

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
January 17, 1991**

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Thomas Clayton, W. Andrew Collins, Amos Deinard, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, J. Bruce Overmier, Thomas Scott, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Shirley Zimmerman

Guests: Kathy Confer (Academic Affairs), Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), Senior Vice President Leonard Kuhl, Geoffrey Maruyama, Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Report of the Chair and Discussion of Reallocation

Professor Ibele began the meeting with reports on several items.

- He and Professor Collins met recently with Professor Howe, Chair of the Task Force on Liberal Education and tentatively agreed that the first discussion of the Task Force report would occur at the February 14 meeting of the Campus Assembly. After that there will be open fora at various places on the Twin Cities campus; a final report will then be presented to the Assembly at one of the meetings in Spring Quarter. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy should, however, review the draft report as soon as possible, preferably before the February 14 meeting.
- There will be a resolution on ROTC to be presented from the Senate Committee on Social Concerns. There may also be a resolution on hate crimes.
- He has recently received from M. Kathleen Price, now Law Librarian of Congress, tapes of a discussion of "hate speech" and policies thereon. He will listen to the tapes and then provide them to other FCC members.
- The Committee on Services to the Handicapped will provide some changes in policies with respect to the handicapped.
- In order to restore to the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics its authority over eligibility, a bylaw amendment will be presented in conjunction with the appointment of an ad hoc committee to examine governance issues, among others, pertaining to intercollegiate athletics.
- The possible changes in the tenure code affecting Judicial Committee procedures will be brought back to the Committee as soon as the agenda permits.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

One Committee member inquired about the letter that Professor Ibele sent asking that Committee members and others contact legislators and otherwise make known their support for the reallocation plan. The Committee, it was argued, has not been consulted; there should be no recommendation that the reallocation plan be approved without consultation. Professor Ibele responded that there has been preliminary consultation at earlier meetings and more will take place. Further, the plan is in general accord with Academic Priorities and if anyone wishes to make an appearance before the Board of Regents, they need to act quickly.

It was argued that the previous discussion had not been consultation and that being asked about it before the details are provided suggests the Committee is a rubber-stamp group; it destroys the credibility of the Committee to permit itself to be put in such a position. Another Committee member pointed out that there are timing problems, which the administration is trying to deal with; there was no request for approval or endorsement. The administration will provide information as soon as they have it; they have done so thus far. Other Committee members commented that the consultation thus far has been useful and that the process has been reasonable. Some of the discussion, it was contended, have already had an impact.

It was also maintained that the most important element of the process, in the view of the central administration, is that the faculty support the plan. If the faculty do not support it, the administration believes the entire plan is dead. Their motive is to want to do as well as they can by the faculty in order to obtain their support. This last assertion found general assent--but with the warning, on the part of one, that the voice of the Committee must mean something.

It was suggested that the Committee, in the upcoming discussions, needed to be certain that the principles and rationale which underlie the reallocation plan are made clear. Professor Ibele suggested that inasmuch as the Finance and Planning Committee had already met to discuss the document, some of the information gleaned at that meeting would be useful.

Professor Shapiro observed that about one-third of the reallocated funds will be for system-wide initiatives; the details were not available, yet, but will be provided as soon as they are. That, he said, was the major concern. A significant component of that money, it was said, would be spent on elements of the Undergraduate Initiative. All of the elements of the plan are critically important, another Committee member observed; this effort is intended to reshape the University for the years ahead. Taking money away from units, and stating broad goals, are only part of the process. What process is in place to ensure that appropriate goals are formulated? There must be a vision that guides the implementation of the plan and an evaluation process to see that they are achieved. The reshaping must be as well-planned as the reductions; at this point the level of specificity exhibited in the planned reductions has not been matched in the planned reallocations.

Professor Shapiro remarked that the goals and plans are probably set--but the results are not in a state to be discussed.

As for the funds being cut from central administration, Professor Ibele observed, those are funds which [the late] Senior Vice President Donhowe believed could be cut from the units which report to him. Several Committee members chimed in with the comment that these cuts must not be passed on to departments. Department heads are wary about those reductions; what has occurred in the past, with

some central administrative reductions, is that they become new department obligations. A transfer of function is no savings.

