated. At the same time resources allocated to targeted admissions activity by the Admissions Office are not sufficient to achieve the University's goals. Successful implementation of this program change will not only improve university-wide targeted recruitment programs but will also enhance the effectiveness of collegiate efforts. Resources to effect these changes will be generated from existing funds allocated to Student Affairs by a combination of reducing lower priority functions, eliminating unnecessary duplication, and redesigning and restructuring existing service delivery systems to take advantage of more efficient and effective alternatives.

3. Description of Program Change. This program change will 1) alter the ways prospective students are identified, attracted, and admitted to the University; 2) support the University's commitment to increase the number of minority students; and 3) provide the rich and diverse university community necessary to achieve excellence.

4. Background of the Decision. Despite the increased attention to minority recruitment in the last five years, the University's efforts remain largely uncoordinated and unfocused. The current University administration's commitment to increased minority recruitment is reflected in the formation of the Task Force for Strengthening Excellence through Diversity and the submission of a series of specific recommendations to the President on December 18, 1990 as well as the President's decision to include as one of his eight primary goals and objectives for 1990-1991 "...to ensure a sense of community that recognizes, appreciates, and fosters unity with diversity".
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MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGE CASE STATEMENT
OFFICE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMUNITY BUILDING

1. Reasons for Change:
   a) Retention is an explicit goal of the University and involvement in community is a key to retention of students, faculty and staff; (source: Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education, June 1, 1990).

   b) The recent incidents involving hate crimes on the Twin Cities campuses only reinforce the need to create community and a sense of shared values within the University community.

   c) The Twin Cities campus is a special challenge because of its size, complexity, urban location, commuting student body. (source: Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education, June 1, 1990).

2. Meeting Needs Previously Covered by Unit. In the past there has been no coordinated and coherent effort to create a sense of community. To the extent that there have been any formal community building efforts, they have occurred at the collegiate or departmental level. Developing a focused and coordinated university wide community-building program will have a multiplier effect on current efforts and increase the likelihood of success in meeting this goal. Resources to effect these changes will be generated from existing funds allocated to Student Affairs by a combination of reducing lower priority functions, eliminating unnecessary duplication, and redesigning and restructuring existing service delivery systems to take advantage of more efficient and effective alternatives.

3. Description of Program Change. This program change will not only focus on university-wide community building efforts but will also direct attention to special and underserved populations within the University community. Examples of program changes include expanding services to commuter students, students of color, and disabled students.

4. Background of the Decision. In recent years the importance of institutional culture and climate as a contributing factor to academic success has come under increasing scrutiny. Its importance to the current administration is reflected in its inclusion among the President's primary goals and objectives for 1990-1991.

5. For More Information:

   Nicholas Barbatsis
   Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
   9 Morrill Hall
   624-0542
RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION: IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES

Coordinate Campuses
Context

For several years, the University of Minnesota has been engaged in a system-wide effort to improve the quality of its teaching, research, and public service programs. Quality had suffered because dramatic growth in demands for programs could not be matched by growth in resources. Trying to be all things to all people -- without the money to do so -- meant doing things less well, and that cannot continue in the increasingly competitive world of the 1990s. The University of Minnesota is the state's most important economic development institution, and quality improvements in the University are certainly among Minnesota's most important investments in the future.

From the outset of this effort, the University has recognized that a major share of the quality improvement effort must come from within -- from careful reallocation of existing budgets -- shifting funds from lower priority programs to higher priorities. That means making very tough choices among programs in which the state, the University, and communities have had long-term investments.

Over the next five years, the University's goal is the reallocation of 10% of its annual, state-funded budget, shifting approximately $60 million -- making those changes according to careful academic planning that is geared to the quality improvements that deliver the best return to the state. The state's current financial difficulties make it perfectly clear that the University cannot count on new state dollars -- that the University must assume the responsibility to find its own ways to improve.

Recommendation

After thorough review of UMW's program, enrollment, and costs, plus the additional information and program alternatives provided by the UMW community, it is the University administration's recommendation to the Board of Regents that the UMW program be phased out by June 30, 1992.

Rationale

Although UMW has been viewed as valuable to the agricultural and agribusiness communities, it has not maintained the enrollment needed to make the program cost-effective.
• Down to 809 Full Year Equivalent students from a high of 1009 in 1980-81, the declining enrollment has produced high costs-per-student -- nearly twice the University-wide average for freshmen and sophomores.

• 1988-89 instructional costs were $9,407 for UMW, compared to the University's system-wide average of $5086 for freshmen and sophomores, and $7091 for all levels, undergraduate, professional, and graduate.

In addition to the increasing cost problem, measures of educational outcomes are not encouraging. Only about one-third of the students who would ideally finish degrees each year are doing so.

• Last year 17% of UMW's students received degrees, compared to an optimal goal of 50% for a two-year program.

• About 27% of UMW's students are either not seeking degrees or are undecided about their major field of study.

Finally, alternative educational programs are available in this region to nearly two-thirds of UMW's students.

• Of UMW students who declared majors in Fall, 1990, 23% declared veterinary technology and 12% declared horse management; the remaining 65% declared program fields that are available in other schools in the region.

Principles Underlying the Recommendation

The closing date of June 30, 1992, is recommended in order to give students now enrolled at UMW time to complete their degree programs, and the University will take care to assist students in reaching that goal.

The phase-out period also will allow the reassignment, retraining, and in-placement or out-placement of UMW faculty and staff. Changes will be made while meeting, and, where possible, exceeding contractual obligations to employees, and more detailed plans for this assistance will be completed by the time the reallocation recommendation is presented to the Board of Regents for action in March.

This reallocation recommendation does not involve any change in the Southern Experiment Station or the Minnesota Extension Service activities in Waseca.
Procedures

This recommendation has been submitted to the Board of Regents as an integral part of a package of reallocations. It was on the Board’s January 11 agenda for discussion.

On January 30, the Board is holding a public forum -- 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. in Room 135 of the Earle Brown Center on the St. Paul campus -- for individuals and representatives who register with the Regents’ Office to speak on any of the reallocations recommendations.

Final administrative recommendations will then be submitted to the Board for information at the February meeting and for action at the March meeting.

January 17, 1991
1. **Unit Mission.** The University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC) provides access to undergraduate education at the University with associate degrees in agriculture, natural resources, business, hotel/restaurant management, human ecology, and the arts and sciences as part of its statewide mission of teaching, research and service.

       The campus serves as a center for the University with programs and activities to meet the continuing education, economic and societal needs of residents of the region.

2. **Unit Vision.** UMC is the access point for the University of Minnesota in teaching, research, and service for this area of the state. Undergraduate instruction and thus the mission of the institution will be enhanced by the addition of the Associate in Arts and selected baccalaureate degrees. Research connections will be strengthened with the Agricultural Utilization Research Institute, the Experiment Station, and with other universities to enhance UMC's economic and human resources development roles and to augment applied research involvement and productivity.

       UMC serves as the University's regional center for technology transfer and outreach, meeting the needs of a regionally based, rural populace which requires lifelong learning, training and retraining in order to capture opportunities which maximize their existing resources and strengths.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives For The Unit.**

   a. To strengthen and expand the curriculum in light of the College's revised mission. Eliminate some of the technical AAS courses, add courses for the AA, identify similar/same courses at other institutions to facilitate transfer arrangements, incorporate more interdisciplinary, environmental, international, cultural and other prevailing issues into existing courses (centrality, comparative advantage, demand, efficiency).

   b. To reorganize the academic and administrative structure to accommodate the evolution from AAS to AS to extended baccalaureate degrees which involves fewer but larger units (centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

   c. To establish with other higher education institutions within the region a mechanism for sharing of courses, programs, and degrees (demand, efficiency).

   d. To identify strategies and means for utilizing existing and emerging telecommunications facilities to deliver educational services within the regional service area (demand, efficiency and effectiveness).
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e. To establish a Center for External Studies to coordinate with other higher educational and research institutions the training, workshop, career development, and other informational activities responsive to the businesses and individuals in the Red River Basin (centrality, demand).

f. To strengthen the college's institutional research capability in order to more effectively assess the institution's programs and activities, as well as to facilitate faculty participation in applied research to service the region (quality, effectiveness).

4. Reallocation Strategy For The Unit.

a. Faculty, staff and open positions will be reassigned to courses and academic and student support services to match the strategic plan priorities (centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Partnerships and contracts will be increased with other units within the University (MES and Experiment Station in particular), with the Agricultural Utilization Research Institute, and with other higher education and research entities (quality, comparative advantage, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

c. Higher education planning, coordination, and structuring on a regional basis will be initiated (quality, comparative advantage, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

d. Reductions in the number of academic and student support units will be implemented, consistent with the revised curriculum (demand and efficiency and effectiveness).

5. Reallocation Dollars.

UMC will reallocate $680,000 within the campus as a part of this plan. No dollars are available for central allocation.
CASE STATEMENT - Moving Toward Select Baccalaureate Degrees at UMC

BACKGROUND

UMC is the access point for the University in teaching, research and service for Northwest Minnesota. Undergraduate instruction and thus the mission of the institution will be enhanced by the addition of selected baccalaureate degrees. This also would strengthen the University's research contributions within the region.

JUSTIFICATION

- Baccalaureate programming better reflects the role of the campus in terms of its mission as a part of a land-grant institution.
- By expanding with selected baccalaureate programs, economies are achieved in cost and in space utilization.
- Baccalaureate degrees fit well in promoting applied research, in addressing environmental, agricultural product use, and the human and economic development issues.
- There is no four-year college in Region I.
- Similar degrees in agriculture, natural resources, hotel/restaurant, and human ecology are not readily available at a majority of the neighboring institutions.
- 70% of the students enrolling in the fall of 1990 indicated their desire to receive a baccalaureate degree. Nearly all of these students indicated they would like to receive the degree from the University of Minnesota, Crookston.
OPERATIONAL PLAN

To accomplish the above objective, UMC will reorganize its academic and administrative structure to accommodate the evolution from two-year AAS degrees to selected baccalaureate degrees. The curriculum will be modified by eliminating some lower division undergraduate courses, and expanded by adding upper division undergraduate courses to expand the transfer role and to initiate baccalaureate programs. Most of the necessary academic and student support components required to implement the four-year programming are in place. The campus physical plant also has the capacity to accommodate an increase from 800 fulltime student enrollment to 1200 - 1400 students. Approximately twenty additional faculty/staff would be needed over time as the campus incorporates the arts and science transfer and baccalaureate roles into its mission as part of the University of Minnesota.

For More Information:

Donald Sargeant, Chancellor, University of Minnesota, Crookston

(218) 281-6510
1. Campus Mission*.

The University of Minnesota, Duluth (UMD) serves the state and the nation as a medium-sized comprehensive university dedicated to excellence in all of its programs and operations. As a university community in which knowledge is sought as well as taught, its faculty recognize the importance of scholarship and service, the intrinsic value of research, and the significance of a primary commitment to quality teaching.

At UMD, a firm liberal arts foundation anchors a variety of traditional degree programs, outreach offerings, and selected professional and graduate studies. Active learning through internships, honors programs, research, and community service promotes the development of skills, critical thinking, and maturity sought by society. Demanding standards of performance for students, faculty, and staff make UMD attractive to students with strong academic potential. Opportunities for international experience and a faculty representative of the cultural diversity in each of the academic disciplines on our campus are critical to the attainment of our mission.

The campus contributes to meeting the area's cultural and entertainment needs and serves as a focal point for the economic development of the region through community outreach and through an emphasis on the sea-grant and land-grant components of its program.

Providing both the attributes of a research-oriented university and an environment like a small liberal arts college, the University of Minnesota, Duluth, seeks the student looking for a program that emphasizes a personalized living-learning experience on a medium-sized campus of a major university.

* The mission statement has been modified to reflect an emphasis on international education, cultural diversity, and to eliminate a reference to Commitment to Focus. These changes have not been reviewed by appropriate deliberative bodies at UMD or submitted to the Regents.

2. Campus Vision.

The University of Minnesota, Duluth (UMD) is an educational institution dedicated to the belief that human progress is possible through the dissemination of knowledge, advances in knowledge and technology, and an awareness, understanding, and acceptance of the diversity of cultures, values, aspirations, and life styles of the citizens of our own community and the peoples of the world. Advances in knowledge and learning can take place only within an environment which prizes truth and honesty in scholarship and teaching, and fosters an atmosphere of openness and respect among all those who have come to UMD to work, teach, and learn.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit.

(A) To review all administrative and academic services with the focus on quality management and a belief in the concept of continuous quality improvement. Regular quality reviews will be scheduled and appropriate measurable performance standards will be established for all UMD services and academic programs (criteria: quality, efficiency).

(B) To attract and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff committed to our mission and vision (criteria: quality and centrality).
(C) To provide a curriculum committed to cultural diversity taught by a faculty representative of the pool of professionals in each discipline and the student body (criteria: quality, centrality).

(D) To attract and support students who would benefit from a UMD education. This support will focus on regular contact with all students and be responsive to evolving needs including academic counseling, adequate course offerings, financial aid, access services, opportunities for extracurricular involvement, cultural awareness activities, and placement (criteria: demand, efficiency, comparative advantage).

(E) To strengthen the curriculum to insure its effectiveness in meeting the professional and personal needs of our students (criteria: centrality, demand, comparative advantage).

(F) To support the professional development needs (research, continuing education, and library) of our faculty and staff focusing on those activities that further our mission and vision (criteria: centrality, effectiveness, quality).

(G) To seek accreditation for all programs at UMD which are necessary for our graduates or give us and our graduates a clear comparative advantage while fostering our mission (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage).

(H) To provide a living and physical learning environment which encourages educational development on a safe, well-maintained campus (criteria: efficiency, effectiveness).

(I) To accept and work to facilitate the legislative goal of mission differentiation between the various higher education systems within the state (criteria: centrality, efficiency, effectiveness).

4. Reallocation Strategy for the Unit.

Phase I - 1990-1992

UMD will begin implementation of Phase I of the reallocation plan during the current academic year. Phase I would include programmatic fund transfers in academic units initiating quality improvement efforts, and provide for the orderly elimination of the UMD dental hygiene program (criteria: quality, centrality, demand, comparative advantage, efficiency).

a) Reallocation within the College of Liberal Arts to strengthen composition ($22,000), political science ($47,000), and to build an American Indian Studies Department ($119,000).

Total $188,500

b) Reallocation within the School of Fine Arts to increase liberal arts courses, respond to demand for graphic arts, and build strength in the Theatre Department.

Total $167,000

c) Shift of administrative positions to support external relations, support of campus recycling, commit funds and reallocate effort of Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Student Life to develop the structure for a campus-wide emphasis on Total Quality Management, and reduction of overall campus transportation budget.

Total $201,000
d) In the College of Education and Human Services Professions, complete shift from Home Economics to Special Education and eliminate the Dental Hygiene Program.

Total $404,000

GRAND TOTAL FOR PHASE I - $960,500

Phase II - 1992-96

Identification of Additional Reallocation

(A) The additional steps to be taken to fulfill our reallocation obligation are listed below. Work on each item is currently or soon to be underway. The remaining reallocation required is $2,890,000. It is expected that we will again have a plan which will transfer effort from lower to higher priority activities as well as identify some programs which will be curtailed. The plans will be reviewed and revised more carefully by the UMD Budget Committee, Campus Planning Committee, and other appropriate groups.

a) All programs that are currently accredited or seeking accreditation will be reviewed to determine if it is in the University's interest to retain unaccredited programs. It will be determined what will be necessary to secure future accreditations. The result of this analysis will prioritize accreditation plans and could result in the elimination or consolidation of some accredited programs. Our analysis thus far has led us to the conclusion that we will provide the resources necessary to seek accreditation of our social work program during the current fiscal year. Teacher education programs are to be reviewed for reaccreditation within the next two years, and we are currently of the opinion that our business programs should also seek accreditation (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage).

b) UMD will review every staff retirement and vacancy to ensure that the campus's resources will address our priority needs (criteria: demand, efficiency, centrality).

c) UMD will examine all academic programs with respect to production of majors, quality of program, centrality to mission, and cost effectiveness to determine if any of them should be considered for elimination or receive a reduction in the resources currently provided to them (criteria: quality, centrality, demand, efficiency).

d) Administrative quality reviews during this year or the next will include Police and Parking Services, Athletics, Plant Services, Personnel departments. Academic Support and Student Life units will also be reviewed during the same period using the Baldrige criteria. Academic programs which are currently being reviewed include Counseling, Music Education, and the Master of Business Administration. We have recently completed reviews in Biology, Communicative Disorders, and English (criteria: quality, efficiency).

e) The structure of administration in all units will be examined on the basis of efficiency and effectiveness (criteria: efficiency, effectiveness).
f) We will be reviewing the appropriate level of clerical and SEE support in various disciplines based on the number of faculty, majors, student credit hours generated, and research productivity. Our goal is to provide equal access to those resources based on these criteria until such time as full need can be met in all disciplines (criteria: quality, effectiveness).

Programs Strengthened by Reallocation

(B) Listed below are areas which can be strengthened by reallocation. If our allocation plans as outlined in Phase I are approved, we have $390,000 that can be applied to these needs. We will need a substantial amount of new funding in addition to reallocated funds in order to achieve these goals.

a) Recurring funds which would initially be used for continued education, retraining and/or placement services for faculty and staff members affected by reallocation, will become a centrally held faculty development and research fund.

Total $60,000

b) Make programmatic improvement and strengthen high quality programs in the liberal arts, fine arts, and sciences and provide recurring funds for basic courses and high quality programs.

- Reallocate to meet shifting student demand and improve access to courses in mathematics, basic sciences, communications, accounting, sociology, criminology and psychology.

Total $370,000

- Build on undergraduate initiative already begun and strengthen high quality programs in the liberal arts, fine arts, and sciences.

Total $250,000

- Provide more courses and programs in management and administration for undergraduate students in the arts and sciences and provide the foundation for applied intercollegiate master's programs in arts management, engineering management, and urban and regional planning and administration.

Total $250,000

- Basic support for instructional programs and faculty research.

Total $160,000

c) Provide essential maintenance and improvements to library acquisitions, computer use in instruction, and instructional equipment for the sciences and other areas.

Total $500,000

d) Provide funds, as needed, for high quality programs which require accreditation or for which accreditation is desirable (criteria: quality and centrality).

Total $350,000
e) Provide funds for diversity efforts in student programs and retention, improve services to disabled students, develop an aggressive faculty recruitment program (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage).

- Provide access to working and educational careers to students with disabilities and under-represented minorities. ($120,000)

- Reorganization of international studies within CLA to improve connections with other programs in the enhancement of cultural diversity, reallocate funds for special diversity initiatives such as the Colombian quincentenary celebration, and reallocation of effort to develop a linguistics and language program which takes advantage of the unique cultural attributes of the Lake Superior region and provides a resource to the public schools in the Arrowhead region. ($120,000)

- Provide funds to support recruitment, advisement, and retention efforts in the collegiate units. ($50,000)

- Provide funds for visiting minority faculty members, all campus recruitment of minority faculty members. ($200,000)

**Total** $490,000

f) Support international activities of faculty members and visiting scholars and improve the international education experiences for students (criteria: quality and comparative advantage).

**Total** $100,000

**Grand Total for Phase II** - $2,530,000

The plan provides for a reallocation of 10 percent of the campus 0100 budget (approximately $3,850,000 net of our utility, repair, and replacement allocations) consistent with priorities of the campus. We will do our best to achieve our requested target. We consider the goal vital because our funding priorities, as outlined earlier, are not new programmatic initiatives but meet basic programmatic student needs. In fact, in order to meet our goal completely using some combination of transfer of effort and programmatic curtailments, we will still be short of fully funding our list of needs. (An honest concern is that transfers within a unit will be easier than cuts which will result in campus-wide reallocatable funds. Both types of reallocation are going to be necessary to achieve our goal.) To do it in light of the partial funded growth in our student enrollment is more difficult. Any assistance which can be provided centrally to help us with our plan or which might identify additional funding sources would be appreciated.

The reallocation does not attempt to address the salary improvement need of the campus, student scholarships, or the operation of new space needs, all of which remain the highest priorities that will need legislative or central action to help us address. It also assumes that the student body will be relatively stable for the next four years, growing from 7,900 to 8,000 with an anticipated enrollment of approximately 9,000 by the year 2000 (criteria: demand, comparative advantage, quality).
Case Statement - Campus Transportation Budget

1. REASONS FOR THE CHANGE:
   a. With the closing of Torrance Hall this fall we no longer have any university housing which requires bus transportation.
   b. We feel the elimination of $40,000 from this budget will permit funding of the current service need and permit transfer of fund to higher campus priority needs.
   c. The recommended change is based on efficiency and demand.

2. HOW WILL THE NEEDS BE COVERED?

   As discussed above, current service needs can be met with the reduced budget and there will be no impact on other units of the university or the state.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM CHANGE AND BACKGROUND OF THE DECISION:

   The campus has an $80,000 transportation budget which has been used to bus students from Torrance Hall to the campus. In the past this service was also provided to students living at Capehart and at area hotels. We have recently added 700 beds to our on-campus housing and no longer need to provide campus supported housing at remote sites. In addition we provide a route subsidy to the Duluth Transit Authority for a route through our major off-campus housing area to the campus, and finally we have instituted a plan to subsidize monthly bus passes to students and staff to reduce on-campus parking pressure. These latter two services can be provided at current levels with the reduced budget.

