

1993-94

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

NOVEMBER 18, 1993

The first meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1993-94, was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 18, 1993, at 2:30 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 127 voting faculty/academic professional members, 4 ex officio members, and 10 nonmembers. Professor Judith Garrard, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, presided.

I. MINUTES FOR MAY 20, AND JUNE 3, 1993 - Action

APPROVED

II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
Strategic Planning Procedures - Action

President Hasselmo has set forth his vision of University 2000 in the draft planning document which is being mailed to Faculty Senate members directly and will be distributed widely by the President's Office. The text of the document appears on the Gopher Internet in the University Planning folder which is in the University of Minnesota Campus Information folder. Copies are also available through department and college offices and through University Relations (612-624-6868). The President has asked the Faculty Senate to consult with him on the directions contained in the planning document. Because of the importance and complexity of this item, the Faculty Consultative Committee believes that it should be considered at two meetings of the Faculty Senate.

The first meeting (November 18) will be primarily for discussion. Members of the Faculty Senate or other faculty members may make their points in discussion or may propose non-binding "straw vote" motions to assist in further development of the policy. Faculty Senate members or other faculty members who wish to propose "straw vote" motions should submit them in writing to the Clerk of the Senate (427 Morrill Hall, fax: 612-626-1609) no later than 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 16. The proper form is "Resolved, it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that . . .". Motions not received by that time can be considered only by special action of the Senate. Motions calling for final action (for or against the plan) will not be considered on November 18.

To allow for appropriate distribution of the final draft planning document and to give Faculty Senate members and other faculty members an opportunity to propose amendments before the December 2, Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Consultative Committee moves adoption of the following special procedures:

MOTION:

At the conclusion of the November 18 meeting, the

President will consider the comments made and will prepare a draft for action. That draft will be made available by Monday, November 29. The Faculty Consultative Committee will formulate a motion in response to the President's draft. That motion will be published in the "Minnesota Daily" on Tuesday, November 30, and Wednesday, December 1, and will be faxed to coordinate campus Faculty Senate members. Copies will also be available in the Senate Office by 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 30. Faculty Senate members or other faculty members who wish to propose amendments to this final proposal must submit them in writing to the Clerk of the Senate no later than 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 1 (427 Morrill Hall; fax: 612-626-1609). The Faculty Senate will consider the Faculty Consultative Committee recommendation and any proposed amendments on December 2.

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair  
Faculty Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

The strategic planning procedures were approved without discussion.

APPROVED

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
University of Minnesota Strategic Planning - Discussion

Professor Judith Garrard, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), outlined guidelines for the planning discussion--copies of which were distributed to senators. Before opening the discussion, she said the FCC would like senators to think about framing the debate around four fundamental questions:

Following is the text of Professor Garrard's comments.

"1. Do we need a strategic plan at the University of Minnesota?

Without a doubt, we do! The matter is not one of whether we want or need CHANGE. Change has been thrust upon us.

Most major research universities in the U.S. are in the midst of change and are facing common problems:

- concern about the quality of undergraduate education,
- deteriorating physical plant,
- reduced federal and other research funding,
- decline in prestige and trust in the eyes of the American public.

Here at Minnesota, we have an additional overlay of problems:

- the decline in State funding,
- a series of scandals,

- negative publicity over the past 5 years,
- salary freezes,
- decline in faculty morale, and
- problems with user friendliness--not only for students, but also for faculty and staff, especially on the Twin Cities campus.

Do we therefore need a strategic plan that addresses these problems? The answer has to be yes; the alternative is that we will continue to be at the mercy of changes and events that descend upon us. One of the vehicles for managing change in this complex organization is a targeted strategic plan that addresses some if not all of these problems.

"2. Are the 5 areas outlined in Strategic Directions the ones we as an academic community should be focusing on?

The five areas are

- research
- graduate and professional programs
- undergraduate education
- access and outreach
- user-friendliness

Are these five areas the ones that will address the problems we face? This is a harder question to answer. As we have debated this question among ourselves at FCC meetings, as we listen to our colleagues, and as we interact with the members and chairs of the other Senate Committees, especially SCFA, SCEP, Finance and Planning, and Research, we continually ask, are these the areas of emphasis?