Professor Ibele also recalled that concern had been expressed at the Finance and Planning Committee about the decrease in Graduate School funding [\$210,000] with no apparent accompanying net increase for the Graduate School in the form of graduate fellowships, funds for the General Research Advisory Committee, or faculty summer session research appointments. All of these would increase the quality of research and graduate education--one of the principles on which the entire exercise was originally predicated. These activities represent one of the distinctive elements of the University in the State. A question which must be raised is the extent to which the plan will strengthen those Graduate School programs which support graduate education and research. Another Committee member agreed, noting that a number of faculty had expressed alarm at the cut and who wondered if this signalled a redirection of the University such that this might not be the place where they wished to continue to do their research. Yet another concurred and suggested this is a particularly sensitive point, given the emphasis that the University is currently directing toward undergraduate education.

Care must taken to make it clear, however, that the Committee does not consider the Undergraduate Initiative and efforts to improve graduate education and research to be at odds with one another, it was observed. "As an institution, we ought to be able to chew gum and tie our shoes at the same time."

What has also happened, it was noted, is that there was a considerable component in the now-withdrawn \$34 million legislative request for increasing General Research Advisory Committee funds--by about \$1 million. Somehow, in the formulation of this plan, and the withdrawal of the legislative request, "the Graduate School has been left with an empty bag"--unless there are elements in the system-wide initiatives directed to graduate education and grants-in-aid of research.

The Committee needs also to know, it was suggested, if there are implications in the proposed \$8.8 million rescission from the 1990-91 budget. Presumably there will be income lost as a result of the reduction in the amount of the reserve funds. There will also be a cut in the funds available for bonding for building construction as well, it appears.

Professor Shapiro reported that the University, because the request has been withdrawn, will not seek (this biennium) the release of the last \$6.5 million offset against Indirect Cost Recovery funds. Professor Maruyama inquired of the Committee if he, as faculty legislative liaison, should nonetheless continue to argue for release of that money (although he doubted that the chances of success are very good). The Committee appeared to support such an effort.

* * *

The Committee briefly discussed the attendance at meetings of members of the Judicial Committee. It was concluded that no action was necessary. One Committee member observed, however, that if faculty refuse a committee assignment--other than for good reason--or if they do not meet their assignments, it places a burden on all those who must do the committee's work. It may be that rather than simply dismissing a faculty member from a committee, if he or she misses three meetings, his or her department should be informed; this information should be taken into account when evaluations for

service are being done and salaries are being set. It is part of the responsibility of the faculty to contribute to the operation of the University.

On a related matter, Professor Striebel reported that faculty have been willing to serve on the college grievance committees required by the new grievance procedures.

* * *

One Committee member reported that national columnist Neal Peirce had been in town and had "blasted Minnesota higher education, including the University." He had noted that Minnesota was "over-campused" and had chided the University for its expenditures, financial scandals, and the lowest graduation rate in the Big Ten Conference. Mr. Peirce's connections in Minnesota would perhaps lead him to that conclusion. Some response should be made, it was suggested; Professor Ibele agreed to draft a letter.

* * *

One Committee member inquired about the reactions to the all-University convocation, "Time Out," held the previous week. One individual noted that it was a minor miracle that the event was even held. While it may have fallen short of what some might have hoped for, it was exemplary considering the time available to put it together and the diverse groups whose cooperation was necessary. Others also made positive comments.

There was some discussion about regularly planning such events; the conclusion reached was that a resurrection of regularly-scheduled convocations would probably not be desirable.

Apropos a case of harassment known to one Committee member, it was pointed out that this is a serious problem that the University has no way of dealing with. There are, in fact, no ways to deal with harassment, period--which is the larger problem. Providing a report and information to the FBI is not going to help; the reality is that there is no remedy, through grievances. This is a "climate" issue; the best that can be done is provide support to the victim and make it clear that the University condemns such behavior.