5. FOR MORE INFORMATION:

   Gregory R. Fox
   Vice Chancellor, Finance and Operations
   519 Darland Administration Building
   University of Minnesota, Duluth
   Duluth, Minnesota 55812
   (218) 726-7101
CASE STATEMENT ON PROGRAM CHANGE: DENTAL HYGIENE

1. Reasons

a) This two year program (three if the pre-dental hygiene is counted) is the least central to our mission. It is a professional/vocational program with little connection to other programs.

b) In comparison with other types of majors and degree programs we believe that dental hygiene is one which can be delivered by one of the two year institutions of higher education in the state.

c) Accreditation requirements and other factors make this program one of the more expensive on campus - two to three times the campus average. It occupies a lot of space per student and will have laboratory equipment needs in the next few years.

2. How will needs be covered?

a) Program will not be eliminated until spring of 1993; present students will be served.

b) A report from The Ad Hoc Committee to Study Supply and Demand of Dental Hygienists in Minnesota (April 15, 1987) states that existing demand can be supplied by programs at U of M, Twin Cities, Mankato, and Normandale. HECB is re-studying the situation.

c) A number of other two year institutions in the state are interested in starting dental hygiene programs. HECB or some other agency needs to decide on the number and location of such programs.
3. Description of Program Change.

The intention is to eliminate the program in the spring of 1993; we need to operate the program at a level to retain accreditation until that time.

4. Background.

This is the fourth or fifth time that the program has been slated for elimination. This is not a conspiracy, but the independent judgment of four or five administrations that the program is less central to our mission than others. The initial recommendations were made by the Vice Chancellors. A written plan was sent to five faculty committees on campus. Some modifications were made, but there was little opposition to the elimination of this program.

5. For more information contact:

Acting Vice Chancellor Robert Evans
420 Darland Administration Building
Duluth, Minnesota 55812
(218) 726-7103
CASEx STATEMENT FOR THE SHIFT OF THE ASSISTANT VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
ACADEMIC SUPPORT AND STUDENT LIFE POSITION TO A SIMILAR POSITION
IN EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Reason for the Change:
For several years, UMD has not had a senior management position
in external affairs. Since the Assistant Vice Chancellor had
personal interest in this area and had related responsibilities
in her original job description, it was determined that a shift
was both possible and beneficial for the institution.

How Will Unit Needs Be Met?
The Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Student Life has
incorporated Student Conduct Code Coordinator and budget
management responsibilities into his job duties. Committee
assignments and other duties have been reassigned. The position
will not be replaced.

Program Change:
The Assistant Vice Chancellor will provide leadership in the
areas of development, media relations and alumni relations. She
will report directly to the Chancellor.

Background of the Decision:
One of the recommendations that emerged from the Assistant Vice
Chancellor's spring '90 administrative review was that her
talents were underutilized. External Relations was identified as
an opportunity area for expanded involvement. The Assistant Vice
Chancellor was asked if she would be interested in exploring the
alternative, the office of Affirmative Action was asked if such a
shift would be possible and Academic Support and Student
leadership was asked to look at the implications for a shift for
the unit. When all parties concurred that it was a unique
opportunity for UMD, the final decision was made.

For more information, please contact:

Bruce L. Gildaeth, Vice Chancellor
Academic Support and Student Life
297 Darland Administration Building
10 University Drive
Duluth, MN 55812
(218) 726-8501

(B:012291.bud)
CASE STATEMENT FOR REALLOCATION OF AN OPEN LINE IN CIVIL SERVICE AND THE REALLOCATION OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC SUPPORT AND STUDENT LIFE'S TIME TO TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT.

Reason for the Change:
Improving quality is a top priority for the President and the University. How UMD achieves it requires an ongoing, long-term commitment to continuous improvement. The reallocation of funds will contribute to the development of an infrastructure for training and support of an institution-wide effort.

How Will Unit Needs Be Met?
The Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Student Life will commit one-third of his time to this initiative. The Civil Service retirement will not be replaced.

Program Change:
The Chancellor and the UMD Steering Committee are committed to continue learning about total quality management and to look for ways to relate it to UMD and higher education. UMD has also agreed to be a pilot site for the Minnesota Council for Quality education initiative.

Background of the Decision:
A 1990-91 Academic Support and Student Life initiative was to provide UMD with information about total quality management and to pilot it within the division. Since then an institution-wide steering committee has been formed and has begun work in a number of areas. The Chancellor feels we are now ready to put together an infrastructure that can support a broader institutional effort.

For more information, please contact:
Bruce L. Gildseth, Vice Chancellor
Academic Support and Student Life
297 Darland Administration Building
10 University Drive
Duluth, MN 55812
(218) 726-8501

(B:012291a.bud)
1. **Unit Mission.** UMM is a geographically separate, residential, undergraduate, liberal arts college offering the quality and academic reputation of the University of Minnesota along with the special atmosphere of a small college where opportunities exist for personalized education. The primary purpose of UMM is education leading to the baccalaureate degree in liberal arts disciplines, preparation for teaching in elementary and secondary education, and preprofessional education.

2. **Unit Vision.** UMM intends a place among the best undergraduate liberal arts colleges in the nation through its instructional excellence and innovative general education, the richness of its extracurricular program and services, its physical facilities, the academic ability of its students and its institutional climate. It intends to be a nationally-cited example of the public liberal arts college. During the next decade UMM will take major steps toward greater diversity and internationalism.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives.**

   a. **Maintain and enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience.** Example: emphasize hiring to tenure track or permanent administrative post of persons with multiple competencies, e.g., teaching in discipline and ProsPer, the new general education; living in residence hall and programming such student activities as minority retention. (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage);

   b. **Maintain and enhance diversity of students, faculty, staff and curriculum.** Example: strengthen the Faculty Mentor Program for minority students. (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage);

   c. **Maintain and enhance the internationalization of the campus, its students, faculty, staff and curriculum.** Example: develop an international education office and secure an off-campus international house. (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage);

   d. **Maintain and enhance the collegiality of the campus.** Example: properly staff and provide programming for the new Student Center. (criteria: centrality, comparative advantage, demand);

   e. **Maintain and enhance the automation of the campus.** Example: develop computing capability for all operations of the college. (criteria: quality, effectiveness).

   f. **Maintain and enhance the entire spectrum of external affairs, alumni, development, university relations.** Example: develop a program to increase alumni contributions. (criteria: comparative advantage, effectiveness).
4. **Reallocation strategy.** The following are five examples of means which will be developed to reallocate 10% of the Campus's 0100 budget or $1,200,000 consistent with the Strategic Plan for the University:

a. Hire replacements for present faculty and administration resignations and retirements by position descriptions which permit reallocation to more flexible assignments. (criteria: centrality, quality, comparative advantage);

b. Phase out the present Health Education major, reallocating that instruction to a general education requirement in health fitness. (criterion: centrality);

c. Reallocate funds and recruitment pool for some targeted short-term faculty from M.A./A.B.D. graduate students to such non-conventional sources as faculty emeriti, high school and community college instructors on sabbatical leave, foreign visitors. (criteria: quality, effectiveness);

d. Work toward an academic calendar with an earlier start, reallocating funds for housing and feeding students in early-fall activities and deriving more June conference revenue. (criteria: comparative advantage; effectiveness);

e. Transfer clerical activity from that which could be automated, e.g., barcoding, to more productive activity. (criterion: effectiveness).

**Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used:** $1,200,000

27 December 90; revised 22 January 91
1. Consistent with the University of Minnesota goal to raise the quality of instruction and student support, University of Minnesota, Morris, has decided to phase out its major program in Health Education. There are three principal reasons for this change:

   a. The North Central reaccreditation team which visited the campus in spring 1990 questioned the educational quality of the Health Education major in view of its minimal faculty staffing.

   b. With the exception of its providing a necessary course for elementary education majors, a course which will continue to be taught, the Health Education major is only minimally interdependent with other majors on the campus.

   c. The teacher licensure program in physical education, a logical complement to health education, was eliminated some years ago.

2. An undergraduate major in health education is available at the university's Duluth campus, at several of the state universities and in some area private colleges.

3. The teaching, supply and equipment resources now devoted to Health Education will be shifted to permit the development of a strong General Education requirement in health and fitness. That requirement is a part of the new Project ProsPer, a commitment the institution has included in its current catalog.

4. The Campus Resources and Planning Committee recommended the dissolution of the Health Education major in 1988 because of its lack of centrality to the campus mission. That action was subsequently voted down in the Campus Assembly after vigorous discussion. The reallocation discussions in Fall 1990 returned to the topic. The chairperson of the Division of Education discussed the possibility of such a change with key faculty members in the Physical Education and Health disciplinary group. Again the criterion of centrality of mission was the principal reason for the decision. Health Education is not crucial to a liberal arts curriculum.

5. Contact Elizabeth S. Blake, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean, 612-589-6015.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION: IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES

Reallocation Worksheets and Case Statements

Academic Affairs
CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

1. **Unit Mission** The mission of CSOM is to understand and improve the process of management and to transfer and extend the usefulness of that understanding via its teaching programs.

2. **Unit Vision** CSOM seeks a national and international reputation through the preparation and placement of its graduates and the dissemination of its research. Moreover, the School recognizes a special relationship with and responsibility to the region's business firms, labor unions, governmental units, and not-for-profit agencies in furthering improved management study and practice.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives**
   - Restructure MBA program to address legitimate concerns regarding breadth of curriculum, internationalization, corporate social responsibility, leadership, and entrepreneurship/innovation (criteria: quality, comparative advantage, demand)
   - Develop an International Management program to strengthen the school in an area that will become more and more essential to maintaining a national and international reputation as time goes on (criteria: centrality, comparative advantage, demand)
   - Add undergraduate emphasis in Management Information Systems to meet the expressed demand on the part of employers and students (criteria: quality, comparative advantage, demand)
   - Add funding for five additional Ph.D. students to bring three programs up to critical mass (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness)
   - Restructure BSB Regular program so as to shift and/or add resources so as to provide more management classes for non-management students (criteria: centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness)

4. **Reallocation Strategy**
   - Cutting faculty lines and thus payroll via dropping certain concentrations/sections within MBA/MAIR programs where demand is small by MBA/MAIR program standards (criteria: centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness)
   - Cutting faculty lines and thus payroll via dropping certain concentrations/sections within BSB programs where demand is small by BSB program standards (criteria: centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness)
   - Cutting faculty lines and thus payroll via dropping certain sections within Ph.D. programs where equivalent sections are available elsewhere in the University (criteria: comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness)
   - Reallocating faculty lines from areas that deliver courses/concentrations out of which student placement is relatively low to areas that deliver courses/concentrations out of which student placement is high. This strategy will require much tougher decisions than a and b above and will be accomplished only with a complete revision of one or more of our degree programs (criteria: comparative advantage, demand)
   - To maximize funds available for reallocation and to guarantee an amount no less than 10 percent CSOM will restructure the administrative organization of the school, establish a new system for distributing supplies, equipment and expense (SEE) dollars that is aimed at providing incentives that should reduce total SEE requirements, and increase the transfers from outreach programs to academic programs (criteria: efficiency and effectiveness)

5. Total unit dollars to be reallocated over 5 years: $1,465,000.
CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
CASE STATEMENT ON MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGE

ELIMINATING SECTIONS WITHIN MBA/MAIR PROGRAMS

Support for the Proposed Program Change

On the basis of centrality, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness, we are proposing to eliminate a number of sections now offered annually as part of our MBA/MAIR programs. It is anticipated that elimination of the sections will in some cases require the elimination of concentrations currently available to our MBA/MAIR students.

The school now offers MBA and MAIR degree programs. There are roughly 1700 students currently enrolled in these programs.

By comparison of our program with those of our competitors, we have determined that our competitive position, as well as our quality, would not be significantly affected by an increase in the average enrollment in concentration and elective sections within these programs. Therefore we will be eliminating electives and concentrations that make it impossible for each of our seven departments to achieve a target average enrollment per section.

The risk comes from the possibility that the range of concentrations and electives will be reduced to such a level that we would not be considered a full-line MBA program school. Such a consequence would be quite harmful to our objectives. We are currently investigating the details to measure the magnitude of this risk. If it is great, we would recommend adding students rather than cutting faculty lines. The net result financially would be the same.

How Will The Need Be Met

The students in these programs who would otherwise have taken the sections we will be eliminating would switch from those classes with low demand to classes within the Carlson school with higher demand, but still with excess capacity. The consequences for the rest of the university would be almost nonexistent.

Proposed Program Change

We are proposing to eliminate a number of sections (and perhaps, therefore, concentrations) now offered annually as part of our MBA/MAIR programs. The number of sections to be canceled could be enough to reduce the need for faculty by three lines.

Background of the Decision

We identified average enrollments in elective sections at our competitor schools. We knew the average enrollment in our own elective sections. We determined that our average enrollments were below those of our competitors. We determined that the advantages of the lower enrollment in these professional programs were negligible. We established a target average enrollment that would put us closer to the average for our competitors. In order to meet this average, given degree requirements and the size of our BSB programs, we determined that enough sections could be eliminated to reduce faculty requirements by up to three faculty lines.

The general outlines of this proposal have been discussed and approved by each of the seven department chairs and the two program directors as part of the Faculty Executive Committee discussions. The deans'
office and program offices are now in the process of proposing specific sections to be cut. These specific proposals will then be taken up with each of the departments to determine the risks involved.

Source of More Information

Timothy Nantell, Acting Dean
214 Management and Economics Tower
624-3558
ELIMINATING SECTIONS WITHIN BSB PROGRAMS

Support for the Proposed Program Change

On the basis of centrality, demand, and efficiency and effectiveness, we are proposing to eliminate a number of sections now offered annually as part of our BSB programs. It is anticipated that elimination of the sections could in some cases require the elimination of concentrations currently available to our BSB students.

The school now offers Regular and Accounting BSB degree programs. There are roughly 900 students in these programs spread between their junior and senior years. By the fall of 1992, the enrollment will be reduced to 750 students.

By comparison of our program with those of our competitors, we have determined that our competitive position, as well as our quality, would not be significantly affected by an increase in the average enrollment in concentration and elective sections within these programs. Therefore we will be eliminating electives and concentrations that make it impossible for each of our seven departments to achieve a target average enrollment per section.

The risk comes from the possibility that the range of concentrations and electives will be reduced to such a level that we would not be considered a full-line BSB program school. Such a consequence would be quite harmful to our objectives. We are currently investigating the details to measure the magnitude of this risk. If it is great, discussions with the university would have to held to determine how best to resolve the tradeoffs.

How Will The Need Be Met

The students in these programs who would otherwise have taken the sections we will be eliminating would switch from those classes with low demand to classes within the Carlson school with higher demand, but still with excess capacity. The consequences for the rest of the university would be almost nonexistent.

Proposed Program Change

We are proposing to eliminate a number of sections (and perhaps, therefore, concentrations) now offered annually as part of our BSB programs. The number of sections to be canceled could be enough to reduce the need for faculty by two lines.

Background of the Decision

We identified average enrollments in elective sections at our competitor schools. We knew the average enrollment in our own elective sections. We determined that our average enrollments were below those of our competitors. We determined that the advantages of the lower enrollment in these professional programs were negligible. We established a target average enrollment that would put us closer to the average for our competitors. In order to meet this average, given degree requirements and the size of our MBA/MAIR programs, we determined that enough sections could be eliminated to reduce faculty requirements by up to two faculty lines.
The general outlines of this proposal have been discussed and approved by each of the seven department chairs and the two program directors as part of the Faculty Executive Committee discussions. The deans' office and program offices are now in the process of proposing specific sections to be cut. These specific proposals will then be taken up with each of the departments to determine the risks involved.

Source of More Information

Timothy Nantell, Acting Dean
214 Management and Economics Tower
624-3558
Support for the Proposed Program Change

On the basis of comparative advantage and efficiency and effectiveness, we are proposing to eliminate a number of sections now offered annually as part of our PhD program.

The school now offers PhD degree programs in all seven of its departments. There are roughly 110 students currently enrolled in these programs. We have historically taught 41 seminars annually across these seven departments to these students and to students from other units throughout the university. A number of these seminars cover material that, to a certain extent, is covered elsewhere in the university at similar levels of rigor. Other units might, in some cases, even have a comparative advantage in terms of presenting the material. In addition, demand is relatively low in the sense that average enrollment in these sections is less than 10 students per course.

The risk comes from the central role a strong PhD program has played in the school's strategy. Faculty could be disturbed by a reduction in the availability of PhD seminars to teach. Such a reaction could lead to faculty turnover, canceling some of the progress the school has made on that front over the past few years. We see the risk as relatively small.

How Will The Need Be Met

We are estimating that the material covered in these seminars is available elsewhere in the university through already existing courses. The most likely units affected will be economics, psychology, and statistics. The number of Carlson students that would be added to the enrollment in any one course in any one quarter in any one of these units would be so small as to have little or no impact on the economics of those offerings.

Proposed Program Change

We are proposing to eliminate a number of sections now offered annually as part of our PhD program. The number of sections to be canceled could be enough to reduce the need for faculty by one and one-half lines.

Background of the Decision

We identified all of the PhD seminars offered and made judgements regarding those that could be taught by other units within the university. The school's PhD committee (comprised of one faculty member from six of the school's seven departments) then recommended a proposal to eliminate certain sections from our offerings. The Faculty Executive Committee concurred in the sense that they are aware of the magnitude of the cuts proposed.

Specific sections to be cut are now being proposed by the faculty of each of the departments. Exactly what we are able to accomplish won't be known until these recommendations for specific cuts are passed on.

Source of More Information

Timothy Nantell, Acting Dean
CASE STATEMENT: REVENUE INCREASES

Recommendation
The Administration recommends that the regular MBA program admissions expand from 110 to 120 (and possibly to 160 in subsequent years), that the Duluth Medical School admissions expand from 48 to 53, and that Law School admissions remain at 270, where they have been for the past two years, with the understanding that new tuition generated by these increases be returned to those schools. The Administration also recommends that Summer Session tuition rates be based on those of the subsequent, rather than the preceding, academic year.

Rationale
Efficiency and effectiveness
- The recommended increases in enrollment can all be accommodated without any expansion of faculty, by increasing the size of the first-year class up to the capacity of the classrooms used. (Future possible increases in the MBA program will require faculty expansion but will generate tuition more than sufficient to cover the cost.)

Quality
- Law, Management and the Duluth Medical School all need to improve the quality of their own programs, but the institution cannot fund the improvement by transfer from other units. The Administration has encouraged the schools to generate the funds needed by internal actions. The expanded class size will produce additional tuition revenue to be returned directly to the school that produced it.

Centrality
- At present, tuition for the 1991 summer session is set at the same level as tuition for the 1990-91 academic year, although salaries paid after July 1 are those of the 1991-92 academic year. This means that net summer session receipts that would otherwise be available for high university priorities are smaller than they might be. Basing summer session tuition rates on the following academic year rates will require using an estimate of those rates, because rates for summer must be set earlier than those for the academic year.

Procedures
The funding implications of the summer session proposal is included in the CEE reallocation proposal as part of the package of reallocations that was on the Board’s January 11 agenda for discussion, and to be submitted to the Board for information in February and for action in March. The funding implications of the professional school enrollment expansion is not included in that package, but will be incorporated in the budget proposal for 1991-92, in conjunction with the overall tuition revenue projection.
CONTINUING EDUCATION AND EXTENSION REALLOCATION WORKSHEET

1. **Unit Mission** The mission of Continuing Education and Extension (CEE) is to develop and deliver credit and noncredit courses, programs, and services that represent and support the academic resources of the University and that respond to the continuing higher education needs of the people of Minnesota.

2. **Unit Vision** CEE's courses, programs, and services (on the Twin Cities, Duluth, and Morris campuses, in selected off-campus sites, and at the Rochester Center) will be distinguished by quality, accessibility, and diversity. The quality of instruction will be enhanced by expanding faculty opportunities for curricular innovation and experimentation. CEE will continue to provide opportunities for working men and women to improve themselves or prepare for new careers and, who, whether working or not, derive pleasure and benefit from intellectual pursuits. Finally, CEE will increase its efforts to enrich its staff with representatives of previously underserved populations and to make University programs of lifelong learning available to all interested individuals.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit** (Implementation will depend in part on receiving funds from the reallocation process.)

   - Expand the number of baccalaureate, professional and graduate degree and post-baccalaureate certificate programs while maintaining a wide variety of lower-division offerings in order to assure the University's accessibility. (Criteria: quality; centrality; comparative advantage; demand)

   - Make judicious use of alternative sites and various forms of telecommunications as means of reaching students who for good reasons find it difficult to come to campus. (Criteria: demand; efficiency and effectiveness). CEE intends to establish an off-campus site in downtown Minneapolis (see attached request for funds).