In order to gather more data, FCC members have made site visits over the past month. Teams of FCC members met with groups of faculty senators throughout the Twin Cities campus. Those who met with us tended to be informed and interested in the content of U2000. There were some very knowledgeable and creative suggestions for improvement in the Plan. In one or two of the groups, we found discouragement, but even in those groups, there was the willingness to think together about 'what could be.' We found more consternation about the details of the Plan than the Plan itself.

But what about these 5 areas of emphasis? Faculty Senators in the site visits told us: "of course these are the five areas; in fact, there was nothing new in these 5 areas -- we've been discussing them in one way or another for years." Well, that's verification of one sort!

Are there other areas that should be included? No others seemed to emerge. So, based on our own deliberations, our own consultation with colleagues in other Senate Committees, and in discussions with subsets of this Faculty Senate, we as an FCC have concluded that these are the five appropriate areas of emphasis.

"3. Finally, we come to the crux of the matter. If these are the five areas for the Strategic Directions, then what is right and

wrong with them? Which parts are acceptable? What needs to be modified?

I ask that you spend most of your time today discussing each of these 5 areas of the strategic plan.

"4. How can the planning process be improved?

Perhaps the Faculty Senate is collectively satisfied with the planning process to date and especially with the process outlined in the current draft of the Strategic Plan. If that is the case, then say so, and we can spend our time on other issues.

The FCC has made some specific suggestions:

- We want true consultation about all aspects of the Strategic Plan before the material is formally distributed to the community outside of the University.

A creative faculty member suggested that we use the "bathrobe criterion" to determine whether consultation had occurred: If faculty who should have been consulted find out about a University issue that involves them for the first time in the newspapers as they sit at breakfast in their bathrobes, then there has been no consultation!

- We want an active and specific role for the faculty and the academic units, and we want those roles to be explicitly spelled out in a planning document.
- The process must be oriented to energizing departmental and collegiate planning.

The faculty must plan a central role in this process.

- We want a more direct role for faculty in the resource allocation process.

If YOU have suggestions for how to improve the planning process, then focus your comments on what needs to be done and done better.

"As we begin this debate I ask that you bear in mind 3 additional points:

- This planning effort must not be 'business as usual.' The faculty cannot allow it.
- We the faculty must shake loose the dust of discouragement and demoralization and commit ourselves to active participation in the development of this Plan.
- I have been assured by President Hasselmo that the information we provide today will be used specifically to revise this Plan before it is brought back to the Faculty Senate for our December 2 vote and before the Plan is submitted to the Regents at their December 8 meeting.

Our specific task today is to provide direct advice to the administration about the proposal before us.

Now get out your red pens!"

Professor Garrard then welcomed President Hasselmo to the meeting. The President said he was pleased to once again have an opportunity to discuss planning with the Faculty Senate. A planning process, he said, always takes place in a historical context and that historical context shapes the way it unfolds. By historical context, he meant Commitment to Focus, the principles of which are very much in evidence in the current planning efforts. That effort, he said, floundered because it was misunderstood in the broader community. In 1991, the University entered into major restructuring and reallocation within the University that included the closing of a campus and a number of other programs. The institution has also been through a series of budget cuts by the State that in many ways erased the positive effects that were intended by the reallocation and restructuring in 1991. The University faces many challenges, including challenges by the media, which poses problems related to distribution of information.

The President said he was urged by faculty leaders to present a framework by which the University could do its planning, the result of which is University 2000. University 2000 lays out a mission and some strategic directions for achieving the aspirations of that mission. It is a working hypotheses--a set of ideas which tries to set directions. The cluster planning is an effort to bring together faculty members in a way that they can look at what the intellectual frontiers should be in the year 2000 and to look at where the University must position itself in national and international leadership. A number of mechanisms are being used: the cluster concept; planning at the collegiate and departmental level; and planning that is cross-cutting, such as the Outreach Council and the forums on teaching. The President emphasized that planning is a partnership effort, an attempt to synthesize trends, efforts, principles, and directions that have emerged over many years and in many ways is a reaffirmation of the basic values of the institution. President Hasselmo said he wants to ensure that the academic substance is preserved and flourishes and that the University offers an environment where faculty and staff can lead productive working lives, and where students can enter into a stimulating intellectual life that will prepare them for their roles in society.

Professor Garrard next called on a member of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teaching and Research Excellence under the strategic plan to read a statement developed by that group, the text of which follows:

"The Blue Ribbon Committee on Teaching and Research Excellence under the strategic plan, which has been charged by the Faculty Consultative Committee to advise it on the 'potential impact of the strategic plan on faculty excellence in teaching...and on research and scholarly activity,' believes that whether pursuit of the

five goal directions outlined in the November 5, 1993, University 2000 draft would enhance the quality of teaching, research, and scholarly activity at the University of Minnesota--or whether it would inadvertently result in a deterioration of quality along one or more of these dimensions--depends critically on the specific methods devised to move toward these goals and on the financial resources available to support that movement. Because the November 5 draft does not sufficiently detail the ways and the means by which these goals, each laudable in itself, realistically might be achieved in consort with one another, it is not yet possible to evaluate the impact that adoption of the current University 2000 statement would have upon faculty excellence in teaching, research, and scholarly activity."

The floor was then opened for discussion. Following is a summary of the questions raised and comments and suggestions made by faculty senators:

- The planning document should explicitly address issues related to serving an urban population, particularly the issue of lifelong learning.
- Identification of the problems and the areas that need changing must be identified before the goals of U2000 can be met.
- More definition is needed in what the core areas are--what is core of the land grant university and what are core/central disciplines?
- High school ranking is a traditional indicator of ability and the University should not look only at traditional criteria for selection.
- Is there a plan to redistribute undergraduate funding to meet the goals outlined in the document? President Hasselmo responded that the strategy is not to start with budget cutting but to present a plan that will give the University the best opportunity to make its case with the State--to remind the State that there are great advantages to investing in the University. At the same time, the University needs to examine all areas and some restructuring and reallocation may be appropriate.
- What mechanisms will be in place for deciding where resources will be directed, and who will make those decisions?
- As a research university, should University College be a function of the University, particularly when this is not the only urban university in the Twin Cities?
- Is it reasonable to expect faculty members in the research area to also have the time and perhaps the

skills to deal with students in University College, as the planning document suggests?

- Ought not the University first look at making its present programs more efficient before embarking on a new plan?
- University College cannot be separate but equal as suggested in the document-- if it is different, it must be separate.
- It appears the document does not give the same rewards in performance measurements to applied and interdisciplinary work as to basic research.
- If outreach and access are different from service as it is traditionally thought of, then greater definition is needed.
- Throughout the document the term "reward" is used; however, it is not clear what the concept of reward means. Does rewarding excellence mean more money or is there some other definition? Missing in the document is the issue of "non-excellence." How do you deal with units that are not excellent?
- Will there be inloading connected with the plan and what will be the expectations for the faculty in terms of outreach?
- In order to be successful in the 5 areas (directions), the University will need to prune elsewhere. Before approving the plan, the administration needs to identify those areas that will be pruned.

Feelings of apathy, skepticism, confusion, and demoralization were also expressed. A recurring theme centered on faculty frustration with years of planning that has resulted in little change, and their belief that their efforts will have little or no impact on outcomes. One reason faculty are frustrated with University planning, said one senator, is because there are no financial incentives, and suggested that might be a way to improve quality, to maximize change, and to reward innovation.

On a more optimistic note, one senator encouraged the University to look at its "successes," such as the Weisman Art Museum project, to show the University community and the State what can be accomplished.

The chair of the Senate Finance and Planning Committee (SF&PC) said the SF&PC is encouraged by the Reinvestment Fund proposal which he views as a mechanism by which different plans will be assessed by their quality, innovativeness, and usefulness, in fostering the five basic directions for the University. This will provide a source of funds to move the University in these directions. It is not clear at this time how the efforts of faculty and departments will be included in this process. On a separate note, he said he believes central administration has failed to transmit to faculty, students, and staff a clear

description of the results of past planning efforts and suggested that the University's accomplishments be more broadly published now and in the future.