* * *

Attention was next turned to the question of transfer of tenured faculty to a different department, an issue which has been raised in connection with the reallocation plans as departments are to be consolidated, restructured, or eliminated. It was suggested that there should be some policy.

The draft statement prepared for the Committee basically holds that the line item goes with the faculty member and that any unit willing to accept individuals being transferred should be permitted to accept them. One important consideration should be the desires of the faculty; if the Scandinavian department is to be closed, Nils Hasselmo should have a choice on which department he wishes to join, depending on the willingness of the receiving department to accept him.

According to the tenure code, it was pointed out, any addition to the tenured faculty of a department requires an affirmative vote of the tenured faculty in that department. Several Committee members recalled that some departments have deviated from this requirement.

One Committee member asserted that the proposal is perhaps too idealistic; what if the department to which the faculty member wishes to move is itself slated for reduction? There may not be any available positions and an increase in the unit faculty would be a step in the wrong direction, one which would not serve the University well overall. This may be an ideal to be sought; what needs to occur is consultation between the individual faculty member and the units so that more than one option can be considered. The administration has to be in a position to block a move on the grounds that it is not in the best interests of the institution. It is a delicate issue but the plans for reallocation could be defeated if the moves were in the wrong direction.

The Committee agreed that the University should not lose control of the process. It was also agreed that however stated, though, the faculty member's desires should be honored if possible. There was discussion about whether the control over faculty transfers should rest with the colleges rather than the central administration; one view expressed was that if the college approves, that should be sufficient. The dean, after all, is answerable to central administration. And any slated reduction in a unit would need to be achieved even if transferred faculty members were to be accepted.

2. Continued Discussion of Reallocation with Senior Vice President Kuhi

At this point Professor Ibele welcomed Dr. Kuhi to the meeting; he explained to Dr. Kuhi that the purpose of the discussion would be to obtain information both about the increases and decreases but at the level of general principles.

It is important to note, Dr. Kuhi said, that the administration is in the midst of discussion and negotiation on the numbers and that they may change a little. The "case statements" for each unit will provide more detail and will be available for the February Regents' meeting. This is a major undertaking, he concluded, intended to serve the best interests of the University as a whole; the administration feels strongly that this process is a sound way to instigate change. Advantage can be taken of the State's fiscal crisis to address hard issues--not all of which are confined to the University, such as the appropriate role of the technical and community colleges. He stressed that support of the Committee is extremely important; ultimately, without the support of the faculty, the plan will collapse.

The reactions from legislators thus far has been positive, Dr. Kuhi told the Committee, except, of course, from those from the Waseca area. They see the plan as a bold move by the University. There is also some feeling that if the University, with its constitutional independence, cannot close a campus, then no system can--and "you can forget about reform of higher education in the State for another couple of decades."

Professor Ibele next explained to Dr. Kuhi that the intent of questions from the Committee is not to challenge the process--everyone recognizes the importance of the decisions. The questions and answers are to better inform the Committee members in order to perfect the plan and to enable Committee members to become better advocates.

Dr. Kuhi's attention was drawn to the net reduction in Graduate School funds and the perceptions of some faculty that the reduction may be viewed as a turning away from graduate education and research. Dr. Kuhi responded that this represents only a 1% reduction in the Graduate School. Further, money being redirected to some of the units will be for items such as start-ups, matches for faculty involved in interdisciplinary units, and new research under the Research Initiative Fund (\$2 million). There has been concern ever since the Undergraduate Initiative was proposed that somehow the University is downplaying research and graduate education; nothing could be further from the truth, Dr. Kuhi told the Committee. When more details of the plan are available, and the numbers are added up, it will be clear that there will be an enormous amount of money going to support research.

Another Committee member agreed with Dr. Kuhi, pointing out that if one looks at the various elements of the plan, there are items which clearly increase support for graduate education and research. If one looks only at the Graduate School item it might seem that these activities are being downplayed--but a serious review of the entire plan leads clearly to the opposite conclusion.