   - Develop and expand tailor-made programs (using Neighborhood Programs as a model) for special populations and communities which heretofore have been inadequately served by the University; recruit, retain, and support individuals and groups with special interests and needs in order to diversity the CEE student population, and implement the recommendations of the CEE Task Force on Diversity. (Criteria: centrality; demand)

   - Increase subsidies for services which improve the quality of classroom instruction and for which departmental supply budgets are decreasing (films, videos, etc.). (Criteria: quality; efficiency and effectiveness) CEE has requested $400,000 to remove or substantially lower the annual cost to departmental SEE budgets of film and projection rentals (copy of letter to Anne Hopkins attached).
4. **Reallocation Strategy for the Unit**

- Remove or decrease University subsidies for the following programs:

  **University Media Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KUOM (terminated/self supporting)</td>
<td>$458,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast TV (terminated/self supporting)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **Extension Classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Advisory Service (terminated)</td>
<td>36,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Campus (self supporting)</td>
<td>139,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Center (more self supporting)</td>
<td>30,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Center (more self supporting)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts and Lectures (more self supporting)</td>
<td>39,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Office (one position eliminated)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General College Support (joint appoint. terminated)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPhail Center (relationship terminated)</td>
<td>402,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve (reduced)</td>
<td>192,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $1,402,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session (tuition base moved from preceding to ensuing years)</td>
<td>$358,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  $1,760,000

---

By July 1, 1996, this amount of support will be reduced from the CEE annual budget. The year(s) in which each line item will be reallocated is yet to be determined.
CASE STATEMENT:
INDEPENDENCE OF MACPHAIL CENTER

Context

The MacPhail Center for the Arts was founded as an independent music school in 1907, and became a part of the University of Minnesota, administered by Continuing Education and Extension, in 1966, when financial difficulties threatened its survival. It provides instruction in voice and instrumental performance and music theory, to children and adults, primarily at now aging facilities especially designed for that purpose at 1128 LaSalle Avenue in Minneapolis. The University agreed to assume responsibility for the program in the expectation that there would be a mutually beneficial relationship between the MacPhail program of childhood and adult music education and the University’s Music Education program. That relationship did not develop as expected, and in 1988 the Regents approved a program to return MacPhail to independent status with a phased reduction of support. The phased program will lower the University’s direct support from its current level of $402,000 by one-third in July, 1992, by an additional one-third in July, 1993, and to zero in July, 1994, at which time approximately $135,000 of support from physical plant will also be withdrawn as the Center resumes responsibility for its own building maintenance.

Recommendation

The Administration recommends that no action be taken by the Board at this time; this will leave in place the 1988 decision to phase out support. Later in the Spring the Administration will present a recommendation to the Board regarding the return of the MacPhail building to the Center on independence.

Rationale

The University’s decision to return the MacPhail Center to independent status was based on two criteria:

Centrality

- The primary instruction of the MacPhail Center is in musical performance, addressed to age groups ranging from young children to adults. This provides an important cultural contribution to the community, but is not closely linked to the University’s mission.

- The fact that the program has not been self-sustaining financially means that funds have been diverted from more central priorities to this program.

Comparative advantage.

- The University has no particular expertise in providing this instruction; most of the instruction is provided individually by part-time instructors who also have other part time jobs as free-lance musicians or teachers in the community, not by regular University faculty.

Procedures

No new action is required. The funds to be freed by the phasing out of support are an integral part of the package of reallocations that was on the Board’s January 11 agenda for discussion, and to be submitted to the Board for information in February and for action in March.
CASE STATEMENT: CLOSURE OF KUOM

Context

The University operates KUOM, an AM radio station (770 KHz), from 10:30 AM to sunset. The license to operate is shared with WCAL (St. Olaf College) which broadcasts from sunrise to 10:30 AM. After 1992, the University may be in a position to own the license outright. The transmitted power of the radio tower is 5,000 watts permitting the station to broadcast to the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The current target audience is over 45 years in age, upper income, well educated, and community activists. Programming consists of call-in programs using University faculty, students, and staff, music, extension courses, and live campus events. All programming is local; the station does not broadcast any national public radio programs. It is estimated that the station reaches 7,500 listeners per week and the average quarter hour audience is 400 listeners. The University contributes approximately 60% of the station's $750,000 annual budget. The station is not tied in any significant way to the University's Journalism Program.

Rationale for Closure

The University's decision to close KUOM is based on three interrelated criteria: comparative advantage, demand, and efficiency.

* Lack of Comparative Advantage  Unlike markets served by successful university radio stations, e.g., the University of Wisconsin, KUOM operates in a highly competitive market with over forty radio stations. High quality and expensively produced national public radio broadcasting together with commercial, all-music and college stations such as WCAL, leave KUOM a very small niche in the listening market.

* Low Demand  KUOM's market share is very small and will remain so even if the morning hours are obtained. Faculty support for the station is very low and few listen to the station.

* Low Efficiency  The station serves a very small and narrow cross-section of the state. The capital investment required for 24-hour broadcasting (minimally several million dollars to construct multiple directional antennae) and the unlikelihood of securing FCC permission to transmit with a stronger signal prohibit expansion of programming to greater Minnesota. Alternative investments in telecommunications or programming on stations with large and established audiences have the potential of bringing the University's programs to a broader and more diverse audience.

Program Alternatives

The University aspires to reaching a broader audience and having a clear presence on radio broadcasting and other media state-wide.

* Broadcast on commercial and public stations  Rather than maintaining its own broadcasting facilities and trying to establish a slightly larger and less narrow market share in the Twin Cities, it proposes to reach the well-established and large audiences of public and commercial stations by providing these stations with programs about the University. The University may also purchase broadcast time to convey information about the University, its mission, and programs.

* Telecommunications  More effective use of current funds involves the development of telecommunication capabilities. Telecommunications permits the University to offer academic programs, specialized or supplemental courses and lectures, and technology transfer throughout the state to public and corporate audiences. We see telecommunications as a more cost-effective and efficient way to provide instruction and outreach informed by research to the public.

* Limited role for KUOM  In the short-term, the administration proposes keeping KUOM on the air and is investigating simulcast opportunities and limited live broadcasting of events and news.
Background for the Decision

The rationale for closure was developed by the administration and earlier faculty committees. The administration has concluded that further investment in the station under the circumstances and at the expense of higher priority activities is not justified. The station has little support among the University community. Academic Priorities recommended closure of KUOM in 1992 if the station could not be self-sustaining. Discussions with representatives from KUOM and external stations indicate that KUOM cannot become independent of University support by 1992, if ever.

For More Information

Contact:

Robert B. Kvavik
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612-625-0051
GRADUATE SCHOOL

1. **Unit Mission**  To serve the State, region and nation by enhancing the quality of graduate education and the research enterprise at the University of Minnesota.

2. **Unit Vision**  To become one of the top ten graduate schools in the country.

3. **Major strategic objectives for the unit**
   - To support financially the new and challenging research ideas of the faculty, to facilitate the acquisition of shared research equipment, and to provide the faculty with research support to help cope with temporary cutoffs of outside funding.
   - To develop along with the Research Executive Council the policies needed to facilitate and enhance the research undertaking of the University.
   - To foster the continuing growth of an environment in which collaborative research activities, particularly across collegiate lines, will flourish.
   - To recruit a talented, dedicated, and diverse body of graduate students to the University with competitive aid packages.
   - To facilitate the steady progress of graduate students through their curriculum and research programs.
   - To monitor the quality of graduate programs and the research to which they are related, and if problems are discovered to work with the academic Vice Presidents and collegiate Deans to take necessary action.
   - To stimulate and facilitate the development of new high quality graduate programs in areas of significant research at the University and of societal needs, while eliminating weak and outmoded programs.

4. **Reallocation Strategy for the Unit**

   **Internal reallocation**
   - To reallocate every year about 90% of the funds used to support faculty research and faculty and program development (0100: $405,531; 03XX: $1,548,450; 095X: $461,518; 07XX: $191,921).
   - To reallocate every year about 80% of all fellowship funds (0100: $4,216,773; 03XX: $63,622).
   - To reallocate approximately $30,000 from the Space Science Center.

   **Funds reallocated to central administration**
   - To reallocate funds from the Water Resources Research Center ($93,346) to central administration for FY92. Additional funds will be reallocated in FY93-96.

5. **Request for central reallocation funds to meet system-wide initiatives**

   **General research funds**
   The legitimate demands on general research funds are exceeding the monies available. The now withdrawn biennial request asked for an elimination of the indirect cost offset. Two million dollars of the thirteen million gained by that action was to go into the general research funds. Since that money will not be available we are asking for $500,000 in FY92 and FY93 in recurring funds.
These funds are used to provide seed money to start up projects that can become competitive for outside grants, to provide emergency funds when high quality programs temporarily lose outside support, to acquire shared research equipment (on a matching basis) and to support some quality research in areas where outside funds are not available.

The quality is high as each request is thoroughly reviewed and many applications are not funded. The centrality is high because the faculty on all campuses and all colleges are eligible to apply. The comparative advantage is high because it supports the research activities of faculty that only go on at the University of Minnesota.

Multi-departmental programs and research centers

Much of the cutting edge of modern research is across disciplinary lines and thus gives rise to graduate programs that have no departmental home. Neuroscience, Toxicology and Conservation Biology are examples. Logistical support for most of these programs comes from the Graduate School.

The programs are developed in areas where Minnesota has an enormous comparative advantage. Few universities, for example, can put together a Neuroscience program that can draw on such diverse departments as Physiology, Pharmacology, Cell Biology and Neuroanatomy, Psychology, Entomology and Veterinary Biology. The Conservation Biology program that is just coming on line is another area where Minnesota should be able to provide leadership for the entire country. The Graduate School's small budget to support these multi-disciplinary programs is not adequate to the task.

In addition to these multi-departmental programs, there are a number of multi-departmental research centers and proposed research centers which must be considered for financing. Of the long standing centers the Center for Human Learning Perception and Cognition is an example of a unit that should be considered for Central support. Also, a decision has to be made soon on whether the University will put additional funds into the Hormel Institute. Of the newly established centers the Minnesota Building Research Center, which is presently on soft money, should be considered after an outside review for the possibility of some permanent support in 1993. The proposed Lake Superior Research Institute for which there is $400,000 in start-up money from LCMR is another example of a center, in this case a center which crosses not only college lines but campus lines, which should be considered for support. The money from the research initiatives should be made available for these important activities.

The Graduate School will undertake an external review of the Minnesota Building Research Center in FY92 and on the basis of the findings, decide on whether it should be supported after FY93.

Finally, the Graduate School will conduct an outside review of the Sea Grant College in FY93; plans for possible reallocation will emerge from that review.

Fellowship funds

To remain vital, graduate programs must be able to attract outstanding students. Yet support for incoming students is stretched thin in some fields because research assistantships cannot be assigned to first-year students. This is a special problem in fields like genetics, neuroscience, and other biology-based fields where the designation of an advisor typically follows a year of lab rotations. The Graduate School needs funds for 25 new incoming fellows to these fields totalling $350,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total unit dollars reallocated to central administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount available for reallocation FY92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be reallocated FY93-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount to be reallocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Total dollars requested for system-wide initiatives**
   (in priority order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Funds</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>added to the base in each of the next two biennial years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary funds</td>
<td>200,000*</td>
<td>added to the base in the first year; second year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship funds</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>added to the base first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>added to the base first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,550,000+</td>
<td>added to the base in second and succeeding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For support of multidisciplinary graduate programs only; additional funds will be needed for any new Centers.
Graduate School Case Statement on Closing Clinical Master's Programs

In keeping with its goals from Plan for Focus and Strategy for Focus, as well as from the current reallocation effort, the Graduate School has determined that a major grouping of clinical M.S. programs are to be disestablished. The eight programs about to be removed with the concurrence of the faculty and the Dean of the Medical School are: Dermatology, Neurology (includes Ph.D. too), Ophthalmology, Orthopedic Surgery, Pediatrics, Radiology, Therapeutic Radiology, and Urology. These programs were originally established decades ago for the purpose of allowing medical residents to develop their clinical research skills and obtain an M.S. degree while at the same time fulfilling requirements expected of medical residents per se. Such students, called medical fellows, have now been largely supplanted by students, called medical fellow specialists, who pursue residency training without opting for the graduate degree. This decline in demand for the clinical M.S. degree has been especially apparent in the last several years and virtually all of the programs noted above have recorded zero enrollments for some time. In effect, interest in the clinical M.S. degree has shifted to other vehicles like post-residency research fellowships or the Ph.D. degree. Admissions to these eight programs have been suspended by the Dean's office pending a vote on their final disestablishment at the February 1991 meetings of the Health Sciences Policy and Review Council and the Graduate School Executive Committee. The financial savings associated with these closings are extremely small because student interest has waned for a long time. Whatever the savings involved, they already have been realized.

Three other clinical M.S. programs have indicated a desire to reexamine their commitment to clinical graduate education. They are: Family Practice and Community Health, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Psychiatry. Finally, three clinical programs will continue as before: Otolaryngology, Neurosurgery, and Surgery, all of which have the M.S./Ph.D. and are very active operations.

Given these decisions and events, Dean Holt of the Graduate School and Dean Brown of the Medical School will shortly be constituting an ad hoc committee whose charge will be to examine future needs for clinical research training leading to a graduate degree and the mechanisms appropriate to those needs. In the light of the report of this committee, the M.S. programs in Family Practice and Community Health, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Psychiatry will be reviewed.
1. **Unit Mission** As adopted by the faculty, the mission of the College of Education notes a threefold obligation — "to extend continuously the frontiers of knowledge and tested skill, to provide education of high quality for prospective and present members of the education professions, and to afford leadership in applying tested insights to school and college problems."

2. **Unit Vision** The College of Education aspires to provide the best model programs in teacher education and personnel training in the state; to provide programs that fulfill the growing educational needs on non-school settings (e.g., families, organizations, business, and industry); to provide the best graduate programs and research in education in the state; and to provide guidance and support for the K-12 educational reform movement in Minnesota schools.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit** The following five objectives for the college were adopted during the Strategy for Focus exercise in 1987.

   - Redesign teacher education to create postbaccalaureate model programs
   - Strengthen the college's research and development productivity
   - Strengthen the college's graduate programs
   - Provide a strong affirmative action program
   - Expand and strengthen ties with school districts

4. **Retrenchment Strategy for the Unit** The College of Education will reduce its budget by $1.88 million (12%). The College will curtail and/or discontinue selected teacher education programs. The strategy described below is designed to preserve essential strength across the college while fulfilling the essential aspects of our mission.

   The college will discontinue, reduce, consolidate, or eliminate the following programs. Since the exact order of these changes cannot be determined at this time, they are listed with approximate dates at which time the proposed action is intended. All proposals are subject to change after further review.

   **Consolidate**
   - counseling and student personnel psychology (Educational Psychology) and counseling psychology in CLA (1995)
   - administration of school psychology and special education (Educational Psychology) (1993)
   - administrative staff in college office and ESAO (1993-94)
   - programs in adult education (Curriculum and Instruction) and training and development (Vocational and Technical Education) 1992-1993

   **Curtail**
   - reduce size of elementary education postbaccalaureate licensure program by 1/3 (1992)
   - reduce faculty size (see table below)
   - reduce administrative staff in college administration.
   - accelerate previously planned reductions in Education Student Affairs Office

   **Discontinue**
   - five remaining undergraduate programs in K-12 teacher licensure
   - three postbaccalaureate programs in K-12 teacher licensure
     - social studies education (1992 or 1993), English education (1992 or 1993), art education
     - (1992 or 1993)
   - graduate programs in three sub areas in Kinesiology and Leisure Studies (1993 or 1994)
   - elimination or reduction of the college's contribution to the Minnesota Council on Economic Education and/or the Center for Research in Learning, Perception, and Cognition (1992)
5. **Total Impact Statement** The proposed program reductions will "downsize" faculty in the College of Education from 160 to 135-137) over the five year period. The estimates below assume that the average cost of a faculty member in the college is about $63,000 and support items associated with each faculty member are about $12,000, the budget consequences noted below are estimated in terms of faculty "units" at $75,000 each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty (90-91)</th>
<th>Estimate of Faculty Positions by 1996</th>
<th>Amount Saved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Educational Policy and Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Educational Psychology</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Child Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Kinesiology and Leisure Studies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Vocational and Technical Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-level Administrative Offices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>135-137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Request for Funds Reserved for University-Wide Initiatives to Meet College and University Objectives**

**Diversity** Programs in the College of Education produced 35% of University of Minnesota doctorates awarded to minorities between 1981-1989; recent recruitment efforts have increased minority enrollment in licensure programs by 26%; the college employs almost 1/4 of all African American regular faculty members at the University. These strong efforts must receive continued support.

- Recruitment and retention
  - Matching component for currently funded Bush grant (Common Ground Consortium with HBI's) $90,000
  - Student retention -- minority students (especially ESL Asians) have applied for admission but lack skills in English. Need is for a mentorship-tutoring program $20,000
  - Program coordinator -- part time recruiter to full time $25,000
  - Adjunct professor fund -- to employ minority adjunct professor from local community in needed areas $75,000
  - Funds to support current tenure-track minority now on soft funds $24,000
  - $234,000

**K-12 Linkages** Strengthen faculty links to K-12 schools:

- CAREI Fellowship Program -- Funds are needed to establish a fellow program in the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement which would support collaborative projects between member K-12 schools and faculty members across the University. $75,000

- School Partnerships -- The college proposes to establish 4 "partnerships" with K-12 schools (one per year for four years) for school improvement and improvement of the education of educators. These partnership efforts focus directly on pre- and in-service teacher development as well as outcome-based curricula, literacy, multicultural education, and interdisciplinary learning.
Discussions with district personnel have resulted in plans to establish partnerships at an elementary, a secondary, and a middle school in St. Paul, Rochester, and Minneapolis respectively with a fourth site in Greater Minnesota. Funds are needed for purchase of teachers’ time and for supervising by College of Education faculty. Cost per year for each site is $76,000, so cost for 1991-92 is $76,000, 1992-93 $152,000, 1993-94 $238,000, and 1994-95 $304,000. (About $90,000 in faculty effort will be allocated in addition.)

Cost per year:
- 1991-92: $76,000
- 1992-93: $152,000
- 1993-94: $238,000
- 1994-95: $304,000

• Preliminary discussions have been held with IT over a collaborative effort aimed initially at K-12 math and science. No budget estimate is available at this time.

Three Postbaccalaureate Licensure Program  Retain post-baccalaureate program in social studies, English, and art which have strong connections with K-12.

$210,000

Undergraduate Initiatives  Graduate assistantships to support undergraduate instruction in child development. The Institute of Child Development offers CLA majors in child psychology (13th largest of 50 in CLA). TA’s are needed to help with 40+ large class sections each year.

3FTE's @ $18,000 = $54,000
MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGE
DISCONTINUANCE OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN K-12 TEACHER LICENSING

1. **Rationale for the change**  The Strategy for Focus (SfF) plan of the College of Education (1987) proposed eliminating teacher education at the undergraduate level in part to provide the opportunity for faculty to develop "model" programs and in part to connect the college with the emerging national agenda in teacher education (e.g., national policy groups such as Holmes Group, Carnegie Task Force, Rand Corporation, and Center for Educational Renewal have a full undergraduate education in liberal arts and a strong postbaccalaureate teacher education program).

The SfF plan noted our intention to "redesign" teacher education curriculum completely and to institute "model" 5th year programs. This development process was funded by the College of Education and by a three-year allocation from central administration.

All teacher licensure programs are projected to be converted to post-baccalaureate status by 1993. Two of the programs, second languages and social studies, are currently in their fourth year; agricultural education and home economics in their third year; English education in its first year; art, business, marketing, and science education in their first year; and elementary, mathematics, and industrial education will be ready within the next three years. Initial evaluations indicate that all expectations have been met, e.g., entry GPA criteria are high, in fact, the average GPA at entrance is over 3.3. Students report the programs are vigorous and that they are well-received by school people. Hiring officials view graduates as being highly qualified and very well prepared to fit contemporary schools.

The undergirding assumptions of this development exercise were that the College of Education's programs would lead the way in the state and region toward a more complete and rigorous teacher education system.

2. **How needs will be met**  The University of Minnesota's College of Education is the only teacher education unit in the state which has moved in this direction. The State University System and private colleges have substantially expanded their education offerings.

3. **Description of proposed changes**  As noted above, the change consists of making a transition from undergraduate teacher education programs to advanced level programs which are more selective and more rigorous.

4. **Background of the decision**  The decision was made in 1987 after extensive discussion and consultation internally (College of Education and University) and externally (school superintendents, Minnesota Department of Education).

5. **For more Information**  Contact William E. Gardner, Dean, College of Education, 104 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
   Phone: 625-6806
HUMPHREY INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

1. **Unit Mission** The mission of the Institute is excellence in education, research, and outreach in public policy, planning, and public affairs. The Institute performs its mission by (a) preparing students for careers as managers, planners, and policy analysts; (b) serving as an inter-disciplinary center for basic and applied research; and (c) acting as a nonpartisan resource to help empower citizens, communities, and organizations.

2. **Unit Vision** The Institute aspires to strengthen its research capacity to better understand the critical social problems society faces; to develop more diversity in all its programs; to engage in scholarly research which ultimately integrates the social sciences to extend the frontiers of knowledge; and to more effectively educate citizens for democratic governance here and abroad.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit**

   • To identify, recruit, hire, and retain quality faculty necessary to teach revised and expanded curricula and to sustain an expanded research mission (criteria: quality, centrality). Related here is the goal of recruiting and retaining a more diverse faculty.

   • To identify, recruit, hire, and retain quality practitioners necessary to develop effective outreach programs, undertake applied research, and to develop practical skills of students (criteria: centrality, demand)

   • To involve faculty from across the University in effective multidisciplinary approaches to solving critical social problems (criteria: comparative advantage, centrality)

   • To develop a more effective management system consistent with the growth and development of the Institute's programs (criteria: efficiency and effectiveness).

4. **Reallocation Strategy for the Unit**

   The plan provides for a reallocation of 10% of the Institute's 0100 budget or $140,000 consistent with the Strategic Plan of the Institute and University priorities.

   The Institute has retrenched one position in community outreach and advocacy ($55,000) and eliminated the program associated with it; reduced four faculty vacancies from full professor rank to three at assistant professor and one at associate professor rank (a savings of $99,000); and eliminated summer support for its Master of Arts and Master of Planning program directors ($36,000). The new, lower ranked positions are reconfigured to strengthen the Institute's program in population analysis and policy; to strengthen the base on the non-profit sector to its public management program. Each of these are components of the Institute's Strategic Plan. In total, $190,000 has been retrenched and $140,000 reallocated.

   Total unit dollars to be reallocated over 5 years: $140,000
THE LAW SCHOOL

1. **The Mission of the Law School** The mission of the University of Minnesota Law School is to provide quality legal education:

   • by educating men and women in the law, through instruction leading to a Juris Doctor degree, and through other quality programs
   • by contributing substantially to Knowledge of the legal order through the publication and other dissemination of scholarship
   • by providing discipline-related public service to the University, the state, the nation, and the international community, and to the legal profession in those fields in which it has special expertise

2. **Unit Vision** During this period, the Law School seeks to solidify its position as one of the five leading public law schools in the United States and to be clearly recognized as one of the ten leading schools (public or private) in the country.

3. **Major strategic objectives** The law school's objectives fall into several major categories:

   • **Programmatic improvement.** We plan to improve our program by concentrating our resources in areas of programmatic strength, to the extent consistent with our obligations to provide broadly based instruction for the J.D. degree. These areas include: international law, criminology and criminal procedure, evidence and trial practice, environmental law, commercial and business law, and clinical programs. We also seek to provide the framework for a program in feminist jurisprudence and a Center for Advanced legal studies.

   • **Diversity.** We plan to use our resources to continue to maintain a representative student body and to recruit faculty members to provide broad diversity.

   • **Quality.** We plan to continue to provide a high quality of instruction and other faculty interaction for students and a high rate of scholarly productivity.

   • **Interaction.** We plan to increase our level of interaction with other divisions of the University through ongoing research and instructional contacts and other interactions occurring in the areas of programmatic strength identified in the paragraph on programmatic improvement above.

   The Law School is already recognized as an institution of national quality and stature; these measures should enhance that quality. It is central to the mission of the University. The resources already invested in the Law School and its Library give it a substantial comparative advantage over other institutions in the Middle West. The student demand continues to increase. The Law School is one of the most cost-effective and efficient graduate and professional programs in the University and compares favorably with cost levels at other institutions.

4. **Reallocation strategy for the Law School** The reallocation plan for the Law School is based primarily upon increased tuition revenues through increases in student numbers (a planned increase in class size will be completed in 1991) and other tuition adjustments. Faculty size cannot be reduced below the present 20:1 student-faculty ratio without an adverse impact upon quality of instruction and potential violation of accreditation standards. The library budget is also critical to the maintenance of the national stature of the Law School.

Since the Law school operates only a single program it will be difficult to trace any particular transfers of budgeted funds, although a substantial reallocation of effort to accomplish the objectives stated above are planned. Any reductions of funding would be distributed between the academic programs and the Law Library.

Unit dollars to be reallocated: $250,000.
1. **Unit Mission:** The Libraries' mission is to be the major provider of information needed for University-wide research and service programs, and for educational programs on the Twin Cities Campus. As part of a major land-grant institution, the Libraries play an integral role in supporting the creation, transmission, application, storage, and preservation of recorded knowledge. To this end, they make their collections available to all citizens of Minnesota.

2. **Unit Vision:** The University Libraries aspire not to become the largest, but to position themselves among the ten best university library systems in the United States. Attaining this goal will require maximum use of emerging information technology, placing in equilibrium investment in the ownership of important collections and investment in technology and services which enable rapid bibliographic, physical, and electronic access to information resources held elsewhere around the world. It also requires the recruitment and retention of a highly skilled staff whose diversity reflects the breadth of programs and culture of the University.

3. **Major Strategic Objectives**

a. To improve the quality of library services and collections needed by undergraduate students (criteria: centrality, demand, quality);

b. To expand LUMINA by adding citations to periodical articles and other library material, by providing easy access to other important electronic databases (gateways), and, in cooperation with other interested University units, by developing the needed facility to transmit images of recorded knowledge (criteria: comparative advantage, effectiveness, demand);

c. To identify, recruit, and retain high-quality academic professionals who have the skills to help students become "information literate" in a world in which information is essential for both social participation and empowerment. Closely related is the Libraries' determination to attract professionals who are members of minority groups (criteria: quality, centrality, effectiveness);

d. To improve the quality of faculty research by developing systems to facilitate access to the Libraries' extensive archival and manuscript collections. These resources constitute a relatively untapped mine of scholarly information and need to become more accessible to University researchers as well as to other scholars throughout the nation (criteria: comparative advantage, quality, centrality);

e. To expand statewide access to library collections via MINITEX (criteria: comparative advantage, effectiveness, demand);

f. To increase efficiency and effectiveness of library operations. Current examples of this are the survey being conducted of user needs, greater reliance on office automation, and evaluation of vendor performance (criteria: demand, effectiveness).

4. **Reallocation Strategy for Unit:** Because inflation in the prices of scholarly books and journals is increasing at a rate far higher than any other consumer commodity (estimated at 20 percent in 1991), some $840,000 in new dollars will be needed simply to maintain existing journal and serial subscriptions. Secondly, a severe lack of space for book stacks in the four major libraries (Walter, Wilson, Bio-Medical, and St. Paul) prevents the further consolidation of branch libraries. These factors make the challenge of reallocation more formidable.
than would otherwise be the case. Against this backdrop, library reallocations of $1.36 million over the five-year period will focus on the following:

a. The University Libraries will increase their reliance on collections owned by other universities (e.g., CIC institutions); staff assigned to the interlibrary loan function will be augmented (criteria: effectiveness, demand).

b. Savings that will accrue from implementation of the LUMINA-based automated book check-out system will be reallocated to support University objectives (criteria: quality, demand, centrality). $250,000

c. Following the academic priorities established by the University, acquisition dollars will be shifted to some degree from lower priority programs to high priority programs. A projected annual inflation rate of 20 percent will also necessitate budget reallocations within the Libraries (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage).

d. The Libraries will explore whether the proposed STARS (student accounts receivable) system might generate savings if library procedures concerning “holds” and fines were modified to accommodate STARS requirements (criteria: effectiveness). $100,000

e. Library operating hours across the campus will be evaluated with a view towards standardization of schedules and reduction in hours open, if warranted by low usage (criteria: demand, effectiveness). $100,000

f. The Libraries will continue to reduce administrative costs by the transfer of staff effort to user services (criteria: demand, effectiveness, quality). $200,000

g. Library positions and/or percentages of staff time will be reallocated to meet more directly University objectives such as improving the quality of instruction and student support, support for research, and increasing technological transfer and outreach (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage). $710,000

While it is not possible to control or ration the demand for library services, staff positions in some areas might be reduced. As positions become vacant, each will be reviewed to determine if it should be continued, dropped, or reassigned. However, the Libraries are already some 100 FTE staff below levels found at peer universities, so eliminating positions is not a viable option.

Total dollars available for internal reallocation: $1,360,000.

5. Proposals for the Use of Funds Transferred to the Libraries from Other Divisions ($1,000,000): In view of the role which the Libraries play in serving the research needs of the entire state, all of the new dollars received by the Libraries through the University’s reallocation process will be used to purchase books, journals and other informational resources ($200,000 per year over the five-year period). The Libraries already lend almost 500 books and journal articles each day to other libraries via MINITEX, and there is every indication that such usage will continue to increase. However even with these additional funds, the quality of the Libraries’ collections will erode somewhat due to the extraordinary inflation in the price of scholarly material.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION: IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES

Reallocation Worksheets and Case Statements

Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics
1. Unit Mission: Minnesota Extension Service (MES) is the outreach arm of the University of Minnesota that offers research-based education to people of all ages throughout the state, in cooperation with county, state, federal and private partners. MES seeks to enable people to foster full development of youth, adults, families, and communities; to improve the economy, especially the food and fiber sector; and to provide effective natural resource management.

2. Unit Vision: The special niche of MES is non-credit education. MES has unique expertise and resources to identify problems, find research-based solutions, and deliver educational programs that provide people with knowledge and skills to make informed decisions about their own circumstances. Working in concert with counties and local communities, through volunteers, and by linkages within and outside of the university, MES strives to be an authoritative source of useful education to address central issues of concern. Its programs support University priorities and the MES strategic plan, Focus on People.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit: To meet constantly evolving clientele needs, MES must periodically adjust its course. With limited resources, this means a corresponding reallocation of time and money to meet shifts in client needs. The 1991-95 MES strategic budget plan reallocates program funds to selectively address issues that will predominate during these five years. The criteria for change are based on the five University guidelines and on the MES organizational priorities of: program excellence, strengthening cultural diversity, equal program access, efficient use of new communications technology, and integrating an international perspective into programs. The fact that MES is de-emphasizing certain efforts does not mean that these efforts are unimportant. Nor does it mean that they will no longer be available in some form. In many instances, other agencies, volunteers and consultants trained by MES will provide services that fill any gap created by MES's reallocation of resources.

4. Reallocation Strategy for the Unit: MES has engaged in reallocation since 1982, beginning with a $3.2 million retrenchment and resulting in the 1986 strategic plan Focus on People. The most important decision was to bring the many available discipline-based university resources to bear on issues of importance to Minnesotans. MES now draws on its five program areas--agriculture, community economic development, 4-H youth development, home economics, and natural resources--to collectively address issues such as preserving water quality, stimulating community vitality, reducing risks for youth and families, sustaining agriculture, developing leadership, protecting the environment, and improving nutrition and health.
Over the last five years, MES has reallocated approximately $8,600,000 (including grants dollars beyond the state and federal allocations) toward these and other issue-based programs. Reallocations include both position changes and reallocation of individual time.

Within the next five years, MES intends to reallocate an additional 10% of MES's budget, or $1.7 million, plus its share of the additional $1.5 million identified by the University for MES and the Agricultural Experiment Station to the programs identified below for enhancement. Grants funding will supplement these efforts. Reallocation will include actual changes of position and refocusing individuals’ time to address major issues.

Proposed program enhancements are based on the four major issue areas identified in Focus on People: (1) education for economic development (public policy, strategic and sustainable economic development, including agriculture; options for finance development, and industry development, including new entrepreneurs); (2) environmental and natural resources education (water quality, energy, conservation and alternative sources; waste management; and integrated resource management for Minnesota's private natural resource base); (3) education for human development (family and youth policy; life skills education for youth and families at risk; interface of the family and youth with the environment; food quality and safety, and science and technology education); and (4) education for community leadership (community service education, and leadership and volunteer development education). To support these, MES will enhance effort and resources in: distance education; video development; staff development for basic educator capacities and issues programming; grant development; and budget management systems.

To free up resources to address major issues, MES will selectively reduce, redirect, or combine specific programs with others for more efficiency and flexibility.

Proposed reductions include: Managing our Farm Family Future (MOFFF); selected programs in crop and livestock production and management, farm management, and farm mediation; environmental horticulture; programs for public involvement in private land resource decisions; wildlife management on private lands; windbreak management; Lake Superior coastal processes; selected 4-H youth programs in mechanical and animal sciences, home economics and camping; financial management programs targeted to upper middle class families; Home Economics Volunteer Development Committee in Program Development and Management Systems; local government education; public infrastructure investment; organizational support in Educational Development System (EDS) for: program units, educational software development, media relations, and program evaluation; and administrative and program leader positions and support.
Minnesota Extension Service
Case Statement on Major Program Change
Agriculture

1. Reasons for change: MES programs in agriculture are emphasizing integrated programming on current and emerging issues while maintaining excellent in base programs. The goals of these programs are to: (1) promote a profitable, productive agricultural sector that will ensure an ample supply of high quality, reasonably priced food and fiber; (2) encourage stewardship and conservation of natural resources and a quality environment; and (3) contribute to improving the quality of life for farmers, farm families and rural and urban communities. The programs are designed to enhance a balance of economics, environmental quality, and social responsibility.

2. How will needs previously covered by the unit be met? Selected programs in crop and livestock production and home horticulture will be transferred to other agencies and individuals, such as volunteers, consultants, and others trained by MES. MES will continue to provide training programs for others who can deliver information and services in these areas to consumers.

3. Brief description of the program changes: In the next five years, MES will redirect resources toward major new emerging issues in the agricultural sector in Minnesota. These redirected efforts are planned to involve about 20% of agriculture resources, or nearly $1 million of campus faculty resources, toward water quality, food quality and safety, farm worker safety, energy, agricultural business management, agricultural policy, strategic management in agriculture, and ethics and social issues related to agriculture.

4. Background of the decision: Over the last five years, approximately $1.5 million invested in campus faculty resources in agricultural programs has been redirected to high-demand new agricultural issues. (County staff reallocations are included in the MES county programs statement.) New educational programs initiated in the last five years include water quality, financial management, leadership in agriculture, urban yard waste management, direct marketing, Project Support (in response to the farm economic crisis), managing our farm family's future (MOFFF), farm mediation, sustainable agriculture, managing in a drought, food-agriculture-nutrition (FAN), grasshopper control, conservation reserve program, alternative crop and animal enterprises, and global marketing.

5. For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
240 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota
1420 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
(612) 624-2703
Minnesota Extension Service
Case Statement on Major Program Change
4-H Youth Development

1. Reasons for change: The problems and needs of youth are very different today than they were 20, 15, or even 10 years ago. Increasing numbers of young and adult Minnesotans are finding themselves in circumstances that limit their ability to develop their full potential as healthy and productive individuals. The MES 4-H program is acknowledged as a successful provider of life skills education for families and youth. MES will continue these programs, but will expand its attention on families and youth with particularly critical needs. Factors placing people in such circumstances include poverty, family dysfunction, inadequate health and child care, discrimination, and substance abuse. MES is increasing its work in the area of human development to provide youth and adults with knowledge and skills that will help reduce and prevent self-destructive behavior and break the cycle of poverty.

2. How will needs previously covered by the unit be met? Some of the programming void created by the proposed shift in priorities will be covered by increased reliance on other University faculty and volunteers and on regional efforts to provide curriculum and programs in these areas. Selected efforts will also be integrated into colleges and departments.

3. Brief description of the program change: The goals of MES 4-H programs are to establish a learning environment for all youth to help them make the important "life" decisions. To do this, 4-H will work in partnership with other youth agencies, recruit and train more volunteers, seek additional public and private funds to provide program enrichment, and ensure that sound youth development programs are in place. Over the next five years, MES 4-H will reallocate $145,000 of campus faculty resources toward increased effort in: family and youth policy education; life skills education; education in the interface of family and youth with the environment; and science and technology education.

4. Background of the decision: In the past five years, MES 4-H has reallocated $120,000 of campus faculty resources to enhance: agent specializations, career education, citizenship/community service; global awareness/international education; natural resources/environmental science; urban programs; youth at risk and health issues; and youth leadership. These particular reallocations will be enhanced by programs listed above. (County staff reallocations are included in the MES county programs statement.)

5. For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
   240 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota
   1420 Eckles Avenue
   St. Paul, MN 55108
   (612) 624-2703
Minnesota Extension Service
Case Statement on Major Program Change
Home Economics

1. Reasons for change: An increasing number and percentage of families are encountering conditions that put them "at risk" in terms of their viability and ability to provide family members with basic needs. When risk factors outweigh the protective factors usually provided by families and communities, children and youth become "at risk" developmentally. MES has been acknowledged as a successful provider of life skills education for families and youth. Educational programs that result in reduced risk factors to Minnesota families will require collaboration across University units, such as the Medical School, the Humphrey Institute, and others.

2. How will needs previously covered by the unit be met? To better support new programming, MES will redirect resources previously committed to programs about aging. Some of the programming void created by the proposed shift in priorities will be covered by other agencies, like area agencies on aging, and individuals trained by MES. Extension home economists will continue to do programming on aging in selected counties (those with very high percentages of the population 65 years and over).

3. Brief description of the program change: MES will focus future programming efforts on families, children, and youth at risk. MES will also help lead Universitywide effort to effectively form internal coalitions and collaborations among units, colleges and departments in the outreach function. Educational programs will embrace a community based education philosophy with local input and evidence of local need shaping the University's response. Educational programs will likely focus on improved health, nutrition, parenting, and child care for families, prevention of teen pregnancy and alcohol abuse. Public policy education about these issues will be implemented at the state and local community levels.

4. MES Home Economics has reallocated $440,000 of campus resources in the last five years to support program and staff development systems and to provide "seed money" for new programs to be funded via proposal development. (County staff reallocations are included in the MES county programs statement.) Home Economics has also "reallocated" ways of working. Examples include transitions from Extension Home Study Group as a primary delivery to a broad issue/problem delivery; MES faculty in departments have moved from direct clientele delivery to providing education to field faculty and materials development; and from 100% programmatic design/delivery for the public to approximately 20% programmatic design/delivery to agency personnel.

5. For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
   240 Coffey Hall, U of MN
   1420 Eckles Avenue
   St. Paul, MN 55108
   (612) 624-2703
1. Reasons for change: The Minnesota economy is experiencing a dual growth pattern, with strength in the major metropolitan areas and slower growth in many of the agriculture- and natural resource-based communities of Greater Minnesota. An aging population, a decline in commodity-based economies on which many rural communities depend, and a relatively weak export base for most state industries are among forces exacerbating economic disparities across the state. Many communities depend on only a few sources of income, making them less resilient to economic recession than are more diversified areas. The average age in rural areas is increasing, in part due to migration of young people to cities. Older workers will be abundant and younger workers will be scarce in the next decades. Increasing numbers of women are in the work force. In summary, Minnesota communities are having difficulty adapting to the social and economic impacts of changes and need to make better decisions to cope with growth and decline problems.

2. How will needs previously covered by the unit be met? Current and projected education needs have prompted MES to enhance rather than reduce Community Economic Development programs in the past five years. While this has been an area of growth, there are still reallocations important to accomplish new program directions. Programs slated for reduction will be included as part of broad-based community programs, but not as stand-alone programs.

3. Brief description of the program change: Over the next five years, MES projects a reallocation of approximately $400,000 of campus resources in the areas of tourism development, small business management, community economic analysis, and growth management. Specific enhancements will include the endowed Tourism Center chair and selected specialists in the other areas noted. (County staff reallocations are included in the MES county programs statement.)

4. Background of the decision: Over the last five years, MES has expanded and focused its efforts in community economic development by internally reallocating approximately $350,000 to this program. Areas of expansion include the Tourism Center; the citizen-led community development program, Project Future; and a program to retrain agents and bolster the community economic development specialization funded, in part, by the Bush Foundation.

5: For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
240 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota
1420 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
(612) 624-2703
1. Reasons for change: Minnesotans use natural resources for life support, enjoyment, and economic development. In doing so, we affect the quality of our environment. Negative impacts include land erosion, degradation of water and air, and threats to plant and animal species. Minnesotans are increasingly concerned about environmental degradation and the implications for health and sustained use. MES addresses environmental issues by educating both the general public and natural resource professionals. Its guiding themes in environment and natural resources include promoting integrated management and protection of rural and urban natural systems, increasing efficiency of resource use, and improving consumer decision-making. Reallocation of human and fiscal resources allows MES to initiate timely, high quality, effective programming on the major resource management issues facing Minnesotans.

2. How will needs previously covered by the unit be met? Current and projected educational needs have prompted MES to enhance rather than reduce Natural Resources programs in the past five years. (See #4, Background, below.) While this has been an area of growth, there are still reallocations important to accomplish new program directions. Specific programs slated for reduction will be addressed in a variety of ways: including in more comprehensive programming, training partner agencies who currently share in these educational efforts, training specialized agents, and transferring new technologies and management strategies to others to utilize.

3. Brief description of the program change: Between 1991 and 1996, MES will redirect $510,000 to further enhance efforts in waste management and integrated resource management, and to initiate new programming emphases in energy conservation and global change; stewardship of urban and community natural resources; youth environmental education; management of exotic aquatic pests; environmental and transportation public policy; and technology transfer and marketing in the growing forest products industry. (County staff reallocations are included in the MES county programs statement.)

4. Background of the decision: In the past five years, based on growing need for educational programs in the following areas, MES has redirected nearly $400,000 to new programming on waste management; water quality; cold climate housing technology and indoor air quality; integrated resource management of private forestlands and waters; land use information technology; and aquaculture.

5. For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
240 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota
1420 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
(612) 624-2703
Minnesota Extension Service
Case Statement on Major Program Change
MES County Programs and Staff

1. Reasons for change: Reallocation and change are a basic part of the history of MES in Minnesota, beginning in 1909. For example, as draft animal management became less important, agricultural engineering programs soared with the mechanization of farms. Economic survival education flourished in the 1930s, became less central to MES programming, then flourished again in the 1980s. In the 1990s, MES is again shifting its resources to address the primary issues for Minnesotans of: youth and families, water quality, community vitality, sustaining agriculture, developing leadership, protecting the environment, and improving nutrition and health. In concert with many local agencies and volunteers, county extension staff are the educators who deliver the knowledge and skills to address these issues tailored to the needs of the local areas.

2. How will the needs previously covered by the unit be met? Some of the programming reductions created by proposed shifts in priorities will be covered by increased reliance on other agencies and community services (thus also reducing some questions regarding duplication of effort), and other individuals and groups such as volunteers and consultants trained by MES. In some areas, MES will continue to provide training programs for others who can deliver information and services to consumers. In other cases, needs have diminished and the programs are no longer in demand.

3. Brief description of the program changes: In the next five years, MES will redirect resources toward county and regional programs in major emerging issues in agriculture, home economics, 4-H youth development, community economic development, and natural resources. For example, in the East Central District, MES estimates reallocating over one-half million dollars' effort over the next five years. Program emphases will vary according to county and regional needs, with increasing emphasis on regional program development and delivery. Clusters of counties are also aggressively seeking outside funding for specific programs. The Southwest District, for example, plans to seek nearly three-quarter million dollars in grant funds over the next five years. Its targeted efforts include expanding the youth issues educational program; community economic development, sustainable agriculture, environmental issues, safe food supply, and others.

4. Background of the decision: Over the last five years, reallocation of field staff priorities and reassignments across the state total nearly $3,500,000. These basic reallocations are integral to ongoing MES programming and responsiveness to changing needs. MES works with the 87 county extension committees who, through their needs assessment process, assist with--in fact, demand--constant reallocation to changing needs of clientele.

5. For more information: Patrick J. Borich, Dean and Director
   240 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota
   1420 Eckles Avenue
   St. Paul, MN 55108
   (612) 624-2703
College of Agriculture  
Strategic Planning Abstract

Mission - The College of Agriculture encompasses responsibilities for research, education, and outreach related to the use of biological materials for society's needs and to the interactions of these products and processes with people and the environment. More specifically, the mission is to provide responsible leadership in the generation and application of research-based knowledge to the use of our natural and human resources for the production, distribution, and consumption of food, fiber and renewable energy, and for the betterment of our natural and human environments; all with technologies that address needs and concerns of a diverse constituency.

Vision - The College of Agriculture, an integral part of the University of Minnesota, will continue to be a highly respected national leader in the development and distribution of knowledge in current and emerging issues of food, fiber, and energy and their related interactions with the natural and human environments. We will continue to balance our programs in response to both the internal and external agendas set before us. Consequently, we will provide leadership to the University in education, research, and outreach related to the role of basic and applied sciences in meeting human needs. Furthermore, we will continue to develop and maintain high quality programs that serve as a foundation to maintain and enhance the economy and quality of life of Minnesota. We expect to continue as the only source of B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in agriculture and related fields in Minnesota and we aim to be the authoritative source of such information for all citizens. Finally, we envision increased contributions to maintenance of environmental quantity and quality of urban life.

Major Strategic Objectives (with most relevant criteria)

1. Enhance College of Agriculture teaching and research programs by continuing to strengthen our human resources. Specifically the College will recruit for top quality and initiate extraordinary efforts to recruit a diverse community of faculty, staff, and students. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage)

2. Emphasize educational value and significantly expand the number of students we serve and do it in a more efficient, effective way. Thus, we will extend Project Sunrise (beyond the recent reduction from 17 to 10 majors and other current projects) to further strengthen the quality of COA graduates via incorporation of capstone courses, decision case studies, international perspectives, and research experiences into the curriculum (Phase II). We will extend programs to Greater Minnesota. (centrality, quality, efficiency)

3. Enhance these strong teaching, research, and outreach activities central to the College mission in a way that will enhance the future vitality of the College and the University and will continue to provide a foundation for the economic well-being of agriculture and the rural sector of Minnesota in an environmental decade. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage)

4. Become a more integral part of the University by promotion of interdisciplinary activities, and by the design and teaching of courses that meet the liberal education requirements of the University by promoting scientific literacy, international understanding, and a comprehension of the interactions of food, agriculture, and natural resources with human and natural environments. (centrality, comparative advantage, quality, efficiency)

5. Emphasize and expand research activities that address the contemporary issues of agricultural interactions with people and the environment. Highest priorities will be on activities that focus on a) the impact of agricultural practices on food and the environment; b) enhancement of farm profitability and economic well-being of the state and c) improvement of quality of life for all people. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage, demand)

6. Continue to be the only Minnesota institution of higher education offering B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in agriculture and related fields. (centrality, comparative advantage, effectiveness)
7. Enhance effectiveness of research programs by integration of branch station planning and research with College of Agriculture activities. (centrality, comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness)

Reallocation Strategy (with most relevant criteria)

1. Increase recruitment and transfer efforts with a goal of 1200 undergraduate majors and expanded classroom contacts for non-majors: (centrality, comparative advantage, efficiency, demand)
   a. design and implement new courses and activities that enhance the quality of undergraduate programs.
   b. participate in common entry point advising.
   c. design and implement courses and activities that contribute to the University's liberal education emphases and result in transfer of effort.
   d. design and teach courses for off-campus students via distance delivery.
   e. implement 2+2 or 3+1 programs with other units and institutions.

2. Improve the efficiency of teaching resources: (efficiency, demand)
   a. reduce the frequency of low enrollment courses.
   b. reduce funds to units failing to meet teaching objectives.
   c. allocate resources to units meeting teaching objectives.

3. Allocate resources for new teaching initiatives that relate food and agricultural topics to the environment, world food and hunger, food safety, technology/society, risk assessment, biotechnology, integrated farming systems, waste management (urban and rural), national and international policies, etc. (centrality, demand, comparative advantage)

4. Allocate all open positions in accordance with strategic plans for teaching and research. This will involve reversion of all open positions to the College with allocation to highest priority needs. (centrality, quality, demand)

5. Allocate resources to enhance the recruitment, employment and retention of underrepresented minorities and women. (quality, centrality)

6. Integrate the branch experiment stations more fully into the planning, budgeting and focusing of agricultural and environmental programs of the College of Agriculture. (efficiency and effectiveness, centrality)
   a. increase efficiency of animal research by concentrating each livestock enterprise to a maximum of two branch stations in Greater Minnesota.
   b. increase effectiveness by sharing faculty among stations.
   c. integrate branch stations superintendents into the College planning processes.
   d. increase use of branch stations for outreach programs.

7. Allocate resources for new research initiatives in agricultural and environmental areas of value-added products, food safety, biological control, waste management, profitability, economic development, and competitiveness, among others consistent with objectives. (centrality, quality, demand, comparative advantage)

8. Enhance effectiveness of teaching and research activities by promoting and accommodating interdepartmental, intercollegiate, and inter-University efforts such as the current combination of Animal Science programs under Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, the many current regional research programs, and the joint state cooperative programs such as floriculture, dairy, potato, sugar beet and soils (efficiency, comparative advantage, quality)

9. Establish a broad-based College of Agriculture Advisory Committee. (demand, centrality)

Total dollars to be reallocated over 5 year period: $807,000 (0100)
                                  $1,500,000 (0302)
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Allocate resources for new research initiatives in agricultural and environmental areas of value added products, food safety, biological control, waste management, profitability, etc. (Strategy #7)

Reasons - Minnesota's economy depends significantly on the agricultural sector which currently faces significant new challenges from issues centered around profitability, water quality, food safety, value added products, farm chemicals, soil losses, waste management, and markets and policies. Research data to support many of the changes needed to address these issues are inadequate. The present allocations of resources for agricultural research does not adequately address these expanding needs. Additionally, the total resources for agricultural research have been declining due to shortfalls in federal funding and due to the extensive retrenchments in College of Agriculture funding over the past 10 years. The impact has been the loss of about 25 positions for research.

Considerations - The College of Agriculture with its branch stations is the only state resource equipped to conduct the agricultural research that is essential to maintain the competitiveness of our farms and farm communities and to continue important contributions to the state's economy. Allocation of resources into new high priority initiatives will require elimination of some current research activities. The College will narrow its commodity focus, which will leave certain segments of agriculture without an ongoing research base. In some cases, this activity might be covered by neighboring states or commodity resources. Some just won't get done, which will handicap those components of the economy.

Description - All open lines will revert to the College office. New positions will be assigned according to the College plan for priorities.

Background - This program change arose from departmental planning meetings, Commitment to Focus documents, and two 2-day retreats held by department heads and superintendents.
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Institute new teaching activities and improve efficiency of resource use. (Strategies 2 and 3)

Reasons - University graduates are generally deficient in scientific, technological and international perspectives. And, there is a significant demand from off-campus students for instruction focusing on agricultural and environmental issues. The College of Agriculture has the expertise and the comparative advantage to address both of these concerns. The College’s ongoing efforts in Project Sunrise have enhanced our ability to provide high quality advising and instruction that focuses on learner outcome objectives such as critical thinking, leadership, communication, teamwork, international perspectives, etc. Integration of these into such topics as world food and hunger, biotechnology/society interaction, environment, food safety, etc., can contribute significantly to the liberal education of all students. The resultant transfer of effort will assist the College in reducing its $0100/FYE student ratio. In addition, the College needs to address imbalances among the departments in the distribution of funds supporting teaching.

Considerations - Because of commitments to missions in agricultural extension and research, faculty appointments in the College of Agriculture are complex. Most faculty have split appointments of teaching and research or extension and research. Consequently, our teaching and research programs are mutually influencing. Since, the College must maintain the human resources to address a wide variety of external needs related to agriculture and the environment, reductions or shifts in teaching allocations often causes undesirable changes in research programs. Thus, the planned increase in teaching activities by the faculty will further reduce our research activities. This will increase pressure on our research efforts and lead to further demands from clientele for additional research resources. Some course offerings will be reduced as low enrollment standards are set.

Description - Teaching funds will be reallocated to those units that increase student FYE’s by offering new courses for general liberal education or for off-campus students. Minimum enrollment standards will be followed for all courses. Faculty will be evaluated and appropriately rewarded for teaching and advising as well as for research accomplishments.

Background - This program change arose from departmental planning meetings, Commitment to Focus documents, and two 2-day retreats held by department heads and superintendents.
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Increase efficiency of agricultural research by concentrating animal research to no more than two branch stations locations per livestock enterprise. (Strategy #5)

Reasons - Animal research is the most facility and labor intensive agricultural research activity. By concentrating activity in a given enterprise to two or less locations, larger numbers can be maintained at lower costs. If appropriately located, research productivity and efficiency of operation will be enhanced.

Considerations - Animal agriculture accounts for about one half of the cash farm receipts in Minnesota. It is even more important because it is a value added product. Animal agriculture of different types is widespread across the state and some concentration of research programs will produce a loss of visibility in some areas. There will be some loss of research information in those components of animal agriculture that are site specific, e.g. feed and feeding systems, waste management. Concentration of enterprises in fewer locations will require closing some facilities and building additional facilities at selected locations. These changes may require some employee transfers.

Description - Animal research in certain livestock enterprises will be closed out at certain locations and the animals moved to other stations. For example, dairy research at Grand Rapids will be moved to other stations.

Background - This program change arose from department head and superintendent planning meetings over the fall and early winter. Some specific aspects have been discussed with animal scientists, branch station personnel and citizens advisory groups, but more planning and discussions are needed before a plan can be completed or implemented.
College of Agriculture
Strategic Planning Abstract

Mission - The College of Agriculture encompasses responsibilities for research, education, and outreach related to the use of biological materials for society's needs and for the interactions of these products and processes with people and the environment. More explicitly, the mission is to provide responsible leadership in the generation and application of research-based knowledge to the use of our natural and human resources for the production, distribution, and consumption of food, fiber and renewable energy, and for the betterment of our natural and human environments; all with technology that addresses needs and concerns of a diverse constituency.

Vision - The College of Agriculture, an integral part of the University of Minnesota, will continue to be a highly respected national leader in the development and distribution of knowledge in current and emerging issues of food, fiber, and energy and their related interactions with the natural and human environments. We will continue to balance our programs in response to both the internal and external agendas set before us. Consequently, we will provide leadership to the University in education, research, and outreach related to the role of basic and applied sciences in meeting human needs. Furthermore, we will continue to develop and maintain high quality programs that serve as a foundation to maintain and enhance the economy and quality of life of Minnesota. We expect to continue as the only source of B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in agriculture and related fields in Minnesota and we aim to be the authoritative source of such information for all citizens. Finally, we envision an increased involvement with environmental issues and with urban audiences.

Major Strategic Objectives (with most relevant criteria)

1. Enhance College of Agriculture teaching and research programs by continuing to strengthen our human resources. Specifically the College will recruit for top quality and initiate extraordinary efforts to recruit a diverse community of faculty, staff, and students. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage)

2. Emphasize educational value and significantly expand the number of students we serve and do it in a more efficient, effective way. Thus, we will extend Project Sunrise (beyond the recent reduction from 17 to 10 majors and other current projects) to further strengthen the quality of COA graduates via incorporation of capstone courses, decision case studies, international perspectives, and research experiences into the curriculum (Phase II). We will extend programs to Greater Minnesota. (centrality, quality, efficiency)

3. Enhance those strong teaching, research, and outreach activities central to the College mission in a way that will enhance the future vitality of the College and the University and will continue to provide a foundation for the economic well being of agriculture and the rural sector of Minnesota in an environmental decade. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage)

4. Become a more integral part of the University by promotion of interdisciplinary activities, and by the design and teaching of courses that meet the liberal education requirements of the University by promoting scientific literacy, international understanding, and a comprehension of the interactions of food, agriculture, and natural resources with human and natural environments. (centrality, comparative advantage, quality, efficiency)

5. Emphasize and expand research activities that address the most contemporary issues of agricultural interactions with people and the environment. Highest priorities will be on activities that focus on a) the impact of agricultural practices on food and the environment b) enhancement of farm profitability and economic well being of the state and c) improvement of quality of life for all people. (centrality, quality, comparative advantage, demand)

6. Continue to be the only Minnesota institution of higher education offering B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in agriculture and related fields. (centrality, comparative advantage, effectiveness)
7. Enhance effectiveness of research programs by integration of branch station planning and research with College of Agriculture activities. \( \text{(centrality, comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness)} \)

Reallocation Strategy \( \text{(with most relevant criteria)} \)

1. Increase recruitment and transfer efforts with a goal of 1200 undergraduate majors and expanded classroom contacts for non-majors: \( \text{(centrality, comparative advantage, efficiency, demand)} \)
   a. design and implement new courses and activities that enhance the quality of undergraduate programs.
   b. participate in common entry point advising.
   c. design and implement courses and activities that meet University liberal education requirements and result in transfer of effort.
   d. design and teach courses for off campus students via distance delivery.
   e. implement 2+2 or 3+1 programs with other units and institutions.

2. Improve the efficiency of teaching resources: \( \text{(efficiency, demand)} \)
   a. reduce the frequency of low enrollment courses.
   b. reduce funds to units failing to meet teaching objectives.
   c. allocate resources to units meeting teaching objectives.

3. Allocate resources for new teaching initiatives that relate food and agricultural topics to the environment, world food and hunger, food safety, technology/society, risk assessment, biotechnology, integrated farming systems, waste management (urban and rural), national and international policies, etc. \( \text{(centrality, demand, comparative advantage)} \)

4. Allocate all open positions in accordance with strategic plans for teaching and research. This will involve reversion of all open positions to the College with allocation to highest priority needs. \( \text{(centrality, quality, demand)} \)

5. Allocate resources to enhance the recruitment, employment and retention of underrepresented minorities and women. \( \text{(quality, centrality)} \)

6. Integrate the branch experiment stations more fully into the planning, budgeting and focusing of agricultural and environmental programs of the College of Agriculture. \( \text{(efficiency and effectiveness, centrality)} \)
   a. increase efficiency of animal research by concentrating each livestock enterprise to a maximum of two branch stations in Greater Minnesota.
   b. increase effectiveness by sharing faculty among stations.
   c. integrate branch stations superintendents into the College planning processes.
   d. increase use of branch stations for outreach programs.

7. Allocate resources for new research initiatives in agricultural and environmental areas of value added products, food safety, biological control, waste management, profitability, economic development, and competitiveness, among others consistent with objectives. \( \text{(centrality, quality, demand, comparative advantage)} \)

8. Enhance effectiveness of teaching and research activities by promoting and accommodating interdepartmental, intercollegiate, and inter-University efforts such as the current combination of Animal Science programs under Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, the many current regional research programs, and the joint state cooperative programs such as floriculture, dairy, potato, sugarbeet and soils. \( \text{(efficiency, comparative advantage, quality)} \)

9. Establish a broad-based College of Agriculture Advisory Committee. \( \text{(demand, centrality)} \)

Total dollars to be reallocated over 5 year period: $807,000 \( \text{(0100)} \)

$1,500,000 \( \text{(0302)} \)
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Allocate resources for new research initiatives in agricultural and environmental areas of value added products, food safety, biological control, waste management, profitability, etc. (Strategy #7)

Reasons - Minnesota's economy depends significantly on the agricultural sector which currently faces significant new challenges from issues centered around profitability, water quality, food safety, value added products, farm chemicals, soil losses, waste management, and markets and policies. Research data to support many of the changes needed to address these issues are inadequate. The present allocations of resources for agricultural research does not adequately address these expanding needs. Additionally, the total resources for agricultural research have been declining due to shortfalls in federal funding and due to the extensive retrenchments in College of Agriculture funding over the past 10 years. The impact has been the loss of about 25 positions for research.

Considerations - The College of Agriculture with its branch stations is the only state resource equipped to conduct the agricultural research that is essential to maintain the competitiveness of our farms and farm communities and to continue important contributions to the state's economy. Allocation of resources into new high priority initiatives will require elimination of some current research activities. The College will narrow its commodity focus, which will leave certain segments of agriculture without an ongoing research base. In some cases, this activity might be covered by neighboring states or commodity resources. Some just won't get done, which will handicap those components of the economy.

Description - All open lines will revert to the College office. New positions will be assigned according to the College plan for priorities.

Background - This program change arose from departmental planning meetings, Commitment to Focus documents, and two 2-day retreats held by department heads and superintendents.
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Institute new teaching activities and improve efficiency of resource use. (Strategies 2 and 3)

Reasons - University graduates are generally deficient in scientific, technological and international perspectives. And, there is a significant demand from off-campus students for instruction focusing on agricultural and environmental issues. The College of Agriculture has the expertise and the comparative advantage to address both of these concerns. The College's ongoing efforts in Project Sunrise have enhanced our ability to provide high quality advising and instruction that focuses on learner outcome objectives such as critical thinking, leadership, communication, teamwork, international perspectives, etc. Integration of these into such topics as world food and hunger, biotechnology/society interaction, environment, food safety, etc., can contribute significantly to the liberal education of all students. The resultant transfer of effort will assist the College in reducing its $0100/FYE student ratio. In addition, the College needs to address imbalances among the departments in the distribution of funds supporting teaching.

Considerations - Because of commitments to missions in agricultural extension and research, faculty appointments in the College of Agriculture are complex. Most faculty have split appointments of teaching and research or extension and research. Consequently, our teaching and research programs are mutually influencing. Since, the College must maintain the human resources to address a wide variety of external needs related to agriculture and the environment, reductions or shifts in teaching allocations often causes undesirable changes in research programs. Thus, the planned increase in teaching activities by the faculty will further reduce our research activities. This will increase pressure on our research efforts and lead to further demands from clientele for additional research resources. Some course offerings will be reduced as low enrollment standards are set.

Description - Teaching funds will be reallocated to those units that increase student FYE's by offering new courses for general liberal education or for off-campus students. Minimum enrollment standards will be followed for all courses. Faculty will be evaluated and appropriately rewarded for teaching and advising as well as for research accomplishments.

Background - This program change arose from departmental planning meetings, Commitment to Focus documents, and two 2-day retreats held by department heads and superintendents.
Case Statement - Major Program Change
College of Agriculture

Change - Increase efficiency of agricultural research by concentrating animal research to no more than two branch stations locations per livestock enterprise. (Strategy #6)

Reasons - Animal research is the most expensive agricultural research activity. By concentrating activity in a given enterprise to two or less locations, larger numbers can be maintained at lower costs. If appropriately located, research productivity and efficiency of operation will be enhanced.

Considerations - Animal agriculture accounts for about one half of the cash farm receipts in Minnesota. It is even more important because it is a value added product. Animal agriculture of different types is widespread across the state and some concentration of research programs will produce a loss of visibility in some areas. There will be some loss of research information in those components of animal agriculture that are site specific, e.g. feed and feeding systems, waste management. Concentration of enterprises in fewer locations will require closing some facilities and building additional facilities at selected locations. These changes may require some employee transfers.

Description - Animal research in certain livestock enterprises will be closed out at certain locations and the animals moved to other stations. For example, swine and dairy research at Grand Rapids will be moved to other stations.

Background - This program change arose from department head and superintendent planning meetings over the fall and early winter. Some specific aspects have been discussed with animal scientists, branch station personnel and citizens advisory groups, but more planning and discussions are needed before a plan can be completed or implemented.
January 18, 1991

Reallocation1 Worksheet
College of Natural Resources

1. **Objective:** To strengthen the combined research and education programs in integrated resource management and protection including special emphasis on graduate programming in Conservation Biology and undergraduate instruction in Natural Resources and Environmental Studies.

   **Means:** Reallocate funds from traditional single resource oriented management programs within the Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife and of Forest Resources.

   **Subtotal:** $110,317 (O&M-0100) and $138,137 (AES-0302).

2. **Objective:** To enhance quality of the Urban Forestry undergraduate and extension programs.

   **Means:** Reallocation from farm forestry instruction and windbreak/shelterbelt forestry extension.

   **Subtotal:** $16,446 (O&M-0100) and $39,454 (MES-0300).

3. **Objective:** To strengthen forest products operations and marketing program of undergraduate and graduate instruction and complementary research.

   **Means:** Supplement PUF endowment professorship through reallocation from discretionary reserve of associate director AES and reallocation from wood technology and departmental support program.

   **Subtotal:** $60,737 (O&M-0100) and $51,063 (AES-0302).

**TOTAL:** 0100 = $187,500  
0302 = $189,200

AES- Agricultural Experiment Station

MES- Minnesota Extension Service

---

1 Reallocation shown is based on the assumption that present funding in this biennium is the base for the 5 year planning period.
January 18, 1991

COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Objective 1.
Integrated Resource Management

Case Statement

1. **Reasons for change:** Strong growth in student demand at the undergraduate and graduate level for our programs in this area reflects the increasing attention to problems of complex ecosystems and to efforts to serve multi-resource values sought by society. The Natural Resource and Environmental Studies majors have grown by more than 100 in the past five quarters. The graduate program in Conservation Biology is attracting national attention and 7-10 inquiries and applications per week. Increased state and national research efforts addressing issues on sustainability of natural resource systems, impacts of global change, and integrated resource management and protection have been evident in actions of the legislature, congress, studies of the National Research Council, and strengthening of international research institutions.

2. **Adapting to change:** Personnel from the recently established Fish and Wildlife Cooperative Research Unit of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service will pick up selected instruction and research. Some of the single resource research will be terminated. Selected research areas with limited opportunities for contribution and declining student interest will be eliminated.

3. **Description of change:** Objective is to strengthen the combined research and education programs in integrated resource management and protection with special emphasis on graduate programming in Conservation Biology and undergraduate instruction in the Natural Resources and Environmental Studies curriculum.

4. **Background for decision:** Based upon department and College Executive Committee analysis and discussion.

5. **For more information:** Contact- Richard A. Skok, Dean, College of Natural Resources, 235 NRAB, St. Paul; phone, 624-1234.
January 18, 1991  

COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
Objective 3.  
Forest Products Operations and Marketing  

Case Statement  

1. **Reasons for change:** Demand for forest products marketing graduates is strong. Evidence through contacts and placement experience nationally indicates that increased graduates are needed. Supplement needed for an endowed professorship recently completed under the PUF program for forest products marketing. Minnesota's forest products industry has been a major contributor to that endowment. Important opportunities exist to develop a strong mid-management education program for this industry both regionally and nationally.  

2. **Adapting to change:** Elements of the present wood technology instruction will be retained by shifts to other faculty and some aspects discontinued if not core to the Forest Products curriculum. Research adaptation will include analysis of the applicability of similar research being done by other state or federal institutions to our needs here. Released research funds will be directed to more basic research needs in fundamental operations in wood drying and processing.  

3. **Description of change:** This will strengthen the undergraduate programming in forest products marketing by providing a faculty person with leadership in development, industry contacts, and student advising. Graduate education and research in forest products processes and production will be reoriented to more basic studies.  

4. **Background for decision:** The forest products marketing program was identified as a college priority in the 1986 Strategy for Focus collegiate plan. Consultation with a Forest Products Marketing Advisory Committee and with departmental faculty reaffirm this as a continuing priority. Observations on the national and regional trends in research and education in forest products are the basis for change proposed in the wood technology area.  

5. **For more information:** Contact- Richard A. Skok, Dean, College of Natural Resources, 235 NRAB, St. Paul; phone, 624-1234.
January 18, 1991

COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Objective 2.
Urban Forestry

Case Statement

1. Reasons for change: Increased interest in management and protection of the forest vegetation in the communities where people live has led to curricular development in urban forestry. A small but steady demand exists for graduates in this area. The program needs to be firmed up with a continuing faculty commitment. Professionals practicing in this area and communities seeking understanding of urban forestry programs are increasingly interested in outreach educational programming. Major new federal initiatives are encouraging community involvement in urban forestry programs (e.g., America the Beautiful). Urban forestry is a priority documented in the recent staffing plan of the Minnesota Extension Service.

2. Adapting to change: Educational outreach programs will be assumed by state and federal resource agencies or eliminated. The existing farm forestry instruction will be available in other course offerings or is targeted to be eliminated. This reallocation will replace, in part, effort currently conducted by the College of Agriculture but scheduled for elimination.

3. Description of change: Enhance the quality of the urban forestry undergraduate and extension programming.

4. Background for decision: Consultation with departmental faculty, department recommendation and discussion with College Executive Committee. Priority recommendation through the Minnesota Extension Service Strategic Planning process.

5. For more information: Contact- Richard A. Skok, Dean, College of Natural Resources, 235 NRAB, St. Paul; phone, 624-1234.
COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY

UNIT MISSION: The College of Human Ecology examines the interaction of humans and their environment(s): the social environment, the natural environment and the constructed environment. The College's teaching, research and outreach provides insights into how people affect and are affected by their surroundings in a changing world.

UNIT VISION: The College of Human Ecology aspires to maintain highly ranked graduate programs, strengthened undergraduate programs, continued leadership of innovative outreach programs, and increased research productivity which empowers faculty, staff and students to work creatively and effectively in improving the human condition.

MAJOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT:

- Strengthen the quality of our teaching, research and extension programs; improve and enhance the climate of our academic work environment for students, staff, faculty and alumni, especially the undergraduate student experience (criteria: centrality, quality, efficiency, effectiveness and comparative advantage).
- Strengthen and/or increase experiences for faculty, staff and students which facilitates cultural diversity and global awareness (criteria: centrality and quality).
- Communicate and garner support for the aspirations of the College within the University and with important external agencies and constituencies (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness).
- Develop and strengthen the financial and data management and personnel performance systems of the College and improve the administrative and operational procedures in the College; acquire, replace and maintain space, equipment and physical facilities (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness).

REALLOCATION STRATEGY FOR THE UNIT:

- Each department will more closely match the number of faculty, and available resources, for offering high quality programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. Enrollment management in the college, as mandated by Academic Priorities, and reallocation among programs will be necessary. Undergraduates will be offered required courses without dependence on the use of CEE, except for occasional overloads or specialized elective courses. (criteria: demand, quality, efficiency and effectiveness).
- Redesign or merge of programs by offering more integrated or broader programs. Courses containing the same general base of knowledge will not be duplicated within departments and across the College. Participation in liberal education courses will be sought when compatible with program goals and available resources (criteria: quality, efficiency, effectiveness, comparative advantage, and demand).
- The College office will be responsible for University common entry point and initial advising, admission, and graduation, but decentralization of advising beyond the first quarter will be accomplished by 1993. Consideration of greater uniformity in College or Department for grade point average and general departmental requirements (criteria: efficiency, effectiveness and quality).
- A departmental participative model will be fostered for honors and high ability students, internship exploration, recruitment, advising, minority recruitment, fundraising, alumni relations, career services, public relations, and data management (criteria: quality and efficiency/effectiveness).
- Units will maintain minimum enrollment expectation in undergraduate and graduate classes for course offerings and seek different instructional delivery methods/systems to maximize faculty expertise (criteria: quality and efficiency/effectiveness).
- Greater emphasis will be placed on increasing or redirecting research, creative activity and grant productivity (criteria: quality, comparative advantage, demand, centrality to mission).

State total unit dollars available for internal reallocation: $646,580 (AES $156,390 and 0100 $490,190)
Case Statement on Major Program Change: Redesign or merger of programs to more closely match the number of faculty, and available resources, for offering high quality programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. Enrollment management in the college, as mandated by Academic Priorities, and reallocation among programs will be necessary. Undergraduates will be offered required courses without dependence on CEE, except for occasional overloads or specialized elective courses.

Reasons for Change: 1) Sections of classes, taught by full time faculty, need to be available to allow students to complete their degree within a reasonable period of time (quality, demand); 2) A better balance, and coordination of programming, is essential to provide a high quality, integrated effort in the department and college (quality, effectiveness, comparative advantage). 3) Need for additional course sections: 2,000 spaces in 100 sections of 5 design courses (10 day classes were closed in May for fall registration; approximately 100 sections open to undergraduates are offered through CEE, 12 of these are required courses offered only through CEE).

Considerations in covering needs met by unit(s): Demand is high for most of our undergraduate, professional and graduate programs. Graduate professional degree demands are not met elsewhere in the university, state or neighboring states. Some of the undergraduate professional degree demands are met at other units in the state or in neighboring states, however, demand far exceeds availability.

Description of program change: Program emphases and enrollment management will be designed to more closely match the number and expertise of our present fulltime faculty, even though student demand for the program may be high. New faculty hires will be designated to ensure high quality programming needs. Number of undergraduate program options and course offerings will be reduced by at least 25%, while placing greater emphasis on graduate education.

Background of decision: Strategic planning for reallocation was initiated in the college in January, 1990, to be completed by fall, 1990. Two summer administrative retreats facilitated the initiation of the process and resulted in evaluative criteria. Program changes and reallocations are based on: college goals, academic priorities documents, university and college criteria for program priorities, present university budget strategy priorities, department planning document, and the CHE Policy and Planning Committee's curriculum grounded planning database. The planning recommendations have been presented at a faculty meeting and response has been solicited from the department/school heads and the Policy and Planning Committee.

For more information: Mary E. Heltsley, Dean, College of Human Ecology, 32 McNeal, St. Paul Campus (612-624-3430).
Case statement on improving academic student advising: The College office will be responsible for University common entry point and initial advising, admission, and graduation, but decentralization of advising beyond the first quarter will be accomplished by 1993. Consideration of greater uniformity in College or Department for grade point average and general departmental requirements

Reasons for change: Because of earlier rescissions, restricted gift funds are used to employ advising staff. Currently, about 500 undergraduate students (45%) receive their advising from graduate and undergraduate student advisers in the College office. Students lack quality advising due to staff turnover and they lack access to faculty advisers in departments. This will implement the President's initiative of raising quality of student support.

Considerations in covering needs met by units: Funds will be reallocated to advising in departments and solicited gift funds for graduate students now used for advising will be designated for research and teaching assistantships. In return, departments will assume the major responsibility for student advising, forming a partnership between faculty advisers and administrative advisers.

Description of program change: The program change includes faculty advising workshops, student tracking and evaluation system, and staff development. To assist with common entry implementation, $55,000 has been allocated from the Vice Provost's office.

Background of decision: Over the past 18 months, strategic planning has involved the faculty, staff, and administrators in evaluating the quality of student support. A new advising model is being implemented. Departments have assumed more responsibility for advising, a new staff member was employed, a 56% increase in advising inter-university students has occurred, etc. A survey of students to evaluate advising quality will be given Spring Quarter.

For more information: M. Janice Hogan, Associate Dean, College of Human Ecology, 32 McNeal, St. Paul Campus (612-625-6766).
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION:
IMPROVING QUALITY IN A TIME OF
LIMITED RESOURCES

Reallocation Worksheets and Case Statements

Arts, Sciences, and Engineering
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

1. Unit Mission: The College of Liberal Arts is the University's largest college. It has a tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service in the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences. The college strives for excellence in all parts of this mission. Departments and programs in the college are at the core of the university, comprising a central part of all baccalaureate degrees. The quality of the college's programs in graduate training and research are an essential component of evaluations of the quality of the University as a whole.

2. Unit Vision:

Teaching

The college seeks to introduce undergraduate students to the methods and skills of intellectual inquiry, to the heritage of knowledge and creativity from the past, and to an understanding of individual, social, and cultural behavior in a pluralistic world.

The college will continue to work to improve the quality of instruction in lower division courses by encouraging innovative instruction, by increasing the participation of faculty in large survey courses, and by reducing section sizes. Reallocation and the use of new resources to increase the number of faculty and teaching assistants in select departments will play a critical role in this task, for it is precisely the small size of the college faculty that currently limits the quality of the introductory courses it now offers.

The college will also work to provide students with more intensive instruction within their chosen fields and thus emphasize its strength as an undergraduate institution within a research university, with a faculty of distinguished scholars, many of them leaders in their disciplines. Unfortunately, inadequate resources—for example, too few faculty and teaching assistants, poor laboratory facilities, too few computers, and a lack of funds to purchase research materials—have prevented the college from realizing its potential in this area. Through reallocation and the investment of new resources in select departments characterized by large numbers of majors and a strong record of scholarship, the college will exploit more fully its major comparative advantage in undergraduate education.

Recruiting a more diverse faculty and developing a multicultural curriculum are central to our efforts to increase the diversity of CLA students. This fall, 15% of new high school students were students of color. The retention of these students and continued efforts to insure the diversity of new students are critical to our commitment to enhance student diversity. In addition, the college will restructure and improve the Martin Luther King Program to increase our retention of both minority and non-minority students who are educationally "at risk."

Research

The college expects faculty and programs to occupy positions of national and international leadership in graduate training, and to be at the forefront of research and creative activity. The college's highest priority is to enhance the quality of its most distinguished units and to improve selected units which play a central role in liberal education. The college will work to ensure that its major departments are adequately supported by reallocating existing resources and allocating new resources in order to increase faculty size, increase the number of support staff, and increase support of graduate assistants.

Service

The college faculty are broadly involved in the cultural, economic, and political affairs of the state and nation. In these activities they attempt to cultivate a critical appreciation of the arts and to frame social and intellectual issues in order to inform public debate and policy. The college's service and outreach activities will benefit, as support for the scholarly and creative activities of its faculty and students is increased.
3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit:

a. To improve the quality of undergraduate education (criteria: quality, centrality, demand):
   - improve retention and graduation rates;
   - improve the quality of instruction in introductory courses;
   - enhance the quality of instruction in majors;
   - strengthen multicultural and international aspects of the curriculum;
   - improve the recruitment and retention of students of color.

b. To enhance the quality of a distinguished research faculty (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage);
   - sustain and enhance the quality of units that have achieved national distinction;
   - improve select departments in the arts, humanities, and social sciences;
   - increase appointments of faculty of color;
   - increase appointments of faculty with international expertise.

c. To increase administrative efficiency and effectiveness: (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness)

Under a plan called Agenda for Action, the college is in the process of implementing a broad strategy designed to redirect faculty effort toward teaching and research, protect the quality of small academic programs, deliver instruction more efficiently, and strengthen administrative and governance capabilities. This strategy includes:

   - combining or eliminating small administrative units (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness);
   - eliminating small undergraduate and graduate degree programs (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness);
   - reorganizing of foreign area studies programs (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness);
   - offering small classes less frequently (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

The college will enter the next academic year with a substantially improved administrative structure. The number of independently budgeted units reporting directly to the dean will be reduced by at least ten. The five undergraduate area studies programs now located in several small units will be gathered together within the Institute of International Studies. The administrative burden placed on the social science departments whose faculty now provide essential governance services to small language and literature units will be eliminated. Several free-standing undergraduate degree programs will be reorganized and administered through core departments or the Office for Individualized Degree Programs. Several small degree programs will be eliminated or merged with larger and more efficient programs. While these are significant changes in the administrative structure of the college, the process of review and reorganization will be ongoing.

4. Allocation and Reallocation Strategy for the Unit:

a. Internal reallocation of faculty positions coupled with allocation of new resources to build core departments in the humanities, social sciences, and arts (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Reallocation of central collegiate resources and allocation of new resources to improve undergraduate instruction (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

c. Reorganization and streamlining of collegiate administrative structures (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

d. Redirection of resources from departmental administrative functions to teaching and research activities through reorganization and consolidation of small departments and programs and elimination of small undergraduate and graduate majors (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used: $4,737,274
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

1. Unit Mission: The Institute of Technology offers undergraduate and graduate programs in engineering, computer science, mathematics, and the physical sciences, and provides core instruction in its major disciplines for undergraduate students in all colleges. Its mission is to provide high quality instructional, research, and outreach programs that respond to the present and future needs of the state and nation.

2. Unit Vision: The Institute's programs of instruction and research have attained significant national distinction, as shown by the fact that over 55% of its funding derives from federal and industrial sources, by its capacity to attract outstanding faculty and students, and by the attractiveness of its graduates to recruiters from across the nation. However, these programs are presently severely constrained and unbalanced by financial and space resources that are not commensurate with IT's obligations and responsibilities. The Institute's strategy is to retain and improve the quality and effectiveness of its programs, by reallocating present resources and by appropriate allocation of some new resources in areas of high need, resulting in a better balanced Institute with appropriately-funded programs of high quality.

The Institute will significantly improve undergraduate instructional programs; this requires an appropriate balance of the number of programs, the size of the student body, faculty and support staff, resources for advising programs, and adequate budgets for supplies and instructional equipment.

The quality of IT's outreach activities will be increased while maintaining their present overall level and increasing specifically high demand components; notable among these are the Rochester-based M.S. program and other post-baccalaureate educational programs, the Talented Youth Mathematics Program and similar K-12 activities, and programs directed to water and environmental problems. This implies redirection of resources from outreach programs of lesser priority.

An equally important task is to continue to improve the graduate and research programs and to continue to attract federal and industrial research funds for this purpose. This implies an increase in funding to provide the matches required for federal grants and the funds to initiate research by new faculty members, including those who will enhance the Institute's diversity.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit: The Institute's strategy is to provide a balanced mix of high quality instruction and advising, outreach, and research to meet the needs of the state and nation. Given the planned resources, the following objectives will be pursued:

Instruction

a. A strategic objective of the Institute is to increase significantly funds for instructional equipment, advising staff, and supplies. The planned available resources imply that the number of faculty in the Institute as a whole will be essentially constant (criteria: quality, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. High quality undergraduate education requires appropriate student/faculty ratios, effective advising, and appropriate facilities. This requires a reallocation of resources among programs, based on planned enrollment targets for each program and for the Institute as a whole. As part of the reallocation, the undergraduate program in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering will be discontinued and some undergraduate instruction in fluid mechanics will be shifted from Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics to Civil Engineering (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

c. The Institute plans an increase of 50 M.S. degrees granted each year over the present base, a significant increase.

Outreach

d. An Objective of the Institute is to strengthen and in a few cases expand outreach programs directed to the physical and environmental infrastructure of the state, to M.S. and non-credit post-baccalaureate education (including televised instruction), and to programs in science, mathematics, and technology directed to K-12 education. This implies redirection of resources from programs of lower priority to the state; thus the
Institute will close the Mineral Resources Research Center (criteria: quality, centrality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness) and curtail its activities in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering.

Research

e. The Institute is very successful in securing competitive grants from federal agencies that usually require a matching commitment from the Institute. An objective is to increase resources for this purpose and for the support of research programs of new faculty (criteria: quality, centrality, comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness).

4. Allocation and Reallocation Strategy for the Unit: The Institute of Technology's budget from recurring and non-recurring state funds for FY91 is $56 million. Of this amount $4.9 million of recurring funds will be reallocated, and the budget of the Institute will be augmented for FY92 by $3.0 million to a total of $59 million. Most of the reallocated and newly allocated resources will be directed to such non-personnel needs as instructional equipment and supplies budgets.

a. Continue to limit the overall number of undergraduate students in the Institute with appropriate redistribution of student numbers and faculty (and staff) resources between programs to achieve appropriate faculty student ratios in all programs. This involves a reallocation of approximately 35 faculty (8%) (and corresponding staff) positions, over a period of five years, from areas of low need and priority to areas of high need and high priority. This represents a reallocation of approximately $3.75 million (criteria: quality, demand, effectiveness, efficiency, centrality).

b. A further reallocation of approximately $300,000 in faculty and staff effort will be directed to increase advising programs throughout the Institute and its departments.

c. Close the Mineral Resources Research Center, discontinue the ABET-accredited undergraduate program in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, and curtail and redirect graduate, research, and outreach programs in this area. This implies a reallocation of approximately $0.6 million in state funds (criteria: demand, effectiveness, efficiency, centrality).

d. Discontinue support of the Williams Laboratory of Nuclear Physics, resulting in savings of space-related costs of $150,000 per year.

e. Reallocation approximately 25 half-time teaching assistantships to areas of high priority. This implies the reallocation of $250,000.

f. Increase the level of recurring investments in instructional equipment purchase and its maintenance (including computational equipment) by $1.0 million yielding a total yearly investment of $2.7 million.

g. Enhance the supplies budgets of departments within the Institute by $900,000 to a total of $2.4 million per year, in order to provide proper support for both instructional and research programs.

h. Expand the level of outreach activities of the Institute directed to K-12 education and post-baccalaureate education (including televised instruction) through an increase of $350,000 per year. An increase of 50 M.S. degrees per year is planned.

i. Increase programs of retention and recruitment within the Institute directed to improve the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students through a yearly increase of the budgets for this purpose of $250,000 per year.

j. Expand the provision of funds for matching federal grants for instructional and research activities, and for the initiation of research by replacement faculty by $1.1 million.

Total funds reallocated is $4.9 million; a total increase of $3.0 million is planned for state recurring and non-recurring funds.
MINERAL RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTER AND
B.S. PROGRAM IN EXTRACTIVE METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING

A. Description of Program Change

The Mineral Resources Research Center (MRRC) is a unit of the Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering whose educational, research, and outreach activities are centered in mineral processing and extractive metallurgy. The MRRC, as a unit, is the direct descendant of the Mines Experiment Station, established in 1911. The B.S. program in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, together with the B.S. program in Geo-Engineering and the B.S. program in Materials Science and Engineering, are descendants of the undergraduate programs of the School of Mines and Metallurgy established at the University in 1927. The total expenditures in FY90 associated with MRRC activity were $2,366,156.

The University proposes to discontinue, after the graduation of presently enrolled junior and senior students, the accredited B.S. program in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, to modify and partially redirect graduate instruction and research activities of the MRRC and the associated faculty by increased emphasis on environmental and waste management areas, and to attempt to facilitate the transfer of some aspects of development activities presently based within the MRRC to other units of the University, notably the Natural Resources Research Institute, and to other private sector and National laboratories.

This major program change is taken after considerable analysis, and with some regret. The MRRC and its predecessor units have made notable contributions in the past to instruction, research, and economic development. The programs in mining and metallurgy were major elements of the instructional programs of the Institute of Technology in the past; research in this area led, forty years ago, to the development of the taconite process, of major economic impact to the state. However, more recently, the maturity of the mining and extractive metallurgical industry and the development of nonmetallic and synthetic materials have significantly changed the educational preparation required of students, and the nature of the research and development activities appropriate in this area.

The number of undergraduate students pursuing B.S. degrees in the general field of mineral engineering has significantly decreased, both nationally and locally. During the past five years only six B.S. degrees in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering were granted by the Institute of Technology; the fifteen programs in the U.S. with designations in Extractive or Mineral Process Engineering granted only 32 B.S. degrees in 1988. There is a national surplus of undergraduate programs in this field; in our region the programs at the South Dakota School of Mines and at Michigan Technological University are badly underutilized. The reasons for this lack of demand are three. The overwhelming majority of engineers associated with the mining and extractive metallurgical industries are electrical, mechanical, and chemical engineers. Secondly, there are serious concerns about the wisdom of the high level of early specialization implied by a curriculum leading to a B.S. in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering. Lastly, instructional programs developed in the past fifteen years in Chemical Engineering and Materials Science and Engineering are viewed as better preparations for careers in these fields.

The research, both basic and applied, in the field of extractive metallurgy has also changed in nature, as would be expected, in the past twenty years. The maturity of the industry has placed increased emphasis on very large development projects. Projects of such a nature are more fruitfully pursued at specialized industrial and National laboratories than at universities or educational institutions.

These major changes, in the field, developing and accelerating in the past ten years, have repeatedly prompted the University to examine and re-examine its educational, research, and outreach activities in this area. There have been, in the past, serious concerns about the effectiveness of these programs, at the instructional, research, and outreach level. Continued analysis during the past three years has led to the conclusion that a continuation of the present variety of activities, at this level in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering, is no longer justifiable.

B. Reasons for Change

The University proposes to discontinue the accredited B.S. program in Extractive Metallurgical
Engineering once the presently enrolled 7 seniors and 4 juniors have graduated in 1993. Similar educational programs are accessible in the region and in the nation, most notably at the South Dakota School of Mines, where Minnesotans can avail themselves of our tuition reciprocity agreements.

The University will continue its graduate programs in this area but strongly redirect its emphasis toward problems of environmental engineering and waste management in which the five faculty members associated with the MRRC have significant expertise. These faculty members will continue their activities in their Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering.

The University will attempt to facilitate the transfer of certain major development and applied projects to other, more appropriate and effective entities. The Natural Resources Research Institute (NRRI) of the University already undertakes activities in related areas. Major activities are funded by the U.S. Department of Energy at some of its laboratories, and at industrial laboratories. Finally, the University will attempt to interest private sector entities.

The implication of the proposed major program change is the significant curtailment of activities in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering on the Twin Cities Campus to meet the level of need, of appropriateness for a university, and for the expenditure of public funds.

C. How Previous Needs will be Covered

The University plans, as stated above, to discontinue admitting students (at the junior level) for the program leading to the B.S. in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering.

The University plans to significantly contract the present graduate research and outreach activities in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering based in the MRRC; during the period of contraction maximal efforts will be made to transfer projects and activities to more appropriate entities. The present building that houses the MRRC will be vacated with all deliberate, but orderly, speed and utilized for purposes not associated with the Institute of Technology.

D. Background of Decision

This proposal is the culmination of a series of analysis over the past six years, centered on the effectiveness of these programs, their benefits, and their costs. Within the Institute of Technology, activities in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering have only a very low priority, given other needs and the accessibility to underutilized similar activities in the region, and the nation. The conclusion reached during the last three months within the context of the Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering and of the Institute of Technology that, on the basis of demand, effectiveness and efficiency, centrality, quality, uniqueness, appropriateness, and cost effectiveness the programs in Extractive Metallurgical Engineering must be significantly contracted and redirected to a level commensurate with needs, and likely benefits.

E. For More information

E. F. Infante  
Dean, Institute of Technology  
107 Walter Library  
(612) 624-2006

Steven Crouch  
Head, Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering  
122 CME Building  
(612) 625-4080

Kenneth Reid  
Director, MRRC  
103 MRRC  
(612) 625-3344
WILLIAMS LABORATORY OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS

A. Description of Program Change

The Williams Laboratory of Nuclear Physics is a unit of the School of Physics and Astronomy centered on a large tandem accelerator. This Laboratory was a center of research and advanced instruction in nuclear physics during the 60's and 70's. The relatively low energy levels of the accelerator, the maturity and decrease of interest in research in nuclear physics, and the aging of equipment result in a very low priority for the educational and research activities of this Laboratory. The Laboratory does not have any undergraduate or graduate students associated with its activities. One faculty member in the School of Physics and Astronomy centers his activities on the tandem accelerator for work which is mostly supported by industrial funds. The level of activity in the Laboratory is not sufficient to justify its continued support from instructional and research funds; the cost of operation of the accelerator and of the space it occupies is significant, and is estimated at $150,000 per year.

B. Reasons for Change

Repeated unsuccessful efforts have been made during the past five years to increase the level of activity of the Laboratory and of its accelerator, including a major proposal to the U.S. Geological Service and the Department of Energy. There is a surplus of similar facilities at other universities and National Laboratories. The present low level activity of the Laboratory is centered on the use of the accelerator for testing of some commercial products. The University will attempt to facilitate the continuation of this work if it is self-supporting, including the costs associated with space, utilities, and maintenance. University support for the Laboratory facility from instructional and research funds will be discontinued in the immediate future.

Neither instructional nor research activities in the School of Physics and Astronomy will be significantly affected by the closure of the Laboratory.

C. How Previous Needs will be Covered

The University will discontinue its support of the Laboratory; it will also attempt to facilitate the continuation of the present nonacademic activities if these can be made self-supporting.

D. Background of Decision

This decision is the culmination, and conclusion, of a series of attempted actions over five years to utilize, at a justifiable level, a laboratory which is obsolescent, and in an area of limited instructional and research interest. This Laboratory, and its activities, have a low priority within the School of Physics and Astronomy and within the Institute of Technology. The cost/benefit analysis of the continued operation of the Laboratory does not justify the continued support from public funds on either effectiveness, centrality, or demand.

E. For More information

E. F. Infante, Dean, Institute of Technology
107 Walter Library
(612) 624-2006

M. Marshak, Head, School of Physics and Astronomy
148 Physics Building
(612) 624-6062

J. H. Broadhurst, Professor, School of Physics and Astronomy
148 Physics Building
(612) 624-2502
COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

1. Unit Mission: The College of Biological Sciences has a tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service in all areas of biology, from the molecular through the organismal to the biosphere. It shares with the University the responsibility of providing access to excellence in each part of this mission.

2. Unit Vision:

Teaching

In its teaching mission, the college aspires to bring an understanding and knowledge of biology to both majors and non-majors. It hopes through its efforts to bring biological literacy to all graduates of the University. The introductory biology courses of CBS currently serve 2,500 students per year. The college plans to improve its introductory curriculum by designing a course that will be targeted specifically at non-majors, while redesigning the course for majors to incorporate additional material on ecology and evolution. Several of the best teachers in the college have volunteered to commit nearly all of their time to these efforts in undergraduate education. The college will also continue to incorporate research into the educational experience of undergraduate students. Currently more than 60% of undergraduate majors spend at least one term doing research in a faculty laboratory. The college intends to reach a point where all majors have a minimum of one term of research and to provide the option for a longer experience for more of those who desire it.

Research

In its research mission, the college seeks to add to our knowledge of living systems of all sorts, from the subcellular to ecosystems. This research leads to the generation and dissemination of novel information, the training of new generations of scientists, and the solution of problems of importance to society. One of the strongest units in the college and an area of high graduate student demand is biochemistry. The college plans to increase its support for the Department of Biochemistry through reallocation from other units. Other important areas for biological research of importance to the state and the larger scientific community include developmental biology and molecular systematic biology. In order to take advantage of opportunities in these areas, the college will reallocate resources from human genetics to developmental biology and resources from classical systematics to molecular systematics. These changes meet the objective of preserving high quality in faculty and continuing high growth in research.

With the encouragement of the University's central administration, the college is also actively exploring the possibility of redefining the duties of the Director of the Gray Freshwater Biological Institute (GFI) to include the Directorship of the University's Water Resource Research Centers (WRRC). Under this arrangement, the WRRC would be transferred to the College of Biological Sciences. There are hundreds of faculty engaged in various aspects of water research at the University of Minnesota, and the Director of the WRRC ought to be the major coordinator of these efforts. This reorganization would bring the GFI, a major focus of water research, into closer integration with the rest of the campus. It would provide a spokesperson for water research on campus, and a liaison between the public and the faculty at the University, directing inquiries to the appropriate center, as well as improving communication between research programs and centers in the Institute of Technology, the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Agriculture, and the College of Natural Resources. It would be the responsibility of the Director and his staff to facilitate interaction between all parts of the water research community and the interested state and private agencies.

The $200,000 in new resources allocated to the College of Biological Sciences will be used to support research initiatives in the areas discussed above.

Service

In its service mission, the college provides education to the non-University public about biology, serves as a resource of information to society, generates technology to help solve society's problems, and provides faculty expertise to the disciplines. The Bell Museum of Natural History is the unit in the college with the most distinguished history of public outreach efforts. The expertise in public education and exhibits of the Museum staff will be used to bring the activities of all the units of the college to the public. This will help educate the
public about the crucial biological issues of the next century; it will build public support for the college; and it will help expand the membership of the Museum. This plan moves a program which was relatively narrowly focused to a position of centrality within the college. It will increase outreach in the college by involving all collegiate units. These changes will be facilitated by the hiring of a CBS Director of Public Outreach Programs, who will be Associate Director for Public Programs of the Bell Museum of Natural History.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit:

a. To strengthen the curriculum and undergraduate education by:

- differentiating between courses for majors and courses for non-majors and by redesigning courses as necessary to better serve both groups (criteria: quality, centrality, efficiency and effectiveness);
- incorporating as part of the learning experience for all students an experience with research, in which students work collaboratively with faculty (criteria: quality, comparative advantage);
- improving training in teaching as well as research for graduate students (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

b. To strengthen research and graduate education by:

- building upon existing research strengths, in order to sustain and further improve programs of national distinction (criteria: quality, comparative advantage);
- investing in programs that are central to the biological disciplines and to carry out research that is significant because of its importance to the disciplines (criteria: quality, comparative advantage).

c. To position the college and to commit its resources with sufficient flexibility, so that it can respond to important changes in rapidly evolving disciplines and to play a leadership role in educating the general public about developments in modern biology and in protecting the biosphere (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

d. To recruit into the college faculty, staff, and students reflecting the ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity of American Society as a whole.

4. Allocation and Reallocation Strategy for the Unit:

a. Reallocation of faculty positions (18%) in order to match resources with needs and opportunities in such areas as biochemistry, developmental biology, and molecular systematics (criteria: demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Redirection of the effort of selected faculty to undergraduate educational programs, including improvement of the introductory curriculum and development of increased opportunities for undergraduate student involvement in research programs (criteria: quality, demand).

c. Reorganization of outreach efforts to provide a college-wide focus (criteria: demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used: $969,492
1. Unit Mission: The College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (CALA) provides the state's only programs in the architectural disciplines and is one of only a few such schools in the upper midwest. The mission of the college is the education of students and professionals at all levels through: 1) a commitment to excellence in teaching, 2) the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge through scholarship, research, exemplary professional practice, and artistic production, and 3) the advancement and application of knowledge and expertise through discipline related service. While the college is organized to serve the needs of a profession and known nationally for the excellence of its professional educational programs, it should be emphasized that the college also provides a unique component of the University's liberal arts curriculum in courses addressing the role of the built environment in human culture. An educated citizenry, knowledgeable of its roles and responsibilities, is essential to promoting quality in the creation of our built environment.

2. Unit Vision:

The College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture became a separate collegiate unit of the University of Minnesota in 1989, when it was separated from the Institute of Technology and the College of Agriculture, which had had joint administrative responsibility. It is important that the college build its identity through efficient administrative structures, while maintaining established and building new relationships with such programs in other colleges as structural engineering, horticulture, interior design, geography, art history, the Humphrey Institute, and the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

Professional Degree Programs

Further strengthening of the college's professional degree programs is an important objective; in particular, it is essential that the professional education provided by the college is responsive to changes in a profession that is becoming ever more technical, sophisticated, and specialized.

The Department of Architecture's professional curriculum is currently organized around three degree programs: the B.Arch and M.Arch1, which are equivalent, first professional degree programs, and the M.Arch2, which is a post-professional degree program. The B.Arch is a 5 year program which serves students without a prior baccalaureate degree. The M.Arch1 is a 2-4 year program which serves students with a prior baccalaureate degree. Both are accredited degrees and either one is accepted to fulfill requirements for licensure. While each degree serves different students, there is a certain redundancy, confusion, and diffusion of resources by having two degrees (undergraduate and graduate) which are equivalent credentials for professional licensure. The college is giving serious consideration to a major restructuring of the professional degree programs, which would involve the elimination of one of the degree programs.

A decision to go with only one first professional degree program would:

1) focus and strengthen the one selected;
2) eliminate the confusion between the two existing equivalent programs;
3) free-up resources to strengthen a research-based post-professional master's degree program (either M.Arch2, MS, or MA is Architecture).

It should be emphasized that students from the eliminated degree program would be accommodated within the framework of the selected degree program. In the process of deciding which of the degrees will be eliminated, careful consideration will be given to design the selected first professional degree structure to accommodate students from the eliminated program.

Research

It is only recently that research has become a significant component of the college's activities, and it is of critical importance that the college continue to develop strong research programs. Support of the college's research activities has grown from less than $50,000/year in 1984-85 to more than $1,700,000/year in 1990-91. The college's research is concentrated in three broad areas: 1) history of theory, 2) urban design, including such issues as environmental impact and light rail transit, and 3) building research, with special emphasis on energy...
efficiency. It is important that the college now develop a strong, research based, post-professional degree program, in conjunction with its research efforts. Faculty research activities require the involvement of more qualified and advanced graduate students, and the increased specialization and complexity of professional practice demands a more research-oriented, post-professional degree program.

Development of a research oriented master's program has been a long term goal of the faculty, and the reallocation process has created an opportunity to realize this goal.

Depending on which of the first professional degree programs is eliminated, the Department of Architecture will develop a research-based, post-professional degree program. This will be either a new MS/MA, if the B.Arch is eliminated, or an enhanced M.Arch2, if the M.Arch1 is eliminated.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit:

a. elimination of either the B.Arch or M.Arch1 degree program and, if the B.Arch degree is eliminated, institution of a BA/BS requirement for all students (criteria: quality, comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness);

b. development of a post-professional degree program in Architecture with a research orientation (criteria: quality, demand, efficiency and effectiveness);

c. provision of increased support for research initiatives in the Department of Architecture and the Department of Landscape Architecture (criteria: quality, demand).

4. Reallocation Strategy for the Unit:

a. Reduction of college administration (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

b. Reallocation of 3 faculty positions (8%) in the Department of Architecture from the first professional degree programs to a research based, post-professional degree program in Architecture (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

c. Reallocation of 1.55 faculty positions (10%) in the Department of Landscape Architecture to the department's research activities in such areas as environmental issues in urban design (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used: $235,816
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

1. Unit Mission: The mission of University College is to conduct programs in alternative and cross-collegiate undergraduate education. In pursuit of this mission, the college is organized into two programs: the Inter-College Program, for students pursuing cross-collegiate degree programs, and the Program for Individualized Learning, for students who combine traditional University study with other forms of educational experience.

2. Unit Vision: University College recognizes its unique place within the University of Minnesota. In a University renowned in part for its size and complexity, the college offers degree programs tailored to the need of an individual student. Given the resources available to the University to meet the educational needs of all students, the unique place of the college carries with it the responsibility to make sure that individual students are served as efficiently as possible. The place of University College within the University's administrative structure has recently been changed. The college now reports directly to the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, who is Dean of University College.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit:

a. To improve the efficiency of the college's administrative structure (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

b. To serve as a collegiate base for cross-collegiate curricular and program initiatives (criteria: comparative advantage, efficiency and effectiveness).

4. Reallocation Strategy for the Unit:

a. Transfer of .5 clerical position and 1.0 professional position to the Office of the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, in order to provide increased support for undergraduate initiatives (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used: $61,067
1. Unit Mission: Since 1986, the General College has undertaken significant revision of its mission and programs, in keeping with the objectives established for the college by the University. The college no longer offers its own degree programs. Its new mission is to develop, through teaching, research, and service, the potential for baccalaureate education in students who are serious about fulfilling their previously undeveloped or unrecognized academic promise. Elimination of the college's degree programs has enabled the college to reduce its enrollment from 3,500 to 1,550, and to concentrate its efforts and its resources on talented, but under-prepared students.

2. Unit Vision: The General College aspires to identify and recruit under-prepared students who can benefit from early integration into the University and who are willing and able to direct their energy towards a baccalaureate education; to design and implement programs of the highest quality that serve the educational needs of special student populations; to hire faculty skilled in developmental education; to support faculty in the design of curriculum and the delivery of instruction; to increase the number of students who successfully transfer to other academic units for completion of degrees; and to promote multicultural education as a logical extension of the cultural diversity found at the University.

The General College serves students who require special work in order to prepare for enrollment in one of the baccalaureate degree granting colleges or professional schools of the University. The curriculum of the College is composed of:

- an entry-level curriculum known as the "Base Curriculum," a prescribed program of academic skills courses specially designed for and required of students in their first two quarters of college;

- the "Transitional Curriculum," consisting of discipline based introductory courses designed for students enrolled beyond the first two quarters; and

- the "Transfer Curriculum," consisting of General College courses and courses offered in other University colleges that will assist students in effecting a successful transfer into academic programs of their choice.

The entire curriculum is an integrated program of coursework and student support services. General College courses address four general areas of preparation and feature a specified pedagogical approach to instruction. The four general areas are (1) academic skills; (2) content knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences; (3) multicultural perspectives; and (4) academic acculturation. The student support services consist of academic advising and intrusive counseling coupled with co-curricular support activity.

Having developed this unified curriculum, the College must now internally reallocate resources in its support. The college must work to achieve effective student-to-instructor ratios, appropriate class sizes, numbers of sections to be offered, and assignment of teaching assistants in support of lead instructors. Additionally, the College must develop new courses and hire new faculty capable of delivering the curriculum.

Consistent with its revised mission, the College has eliminated all of its upper division courses and has reassigned faculty teaching those courses to other areas of the curriculum. The college has also reduced the size of the faculty through attrition by 33%. The College is contemplating a shift from the current counseling emphasis, stressing preparation for registration, to one with a greater emphasis upon educational planning. Similarly, the College may wish to maintain its intrusive academic monitoring/counseling but limit that activity to a smaller band of academically at-risk students. It has been decided to provide early exit counseling to those students who very early do not show potential for academic work. These changes, coupled with a reduction in student enrollment, would result in the adjustment of counseling loads. The current size of faculty, the existing divisional structure, and the support units require continued close examination and evaluation. Continuing consolidation and reconfiguration of the college's structure in keeping with its new mission will result in cost savings of 10% for reallocation to other University colleges and programs.

3. Major Strategic Objectives for the Unit:

a. To strengthen and expand the curriculum; to review the curriculum's effectiveness in serving targeted student
populations (criteria: centrality, comparative advantage, demand).

b. To reorganize the academic and administrative infrastructure consistent with the college's revised mission and size of the student body (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

c. To identify, recruit, hire, and retain quality faculty and academic professionals necessary to support the curriculum. Consistent with this goal is the objective to attract minority faculty to promote the University's initiatives concerning excellence in undergraduate education through diversity (criteria: quality, centrality).

d. To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the college's student support services, the college may move towards a model focused less upon registration and the monitoring of academic progress and more on holistic educational planning and counseling designed to enhance academic success through personal accountability and clarification of academic pathways through the institution toward successful transfer and program completion (criteria: demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

4. Reallocation Strategy for the Unit:

The college's strategic plan provides for a reallocation of 10% of the college's recurring resources. Major components of the plan include the following.

a. A decrease in the number of counselors and civil service support staff, as a consequence of the continued reduction of the student body to 1,550 (criteria: demand, efficiency and effectiveness).

b. A reduction in both the number of faculty and in the resources devoted to faculty salaries, through retirement and turnover; in recruiting replacements for retiring faculty, special attention will be given to hiring faculty of color and faculty with training that supports the college's revised curriculum and special student population (criteria: quality, centrality).

c. A reduction in the number of academic units and a reorganization of the Dean's Office, consistent with the college's new mission and the size and needs of the student population (criterion: efficiency and effectiveness).

Total unit dollars available for 5-year reallocation without regard to how the dollars will be used: $510,000
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Health Sciences
Health Sciences

Mission: The University's Academic Health Sciences Center is expected to assume leadership for programs designed to meet the needs for health care throughout the state. These programs are intended to be comprehensive and consistent with the high quality of scholarship on which the reputation is based. They must include:

**Education**
Programs organized so the student and practicing professional acquire the necessary skills, attitudes and principles of knowledge to provide exemplary care.

**Research**
Basic biomedical research, factors contributing to the prevention of disease, health promotion and health care delivery.

**Health Care Services**
Exemplary models of patient care integrated with the education and research objectives.

Vision: Maintain and enhance the strong national recognition that each of the Schools of the AHC and its hospital have achieved in teaching, research and service.

**Research**
as demonstrated currently by the fact that 70% of the expenditures of the seven schools is supported with federal and private resources primarily through a competitive grants process.

**Teaching**
as measured by the quality of professional and graduate students, demand for admission, student satisfaction, achievements of graduates and success in meeting the needs of the State for health professionals.

**Service**
to patients as evidenced by national rankings, cost effectiveness and successful outcomes, - to the state by responsiveness to health care needs and by the degree to which the AHC contributes to the attainment of improved health measures for the public.

If the past twenty-year period, about which it is said that new knowledge gained surpassed the advances of the previous 100 years, is the barometer, there will be no shortage of challenges or opportunities. Change is evident as collaboration in teaching, research and service occurs. New initiatives forged around the strengths of the faculty in multidimensional approaches to genetics, molecular biology, neurosciences, pharmacotherapeutics and biotechnology offer promise. The unique circumstances of the AHC, with its research presence in one of the nation's largest concentrations of medical device, service and product industries, provide opportunities in biotechnology, bioengineering and technology transfer. The largely unshared role of the AHC in the State provides a sense of social accountability in partnership with others to address health issues, including needs for primary care, children and youth, rural health needs, aging, AIDS, health care needs of the uninsured and underinsured. Opportunities in health promotion/disease prevention abound. Finally, curricular reform must occur. In addition to specific scientific and clinical knowledge, students must increasingly have problem solving, critical thinking and communication skills, cross-cultural sensitivities, the ability to address ethical dilemmas, and preparation for life long learning through the ability to use the resources available.
Reallocation Strategy: The 91-96 strategy to achieve change is to selectively invest state funds in areas where a needed increase in student enrollment would otherwise jeopardize quality, or where investment, coupled with reduction in the number of students, will achieve the goal of increasing quality and improving the per-student instructional resources to the desired level. Selected priority areas will be developed by enhancing their opportunities to attract non-state funding through investment of one-time expenditures for equipment or bridge funding. Reallocation, as described by each school, but primarily through cost shifting and redirection of positions that come available through attrition, will provide the means for achieving most of the agreed-upon goals. Other mechanisms will include careful review of all current activities to determine their essential contributions. Curtailment of administrative support and consolidation of other activities are expected. Generally, elimination, as opposed to shrinking, of programs supported by state funds is not a viable option in the Health Science schools, due to the integrated nature of the curriculum in professional education programs.

Reallocation Plan: Reallocation of 10% of the state resources devoted to the health sciences will amount to $9.9M redirected during the next three to five year period.

Reallocation of $500,000 within health sciences but across units.

$325,000 will move from Public Health to the School of Nursing as the public health nursing program is consolidated into the the nursing school.

$ 50,000 will move from the University Hospital to the Health Sciences as publications functions are consolidated.

$125,000 will be dedicated to the development of new rural health initiatives. Funds will come from the Medical School, the Duluth School of Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy.

Reallocation of $600,000 to the central pool will occur as follows:

$150,000 from H.S. Administration and Support Services
$170,000 from University Hospital and Clinics
$100,000 from Veterinary Medicine
$155,000 from Dentistry
$ 25,000 from Nursing

$8.8 M to be reallocated within colleges is identified as follows:

School of Dentistry will move funds from future faculty retirements, eliminate of the CAD/CAM program, and reduce residency position support and one contract position to support curriculum reform, preserve physical assets and to support the Dental Research Institute.

School of Nursing will move funds from faculty positions in areas of diminishing enrollment, share the cost of clinical teaching positions with U Hospital, and increase the role of volunteer faculty. Funds will move to graduate offerings in high demand areas.

College of Pharmacy will reallocate from positions, continuing education and supply expense funds to fund teaching support for volunteer faculty, build centers around the PUF chairs and regionalize the curriculum.
Medical School will redirect funds from vacant positions, reduce funding for graduate medical education, cost shift or eliminate funding for temporary faculty, curtail departmental support beyond core office and teaching laboratory positions, and place restrictions on expense items. Funds will be allocated to priority areas in the basic sciences, human genetics, cancer, recruitment of minority students and minority and women faculty, neurosciences and rural health.

UMD Medicine will redirect funds through retirements, and through a more efficient organization of clinical teaching, by curtailing administrative costs and by eliminating the subsidy in continuing education to the University's toxicology program, cell and molecular biology offerings for students, and developing focused areas of research.

School of Public Health, in addition to the transfer of the public health nursing program, will identify additional funds for reallocation to the strategic priority areas of health promotion and disease prevention, environmental health, health care delivery and aging.

College of Veterinary Medicine will reallocate funds garnered by curtailing administrative cost in the restructuring of one department, merging the teaching and administrative functions of the hospitals, curtailing support in equine medicine, reduction of teaching hospital subsidies, reduction of administrative support, and redirecting faculty positions to strengthen and provide support positions for poultry, bovine and swine production medicine, as well as companion animal medicine, to expand its graduate education program and recruit faculty with molecular and cellular skills.

University Hospitals and Clinics will reallocate funds from capital resources, program subsidies, reductions in personnel and academic support to programs in Cancer, Bone Marrow Transplantation, Neurosciences, Sports Medicine, clinical computer capability, primary care and quality assurance programs.

Total funds reallocated $8,800,000 internal to schools, colleges and hospital central pool
600,000 transfers among health science units
500,000
$9,900,000
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University of Minnesota
College of Veterinary Medicine
Case Statement for Merger with the
Department of Animal Science

January 25, 1991

1. Reasons for the Change

- The CVM aspires to become nationally and internationally recognized as the school within the U.S. with the highest quality professional and post-graduate degree programs in dairy, poultry and swine production medicine. Minnesota ranks fourth overall nationally in livestock production. The CVM has a long history of graduating a significantly higher percentage of veterinarians who serve the livestock industries than other Colleges of Veterinary Medicine in the U.S. In 1989, 52% of the CVM's graduates entered either large or mixed animal practices. This compares with a national average of 24%. Of the remaining CVM graduates, 25% entered small animal exclusive practices and 23% entered either advanced study programs or careers in industry or government. This high percentage of CVM graduates which serve rural communities is a trademark for Minnesota's CVM and places it nationally as the leading College in this field. In order to maintain the ability of the College to present a comprehensive food animal curriculum in an environment of limited resources, it is essential that a closer collaboration with the Department of Animal Science occurs. Currently over 80% of the veterinarians in Minnesota are graduates of the CVM. This statistic highlights the importance and significance of the CVM's professional degree program to the State.

The CVM will strive to emphasize the presentation of a progressive DVM curriculum that will provide students with the opportunity to vary their degree of specialization within various species specific tracks. Currently the DVM program is experiencing considerable and increasing demand. The ratio of applicants to available class positions for the entering class of 1991 is approximately 4.8 to 1.

- To better serve the livestock industries of Minnesota and the surrounding region by closer coordination of teaching, research, service and administrative functions of the CVM and the Department of Animal Science. This merger will provide
integrated programs of instruction, research and service. This consolidation will encourage greater interaction among basic and applied researchers.

- Permit the consolidation of the CVM's veterinary physiology unit with the animal physiology unit of the Department of Animal Science. This will promote closer interaction between two units of similar mission orientation.

- To enhance production animal programs within both the CVM and Department of Animal Science by encouraging and facilitating the transfer of teaching and research efforts between these units.

2. Programmatic Coverage

Under the proposed plan, all needs essential to the presentation of an accredited DVM program will be met and enhanced. Graduate programs both within the CVM and the Department of Animal Science will be significantly enhanced by the closer academic and administrative collaboration between the two units. Research activities will also be enhanced by this closer association.

3. Description of Programmatic Change

The Department of Animal Science and the CVM will provide integrated programs of instruction, research and service. The discipline of physiology will be consolidated within the Department of Animal Science. The Department of Animal Science will then take the lead role for the instruction of physiology within the DVM curriculum. To achieve this shift of responsibility, the section of Veterinary Physiology within the Department of Veterinary Biology will be merged with the section of Animal Physiology within the Department of Animal Science. The faculty lines moved to Animal Science will provide much of the core instruction in Veterinary Physiology particularly in areas relating to the renal, cardiovascular and respiratory systems. (Areas not traditionally considered integral to Animal Science).

Details of the Integration of the Department of Animal Science.

General details of this consolidation include:

- Department of Animal Science becomes an affiliate department in Veterinary Medicine.
• Chair of Animal Science reports to the Deans of both the Colleges of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine.

• The Chair of Animal Science serves as a full member of the CVM Administrative Council.

• The Department of Animal Science retains its budget lines through the College of Agriculture.

• Animal Science faculty and, when appropriate, Veterinary Medicine faculty take joint cross departmental, appointments.

• Animal Science Faculty serve on Veterinary Medicine committees (except Promotion and Tenure).

• Closer coordination and consolidation of certain graduate programs will occur between Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine.

• Closer coordination and integration of research and graduate programs in the areas of dairy, poultry and swine production medicine will assist in strengthening these programs.

• The Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine programs of Extension and Continuing Education will become jointly administered.

• International programs will become jointly administered.

• Following the consolidation of Veterinary and Animal Physiology, the Department of Animal Science will transfer 2-3 FTE of instructional effort to the CVM. Areas of effort transfer would include:
  
  • veterinary specific animal physiology
  • general animal physiology
  • physiological chemistry
  • animal nutrition
  • species specific production management

**NB** To achieve the above merger, it is **critical** that the FTE’s of faculty effort which will be retrenched from the CVM, be rehired by the Department of Animal Science. Without these faculty a critical deficiency of disciplinary expertise will be lost to the DVM curriculum.
4. **Background of the Decision**

During the past few years the College of Veterinary Medicine has redirected its programs in order to more effectively fulfill its academic priorities. Most of these priorities are designed to enhance the CVM's abilities to better serve its varied constituencies through its teaching, research and service programs. In April, 1990, the collegiate faculty approved a long range strategic plan for the CVM. Many of the elements in this proposal reallocation plan are in accordance with the goals of the strategic plan. In addition for the past two years, considerable thought has been given at the administrative level to obtaining a synergism from a closer relationship between the College of Veterinary Medicine and the Department of Animal Science. The current planning exercise necessitated that the planning schedule for this union be advanced.

An initial Collegiate plan prepared by the College's administration to reallocate 10% of the CVM budget was presented to the CVM faculty, on November 28, 1990. Following a two week period for input and comment from faculty a proposal was submitted to the Vice President of Health Sciences on December 14, 1990. Since that time the plan has been further examined and revised and resubmitted to the faculty for further comment. The CVM Faculty Council has scheduled meetings with the faculty of each department to gain input. This body will report its recommendations regarding plan elements to the CVM administration.

For more information:

David G. Thawley, BVSc, PhD  
Dean  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
455 Veterinary Teaching Hospitals  
1365 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, MN  55108  
612-624-6244
1. **Reasons for the Consolidation**

- To create synergism from the creation of a single strong department of basic sciences within the CVM. The CVM intends to reorientate its basic science research programs towards the mission of the CVM by significantly strengthening its molecular and cellular capacity. A major focus of basic scientific research will be directed toward the use of molecular and cellular technologies to enhance the production health and welfare of animals.

- To encourage the redirection of collegiate research programs to national veterinary priorities and to enhance the competitiveness of CVM researchers in the national veterinary funding arena.

- To enhance the integration between basic and applied sciences within the CVM's research programs. The CVM must improve the integration of certain areas of its basic sciences with other areas of the College and with other colleges of the University.

- To reduce administrative costs within the CVM and reallocate toward academic priorities.

2. **How Will the Needs Previously Covered by These Units be Met?**

All teaching and service functions previously covered by the Departments of Veterinary Pathobiology and Veterinary Biology will be covered by the new department. It is not anticipated that the physical location of personnel will change. Therefore, the working relationships of individuals should not be negatively impacted but should be enhanced by a closer administrative relationship with other CVM basic science faculty.

3. **Description of Program Change**

- The CVM proposes that its biochemistry unit (2 faculty lines) within this CVM be consolidated with the section of molecular biology within the Department of Veterinary Pathobiology. The
unit will also be strengthened by the transfer of 1 faculty line from the Department of Clinical and Population Sciences. The unit of consolidation would then provide the instructional needs for biochemistry, and the core of molecular and cellular expertise within the CVM.

- With the transfer of the disciplines of physiology and biochemistry, the Department of Veterinary Biology would be decreased to the remaining sections of Veterinary Anatomy and Veterinary Pharmacology. The CVM proposes to shift these two sections (8 faculty) to the Department of Veterinary Pathobiology. This will create an enlarged and strengthened core basic science department within the CVM and would result in a savings of approximately $125,000 (the closing of an existing open chair position, plus 1 departmental administrator). The CVM will then be down-sized from 5 to 4 departments, before the addition of the Department of Animal Science.

- The new Department of Veterinary Basic Sciences will then consist of the sections of Veterinary Microbiology, Veterinary Parasitology, Veterinary Anatomy, Veterinary Pharmacology and Veterinary Pathology (27 faculty FTE).

4. **Background of the Decision**

Over the past decade CVM basic research units have neglected to sufficiently build in areas most related to the mission of veterinary research, particularly as it relates to the production animal species. Unlike human health related research needs which primarily are directed to chronic and genetic health problems, veterinary research needs are clearly prioritized toward infectious disease problems control. The basis for much of this research is centered around the molecular and cellular technologies. A single and strengthened basic science department with a focus on these technologies will significantly enhance the CVM's ability to serve the research needs of livestock industries and significantly increase the ability of both basic and applied researchers to compete for national funding.

During the past few years the College of Veterinary Medicine has redirected its program in order to more effectively fulfill its academic priorities. Most of these priorities are designed to enhance the CVM's abilities to better serve its varied constituencies through its teaching, research and service programs. In April, 1990, the collegiate faculty approved a long range strategic plan for the CVM. Many of the
elements in this proposal reallocation plan are in accordance with the goals of the strategic plan.

An initial Collegiate plan prepared by the College's administration to reallocate 10% of the CVM budget was presented to the CVM faculty, on November 28, 1990. Following a two week period for input and comment from faculty a proposal was submitted to the Vice President of Health Sciences on December 14, 1990. Since that time the plan has been further examined, revised and resubmitted to the faculty for further comment. The CVM Faculty Council has scheduled meetings with the faculty of each department to gain input. This body will report its recommendations regarding plan elements to the CVM administration.

For more information:

David G. Thawley, BVSc, PhD
Dean
College of Veterinary Medicine
455 Veterinary Teaching Hospitals
1365 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
612-624-6244
The restructuring and reallocation plan proposed by the President is a bold, courageous plan to improve the quality of the University. It is a plan which derives from over a decade of institutional planning, an effort in which the faculty have been continuously engaged. We have been working to improve quality for a time now, and the results begin to show: smaller class size, better advising, modern equipment and instrumentation in undergraduate laboratories, longer library hours, and improving student retention and graduation rates. It is essential that we provide the funds necessary to continue this progress until our performance is acceptable. This is what the taxpayers expect and what the students deserve.

The plan is bold because it comes before us when the economy is in recession and the state faces a projected $1.2 to $1.6 billion deficit for the 1991-93 biennium. The plan is courageous because it confronts us with the difficult choices of internal reallocation. Until now our improvements in quality have been bought with increased legislative appropriations and rising tuition charges. At least for the next biennium, we cannot reasonably expect more from these sources. If our progress is to continue, only internal reallocation remains, and as perverse as it may seem, the national economy and the expected status of the state's treasury provide the only conditions under which the hard decisions of internal reallocation are ever likely to be made. Public institutions are much like families in this respect. The best and only time for making hard choices on budgets is when the paycheck shrinks or stays the same.

Our record on internal reallocations is not particularly good. The last time the state faced hard times (1981-82) and cut the University's budget there was an
across-the-board reduction for all programs. A mindless exercise for the most part, it sent a message that we could not, or would not, distinguish between programs on the basis of quality, centrality, efficiency and effectiveness and the other dimensions by which value is assessed. The results were as one might expect -- morale fell, horizons contracted, and a general feeling of weariness settled over the campuses.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has spent four meetings discussing the reallocation process and proposal. Information has been shared as it became available and we have had extended discussions with the President and the Vice Presidents. Yesterday we voted approval of the following resolution.

Whereas, the Restructuring and Reallocation plan submitted by President Hasselmo to the Board of Regents on January 9, 1991, is consistent with and extends the principles and plans of Academic Priorities for the Twin Cities campus and the Strategy for Focus plans of three of the coordinate campuses, and

Whereas, the plan addresses the issue of quality, which has long been a faculty concern in the planning process, and

Whereas, the plan provides for significant improvement in undergraduate instruction, and

Whereas, the plan calls for the University to improve the quality of its efforts in research, graduate education, and service to the State, and

Whereas, it is fitting for the University to initiate discussions and lead by example as the State considers the task of rationalizing higher education in Minnesota,
Therefore be it resolved, that the Faculty Consultative Committee strongly endorses the objectives and principles of the Restructuring and Reallocation plan, and urges the Board of Regents to act favorably on the plan.

In conveying our resolution of support I stress two points:

1) The Reallocation proposal is well founded on the planning process. It has purpose, integrity, and the important element of self-discipline which we have long needed.

2) It is essential that the plan remain intact. If any one of the major elements is removed, the closing of the Waseca campus for example -- for this is the most sensitive element politically -- then I fear the entire plan will fail.

The Faculty Consultative Committee is composed of faculty members from various campuses and colleges. The quality of an individual's service on the Committee is judged by that person's ability to rise above the parochial interests of special constituencies in order to serve the entire University. In this respect we are not unlike the Board of Regents. As recently as 1988, three University Presidents serving at the request of Governor Perpich's Blue Ribbon Commission wrote these wise words about Boards of Regents:

"For this reason we recommend that the Legislature, with the assistance of the Advisory Council, explicitly state as a matter of legislative intent that individual Board members represent all the people of the State, and no particular interest, ideology, or community."
It is ever our fate that we fall short of professed ideals. It is a cause for celebration when despite frailties and differences, we can join as one in support of a greater, higher purpose. The faculty believes that the plan now before us serves such a purpose and that the time to act is now. We urge the Board to speak with one voice in strong support of the Restructuring and Reallocation plan in order that we can get on with the business of making the University a better place to teach, to learn, and to serve.

Warren E. Ibele
Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

January 30, 1991