The chair of the Senate Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) also reported on his committee's efforts in the planning process. The SCEP has discussed at length the type of students the University educates, and believes the type of education best suited to the institution is one that is based on research, scholarship, and artistic expression, and that should be the core of the University's undergraduate education.

The chair of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA) suggested three significant criteria be reviewed when discussing U2000: 1) whether the vision and direction is energizing and motivating to the faculty, 2) whether there is a sense of process in which the faculty and others have confidence, and 3) whether the University understands the fiscal realities.

In the form of a metaphor, one faculty member proposed why the faculty are so apathetic. To some extent, he said, the faculty are like the crew of a large 18th century sailing ship. That sailing ship has a crew of hundreds of men and about 4 officers. The men have no idea what is going on and all the knowledge is held by the officers. While there is confidence in Captain Hasselmo and First Lieutenant Infante, he said, the faculty really do not know what is going on. Perhaps the President needs to persuade the faculty as much as he needs to persuade the State that U2000 is the right plan for the University. He hopes the University will not be engaged in that other nautical operation which is "rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic." There is great power in rhetoric, he added, and urged the authors of U2000 to consult with some of the University's outstanding writers to assist in the composition of the document in a way that will persuade the State that something is happening here at the University of Minnesota.

One Senator was concerned with the language in the document that describes University College as a working term for an evolving mechanism which may or may not involve the creation of a new entity. What does this mean, he asked? He then proposed the following straw vote motion:

That all references to University College be eliminated from the final planning document and amended language be prepared that says the University will identify and meet the needs of a population of parttime degree seeking students.

A motion to suspend the rules to consider the motion was approved. The motion was NOT APPROVED on a voice vote. It was noted that failure of the motion should not be construed to mean endorsement of the concept of University College.

Tinkering with the name, argued one senator, is not enough. The concept of University College and the elements that would go into it need to be addressed. Is the faculty ready and willing to provide those services?



Another individual asked to respond to the comments several senators made regarding planning at the University over the past 5-10 years. The University, he said, has made significant changes, such as the restructuring of the curriculum in the College of Agriculture; the refocusing of the mission of General College; the strides that have been made in the laboratory facilities in IT; the significant downsizing of the largest introductory courses; and the improvement of many departments, such as the School of Music. To be successful two things are necessary: 1) leadership and 2) commitment from the faculty and staff. The destiny of the faculty, he said, is in the hands of the faculty and if apathy continues and is self paralyzing, no planning will make a difference.

Embracing change is good, said another senator, and everyone knows the University needs change. He applauded some of the sentiments and principles of the planning document, but said he cannot support a plan until he knows what the plan is. The faculty have yet to hear what the plan is.

In summary, Professor Garrard said, 1) there is a strong need for feedback on the University's accomplishments in prior planning efforts and 2) the University needs a plan that raises hope and evokes enthusiasm.

Concluding the discussion, the President said he appreciated the comments and questions that were raised at the meeting. It will be important, he said, to overcome some of the fragmentation within the University. In response to the comments about prior planning efforts, he brought the body's attention to a recently published document entitled "Accountability and Change, 1989-93" that is now available in his office. The document outlines the University's accomplishments and changes during the past four years. Oftentimes, the President noted, changes occur in one area of the University and are not broadly known. Two recurring questions he heard during the discussion were, "Can we do it?" and "Will it make a difference?" The University HAS done it and much more than the faculty and staff collectively realize. The change has not been brought about simply by the administration but by the faculty and staff. No public university in several generations has ever closed a campus--the U of M did. The dental hygiene program at UMD was closed--it had been tried for decades without success. The University clawed loose \$21 million by internal reallocation among colleges and it was done with faculty, student, and staff support. It is true, that the University faces an uphill battle when it comes to working in the political arena, but if the planning concepts are not formulated and if the faculty, staff, and students, do not rally behind them, nothing will be accomplished. However, if they do, great things can be accomplished.

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck  
Abstractor