Dr. Kuhi was next asked why the University proposes to decentralize funds for start-ups at a time when the position of Vice President for Research is being established. IT has a particular problem, Dr. Kuhi noted, in that start-up costs have risen to extremely high levels. In general it is true that central funding has not been provided for start-ups; this is an effort to help IT through a critical period in its history. IT has been very successful in recruiting, but in order to maintain the level of quality in appointments it is necessary to help out. Not only will start-up funds be provided, as will new faculty appointments, but also matching funds for research grants and interdisciplinary programs (as increasingly required by NSF). Dr. Kuhi agreed with the observation that problems in start-up costs are not confined to IT.

There must be a balance, it was suggested by one Committee member, between the short-term problem of setting up new faculty members and the longer-term problem of being sure that "seed money" is available for new and established faculty to begin new areas of inquiry--even if on a tentative basis. There are funds in the Graduate School for faculty research initiatives which are unavailable elsewhere.

A question was raised about the K-12 initiative and the cuts proposed for the College of Education; these appear to be inconsistent. Dr. Kuhi responded that Deans Gardner and Infante are scheduled to meet soon on a major effort to improve science and math education in the K-12 system. This is a project that Education will clearly be involved with; the dollar amount for it is not yet clear. He also explained to the Committee that the amounts in the reallocation plan include "debts" from Academic Priorities decisions; the amount identified for Education includes about \$400,000 from Academic Priorities reductions.

The bulk of the funds from the College of Education come from the change in teacher education. There will be no undergraduate teacher education; instead, individuals will be expected to obtain a regular baccalaureate degree, after which they will do graduate work to obtain their teacher training. This change has been planned for a long time; when complete, there will be large savings. Education will continue to play a major role in providing teachers for the State, but the University is only one of many institutions which provide teaching credentials; it also the case that at present the supply of teachers far exceeds the demand and substantial "downsizing" will have no effect on meeting the needs

of the State. Even though the cut in the College of Education appears large, Dr. Kuhi also pointed out, it represents only their 10% share.

If it is justifiable to cut Education in part because other institutions provide teacher education, Dr. Kuhi was asked, would it be reasonable to ask that IT interact with the other systems if it is interested in improving science and math education. He agreed that it would be and promised to deliver the message to IT.

Note was taken of the funds for biomedical engineering; are the dollars earmarked for the engineering or the medical portion? The dollars will go to the program, Dr. Kuhi said; the amount identified is the IT portion. There are also funds in the Health Sciences reallocation for this program, although they are not separately identified in the document.

Dr. Kuhi was asked about the principles guiding reallocation in the libraries. It is mostly administrative changes to improve efficiency, he told the Committee; this will be in addition to the \$1 million increase for the libraries on the Twin Cities campus. The administration has been told that the increase in journal subscription prices alone will be \$800,000. This is "an infinite sink" and the University has to do something about it. A recent commentary in the Chronicle of Higher Education suggested that librarians be given the authority to say "no" to faculty who want the library to subscribe to a journal. Faculty sometimes want more journals in a field than are necessary--and often the more obscure journals are rarely used. One danger of reducing the number of journals is the impact on meta-analytic research, which is widespread in the social and health sciences. Dr. Kuhi agreed, noting that the University is the primary source of materials for the State; he suggested that FCC might take up the question of library journals at some point because it is an issue which must be addressed.

A question was asked about the increase proposed for the Extension Service and Experiment Station; is it intended to replace decreasing federal support for their activities? Dr. Kuhi said that Dean Borich has imposed cuts in the Extension Service and reorganized internally; part of the increase is, as with Education, a continuation of plans laid out in Academic Priorities. The cuts at the federal level, however, are not intended to be replaced by the State; given the amounts involved, it would not be possible to do so. Nor would it be proper to try to do so, he said; the same problem exists with faculty research grants across the institution and the University does not have the resources to take up that slack.

Dr. Kuhi was asked to comment on the language in the plan about reassignment of approximately 150 anticipated faculty and staff vacancies from lower to higher priority units. He said that the number is only an educated guess. The major unit where faculty are involved is Waseca. The President has said many times that the impact of reallocation on personnel will be as small as possible; that means trying to provide opportunities for as many as possible who would otherwise be laid off. The tenure code does not permit laying off tenured faculty and the University does not intend to lay off probationary faculty. For civil service and P&A employees, the University is trying to establish a central clearinghouse for those who are likely to be laid off and provide them first choice at positions in other units without a search. There is a conflict between trying to be fair to current employees, on the one hand, and the equal opportunity rules and regulations which require searches; it is his view, Dr. Kuhi said, that the University has an obligation to the people who are already on the staff. The 150 positions are not, he concurred, the number expected from normal attrition.

Dr. Kuhi agreed with the observation that while faculty members may be protected, the civil service staff could be significantly affected. Of the \$8 million in reductions in administration, about \$6 million is coming from the physical operations side; there will be people laid off. The individual college plans also include providing funds by not filling vacant positions.

What will be the impact of the \$6 million cut on the University's physical plant, Dr. Kuhi was asked. There is a problem, he agreed, given that there is a \$300 million backlog in deferred maintenance. Senior Vice President Donhowe is trying very hard to improve efficiencies, he said; the University Building Energy Efficiency Project is already reaping benefits, for instance. A number of projects done by Physical Plant could probably be done more cheaply by outside contractors. There are a number of items such as these which are in the works which will result in long-term savings to the University.

In terms of moving faculty around, it was said, there may be opportunities lost to recruit new faculty members--a major source of institutional renewal. No one questions protecting the rights of faculty who are already on the staff, but what are the implications of going through a period when there will be reduced opportunities of bringing new people to the University? Dr. Kuhi responded that the units receiving increases will be able to recruit new faculty, and those are probably also the areas where revitalization is needed most. In the professional schools the changes are primarily internal reallocations; it is not clear that recruiting will be greatly affected in those units. This is a problem, however; units cannot lose funds and also be expected to hire. The only consolation is that any hiring which is done can be directed, can be accomplished in departments where the greatest improvement can be obtained. Minnesota, he reflected, is one of about 30 states which are facing serious budgetary problems; many institutions will be in the same boat.

One Committee member suggested that consideration should be given to converting some recaptured faculty positions to civil service positions. There is a sense that departments tend to hire new faculty without appropriate change in the support staff--so faculty are unable to function properly and students end up receiving short shrift. The University needs the staff support as well as the faculty. Dr. Kuhi agreed and said they has asked the colleges to look hard at what they were doing--rather than just cutting off the "bottom," such as TAs and civil service.

Professor Ibele then reminded Dr. Kuhi of the concern of department chairs and unit heads: Central administrative decreases have sometimes led to increases in charges to departments, with no net change in institutional expenditures. Dr. Kuhi agreed that this practice should not occur.

Will the telecommunications increases include links between the Twin Cities and coordinate campuses, Dr. Kuhi was asked. He said it would.

What are the implications of the \$8.8 million cut in the base recommended by Governor Carlson, Dr. Kuhi was next asked. He said the reserves would be used to cover the 1990-91 cut, with difficulty. This will be the most serious issue facing the University; the administration will oppose the cut. The legislature was not expecting the reallocation plan, and legislators will be told that the plan will not work if the University is subject to a major budget cut. At this point no one knows what will happen, but the last thing the University wants to have happen is use of the reallocated funds for a cut in the base budget. That, he concluded, would demoralize everybody. The \$8.8 million is not a "fair share" of the cuts imposed on higher education, he noted.

One Committee member made the point with Dr. Kuhl that the importance of redirecting and reshaping the University for the future must be emphasized, that attention should not be focussed solely on the cuts that will be made. Dr. Kuhl said there would be equal emphasis and detail on the improvements as well as the cuts. Units, moreover, will be informed that even though they may be slated to receive increases the internal reallocation will be as important as the use of new funds.

One Committee member expressed reservations about the extent to which some of the changes will be real reallocation; some of them, it was said, may be nothing more than a shuffling of budgets. Will the oversight be sufficiently detailed to pick up these things? There could be \$100 million in reallocation with no significant change in the University. Dr. Kuhl agreed with the assertion that there is a need to avoid "flim-flam."

Professor Ibele thanked Dr. Kuhl for his comments.

The Committee adjourned at 12:20.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota