

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, December 16, 1993
12:30 - 3:00
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

Present: Judith Garrard (chair), John Adams, Mario Bognanno, Lester Drewes, James Gremmels, Kenneth Heller, Robert Jones, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Harvey Peterson, Irwin Rubenstein, Shirley Zimmerman

Regrets: None

Absent: Carl Adams, Toni McNaron

Guests: Senior Vice President E. F. Infante, Vice President Anne Petersen

Others: Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: Health Sciences reorganization; budgets; research strategic planning committee report]

1. Discussion with Senior Vice President Infante

HEALTH SCIENCES REORGANIZATION

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 12:40 and welcomed Senior Vice President Infante to the meeting. Dr. Infante distributed copies of several documents and drew the attention of Committee members to the first, "Principles Governing the Relationship Between Central Administration and the Health Sciences Center."

He began by noting that the document has been endorsed by the Board of Regents, on December 8; unfortunately, it had not been brought to this Committee before that regental action. There have been a series of conversations on the topic; there are a number of relationships between the health sciences and central administration in areas such as financial affairs, legal affairs, auditing, and research that have been discussed. But it became clear, in the judgment of Mr. Wallin, that it was less a question of relationships than a statement of philosophy or management on how the University is supposed to look at its units. The administration agreed and has been working on such a statement; the Board of Regents liked this statement so much that it decided to vote to endorse it on the spot. This did catch everyone by surprise, Professor Garrard confirmed.

There is no doubt, Dr. Infante told the Committee, that the Board is very concerned about the health sciences, and especially the hospital, because of the rapid changes occurring in health care. The Board wants health sciences leadership hired as soon as possible, which is why the Health Care System

* 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.

President was hired without a search and which is why Mr. Wallin hopes to see a Provost hired by February 15 (which may be difficult to do).

The document, Dr. Infante pointed out, are a statement of relationships between the CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION and the Health Sciences Center. A set of documents is being prepared for major units across the University; he said he could not yet provide them to the Committee because the President has not even yet seen them. They are intended to restate the relationship, for example, between UMD and the administration, between UMM and the administration, and so on.

Asked what the Health Sciences Center includes, Dr. Infante affirmed that it includes all seven collegiate units plus the hospital. It is not clear yet what the relationship between the University and the doctors/the private practice plans will be. The Health Sciences Board will oversee the hospital and the private practice plans. Dr. Infante confirmed that all private practice accounts will be subject to audit by the University, although he said the exact relationship of the private practice plans to the hospital/center has not yet been settled.

Dr. Infante demurred from the suggestion that the document identifies a relationship with the Health Sciences Center that is identical to the one with Morris; the geographic location, for example, prohibits a common physical plant operation, as will exist on the Twin Cities campus. Coordinate campuses are necessarily separate operations, he observed, given their distance.

Dr. Infante was then asked about the language of the "principles" that reads as follows: "The Health Sciences Center will foster cross disciplinary teaching involving graduate and undergraduate students through the University, especially courses that meet the liberal education requirements for undergraduates." He replied that it affirms the health sciences as an integral part of the University. That is important language, it was said; is it agreeable to the faculty of the health sciences? Did it come to be in the document as a result of consultation with the health sciences?

Dr. Infante said he would have wanted to go a little slower on the process; the document is primarily the work of Mr. Wallin and his people and not the result of a consultation process with the Medical School, the other health science units—or with this Committee. It does seem, concurred one Committee member, that events took charge; that faculty have apparently not been consulted. The administration acted in good faith and the Board of Regents took control.

What has been the reaction in the health sciences to the document? Dr. Infante said it is his impression that communication within the health sciences is not as good as it might be; it may be that the document has not been seen by most faculty or some of the deans. It was agreed that an electronic copy of the document would be sent to health sciences faculty senators.

The principles seem to be reasonable statements, Dr. Infante observed, and all oriented in the right direction. They should apply to ALL major units of the University.

Dr. Infante affirmed that the new health sciences provost will report to the President, not through the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Would his office control budgetary and legislative affairs? he was then asked. Dr. Infante pointed out that he wears two hats—one as line officer (Provost of the Twin Cities Campus) and one as staff to the President (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs). The coordinate campus chancellors do not report to or through him, he noted—but as senior

staff to the President, he obviously has a significant role in coordinate campus affairs. He would expect to have a similar role with respect to the health sciences. People often get the line and staff responsibilities and functions mixed up, he noted—and he himself must be careful about which hat he is wearing at any particular time.

If one wished discussion on a University-wide issue, could one go only to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or would one also have to go to the health sciences provost? Dr. Infante said that when a policy is being developed, he would expect to do it as a staff member to the primary person in academic affairs: the President.

If there were to be new policies on promotion and tenure, or grievances, or other conditions of faculty employment, would they apply to all faculty in the system and not require changes for the health sciences? Dr. Infante pointed out that one group, the unionized Duluth faculty, is already not subject to institution-wide policies and matters relating to faculty employment—he has no say about promotions at Duluth. He said, however, that he would expect to have the same role in promotion and tenure in the health sciences that he does with respect to the rest of the University.

Dr. Infante noted that this is a diverse, multi-campus university with different units that behave differently; the units needs flexibility while also needing something to hold them to the center. There will be a constant tension. This is a strong statement that reflects the efforts of the administration to grant maximum responsibility to the health sciences but with appropriate oversight. One could imagine a health science unit proposing a different kind of tenure. It may be that the answer should be "no," but different components of the University have different cultures that must be recognized. In some instances there may be different rules.

One Committee member expressed concern about the extent of consultation with the non-clinical sciences—which have cultures very different from the clinical sciences. Do all departments feel comfortable with this shift or will they need assurance from the President or Senate action? Has the consultation process addressed the concerns of the basic sciences faculty? Dr. Infante said "no." Then, responding to a follow-up question about whether or not this is primarily a Medical School document, he also said "no." A lot of people were involved in drafting the statement, including many from outside the Medical School who support it. This is a statement of philosophy about centralization and decentralization, he said.

Will there be any flexibility, he was then asked, for those who do medical research who say they would rather be in another collegiate unit outside the health sciences? Or are they stuck in a clinically-driven environment? Dr. Infante demurred from the suggestion that the statement was clinically-driven. If not now, it was said, it will be, because there's an 800-pound-gorilla that will control what all the other little monkeys do. [A mixed metaphor developed sequentially by two members of the Committee.]

There is a large clinical component of the health sciences that is very important, Dr. Infante acknowledged—but this document does not speak to that issue. It says that different cultures—even within the Medical School, for example—must be recognized and that there must be an important level of oversight. There was a feeling that the Dean of the Medical School lacked sufficient control over the department heads. Now one would say that culture is atomized at the department level; this document says things should be done differently and that primary authority and responsibility should be at the level of the health sciences provost, with a strong dean of the medical school.

There is a concern, repeated one Committee member, that this statement is economically driven as well as driven by the Medical School—even though the Medical School may have had little to do with the process and were left out of it as much as everyone else. But it is the health care environment that has driven this process extremely fast. Many feel that by contrast, Dr. Infante replied, that universities typically move like snails—and will be left out altogether if they do not respond. The criticisms are NOT of the document, he was told in response, but reflect a fear that faculty members will get trampled in the rush. When he has seen that happening, he said, he has pointed it out; he did not see that happening here and would like to see similar statements for the entire University.

What role will there be for the Graduate School in the structure of the health sciences, Dr. Infante was asked. There are a number of graduate and professional programs; will the Graduate School be divorced from them? The Graduate School has nothing to do with M.D. programs, he responded, and will continue to have the same role with respect to graduate programs.

Should the Graduate School have anything to do with M.D. programs? Dr. Infante said one could ask the obverse question. The colleges exist vertically; the Graduate School is spread horizontally across them. The more important question, he said, is the role of the Vice President for Research—she is staff and a senior officer to the President as well and her responsibilities in that sense run across the University—including, for example, to Crookston and Morris. One could expect, after the document about the health sciences, a statement about the oversight and accountability responsibilities in research being in the hands of the Vice President for Research—and in the hands of the deans.

One can ask the question of why all graduate and professional education does not come under the aegis of the Graduate School, it was said. Degrees are from the University—M.D., J.D., Ph.D. Why are M.D.s treated differently? They are not, Dr. Infante pointed out; the Graduate School has nothing to do with the J.D. degree, either. Committee members agreed that this subject generally needed more treatment at a later meeting.

BUDGETS AND ALLOCATION GUIDELINES

Discussion then turned to the Resource Allocation Guidelines; Dr. Infante noted that they had been discussed already on several occasions by the Finance and Planning Committee. He brought them to FCC today at the suggestion of Professor Garrard, who realized after the last Regents' meeting that the Board wishes to move quickly on them.

Dr. Infante then reviewed the numbers with Committee members and noted several key points. First, the Central Reserves stood at \$37 million at the beginning of 1993-94; they are projected to total \$22 million at the end of the year. They are expected to total \$17 million by the end of 1994-95. "We continue to spend our savings account," he observed. Second, after adjusting for the \$4.1 million shortfall in tuition income last year, the O+M funds will stand at year's end at \$50,000. Third, there are problems in the State Special accounts that need to be fixed and the estimates of ICR income may be too low—he told the Committee that he insisted on a conservative estimate because he continues to believe that at some point the federal budget will be balanced and research funds will decline. Fourth, if there were no changes in tuition revenue and no changes in salaries or funding for supplies and expenses, the University would have \$11 million left over at the end of 1994-95.

There are two columns of information missing from the table of budgetary data, he said. One is a column showing yields from endowments and gifts; the other is unit income—which in some units is quite large.

There are three key questions that have to answered:

- (1) Surely there will be a compensation increase.
- (2) Ab initio, there is no reason to assume tuition will not increase
- (3) The President wishes to set up—and the Board of Regents welcomes the idea—a Strategic Investment Pool.

Those three issues define the framework for setting the budget in January, he said.

The numbers then look like this:

RESOURCES

Unobligated O+M Balance:	11,206,108
5% Average Tuition Revenue Incr:	8,529,000
Total Potential Resources	19,735,108

POTENTIAL COSTS

Non—salary Inflation @3%	3,915,000
4% Salary Funded Costs (preliminary)	13,421,000
6% Salary Funded Costs (preliminary)	19,571,000
Strategic Investment Pool	??

Dr. Infante agreed that "funded" is a key word in the salary items. If a unit is to provide average salary increases of 6%, depending on the persistence of the employees, the ACTUAL COST could range from zero to 6%. If there is turnover, the costs are lower. The unions argue, for example, that even though there are 2% step increases for employees, the actual cost to most units is zero because of turnover. So a 6% increase would actually cost less than 6%. True, acknowledged one Committee member, but PROVIDING 6% would permit larger increases—and everyone would "feel above average." The problem is that others can do calculations and learn that the increases were more than 6% (such as the unions), Dr. Infante pointed out.

(It was confirmed in later conversations that the salary costs are indeed salaries only, not fringe benefits; funds for fringes are already in college accounts. It was also confirmed that the "unobligated O+M balance does NOT include departmental balances.)

A 4% funded salary increase plus a 3% non—salary inflationary increase (e.g., fuel, utilities, duplicating, paper, etc.) total \$17.3 million, Dr. Infante observed, which would leave \$2.4 million for a

Strategic Investment Pool (SIP). It could be larger were there to be unit reductions. Or it could be larger, it was pointed out, by not recognizing inflation in non-salary expenses; another Committee member asserted that those expenses WILL increase and must be recognized.

There are a number of factors at work that will affect the decisions, Dr. Infante reported. The students have not received positively the proposal for a 5% tuition increase. It appears that the Board of Regents favor a large SIP. It appears that the President favors a salary increase; his sense is that it would be, at the cost level, about 4.5 - 5% (and thus 6% increases) for faculty and staff.

One question is then how to target unit reductions for the SIP. The President, he said, is not inclined to favor across-the-board reductions—and was quite surprised to receive contrary advice from the Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP).

The Board of Regents, observed one Committee member, has given the administration marching orders to develop recommendations on tuition, non-salary inflation, salaries, and the SIP—or they will do it themselves. The President, Dr. Infante told the Committee, has asked for scenarios by December 21 on the four numbers. Professor Rubenstein reported that SCFP will meet on December 21 to comment on the scenarios. After that the President will make a decision on recommendations to the Board of Regents; SCFP will meet again on January 4 "to reflect on his recommendations." [It was later agreed that the SCFP meeting on December 21 would be made joint with the Faculty Consultative Committee.]

Asked if he should proceed differently from the practice of consulting primarily with SCFP on these budgetary issues, Professor Garrard said no.

Professor Rubenstein then reported that SCFP did have a rationale for advocating across-the-board reductions to fund the SIP. At this stage of planning, SCFP did not believe there is sufficient information available to make differential cuts. There was also the sentiment that the process should start slowly—and perhaps the numbers for NEXT year should be announced as soon as possible. That would be preferable to large cuts in some units that would have to be made quickly in order to fund the SIP next year. SCFP thought there should be about \$2.5 million in the SIP: the most obvious way to improve education would be take 1.5% of the tuition increase—the part that, by agreement with the legislature, must be justified on grounds of improvement in educational quality—and put it into the SIP. And it has to be new funds for new improvements, he said in response to a comment that the University is already making improvements; the legislature would be legitimately upset if the University began playing shell games with it.

Discussion then turned to the collegiate planning document. Professor Garrard told the Committee, and Dr. Infante, that informal discussion among FCC members prior to the meeting pointed to a major missing element in the document—the question of faculty vitality and development. Faculty are held responsible for OUTPUTS—customer satisfaction, student satisfaction, research funding, number of student credit hours—it's all "take." Where is there a concern about faculty satisfaction and development? Dr. Infante said that was a good point. He noted that the University has invested \$2 million in faculty and staff development and that it would be evaluated at the end of the year; asked if the same investment would be repeated, he said that it is an important issues and implied strongly that it should be.

One Committee member turned the discussion back to the salary issue. Would it be a change in

principles of distribution of salary funds if the University were to provide 4% for 6% increases? If 6% increases are to be given, should units be provided 6%? If there are a lot of open lines or turnover in a department, it could give "rich" raises; in other units, raises would be smaller. Dr. Infante said not. There is a difference between having money and not having it; when not, it must be managed much more carefully. If X% is to be delivered to employees, there would be differential distributions to departments depending on their situation—it would be more difficult but it must be done that way. If the average increase to be delivered were 5%, he said, College A might receive 3% and College B 4%—after the appropriate calculations were made.

That salary proposal, it was said by one Committee member, represents a modification of the proposal that vacant positions revert to central administration. In this case, the overages would be held centrally instead, which is appropriate. This proposal would recognize that fact that departments have extra money.

Asked what pressures he feels in terms of the budget, Dr. Infante said the Board clearly would like to see a large SIP, perhaps \$10 million. One Committee member exclaimed that that much money could not be spent, especially if the expenditures were to be based on college plans; Dr. Infante differed. Most of the items would be external to the colleges, such as the libraries. The faculty want more extensive networking—that will cost about \$36 million over the next several years.

Another pressure is that students will seek to hold the tuition increase to 3.5%. He said he sees that tied to the SIP. Students, he noted, fought him on using tuition money to eliminate the computer fee; now they offer their thanks. A larger SIP, observed one Committee member, is certainly an argument for a larger tuition increase.

Dr. Infante was already late for a meeting with the President but then went around the table soliciting the views of the Committee members on the several elements of the budget. They expressed their views as follows.

- A: There should be a 6% funded salary increase.
- B: First, internal reductions should be differential, based on the information now available (with all due respect to SCFP's contrary view); it is necessary to begin to achieve that discipline right now. Second, if the salary increase is not substantial, the University will LOSE faculty—department chairs are seeing losses already. Third, an \$8 — 10 million SIP is reasonable.
- C: Salary increases should be 6%—or more. It is also to be hoped that some of the SIP funds will be available for the coordinate campuses. (Dr. Infante said they would be.)
- D: We need as much support as we can get!
- E: The unit reductions should be differential because the infrastructure needs attention as badly as do faculty salaries. It may be that there are more faculty here than should be. The SIP should be of significant size.
- F: The strategy is sound. One can be concerned for colleges that are still paying, under the 1991 R+R—there is no place for them to find more money when they have already planned reductions.

There would have to bridge funding available or restructuring would be damaged if the cuts were imposed while units are downsizing. The salary and SIP numbers are reasonable.

- G: The salaries should be 6%; the SIP is desperately needed.
- H: The concern in my unit is funding for course development—there would be no better use of the SIP than that. There are no funds in the colleges for this.
- I: I agree with B. One problem in some units is that they have not had any open lines for some time and they end up behind all others in average salaries; in some cases new assistant professors are being hired in at salaries several thousand dollars above those of associate professors—which in some cases are less than salaries of high school teachers.
- J: An \$8 - 10 million SIP is reasonable. 6% should be the average salary increase, funded partly centrally and partly differentially by unit.
- K: How these are done and what is done are important first steps in U2000. Salaries and the SIP will be crucial to getting faculty on board. The first step must be done well and carefully and in ways that faculty will applaud. If that happens the first year, the rest of the U2000 planning process will go smoothly. (Dr. Infante observed that a \$10 million SIP plus a 4% funded salary increase plus a 3% non-salary increase would leave a shortfall of about \$8 million—requiring a 1.5% reduction in the O+M budget.) That first step must be taken, it was said.
- L: A \$10 million SIP, requiring a 1.5% O+M reduction, is sufficient. Salaries should be funded at 4%, providing 6%; they should NOT be funded at the full 6% because that would cause further retrenchments.

Dr. Infante offered the view that faculty should receive 6% raises.

As a segue into the next agenda item, one Committee member said, he has observed that the views of FCC members on salaries are influenced by other factors; they are often embarrassed to ask for 6% or more because they are more sensitive to the impact on state funds and tuition. But if one asks why Stanford obtains three times as much funded research as Iowa, the answer is because of the faculty. My concern, it was said, is that the faculty have not been the focus of this University for several years, and they must become the focus now. If the FCC will not speak of faculty needs and salaries, they will not be addressed. If the University is to be among the top in the nation, it must have first-rate faculty. But the faculty here is losing spirit—and the University is losing faculty—and salary is a large variable in the equation.

Unfortunately, concluded one Committee member, that argument has to be made to the legislature, not the administration.

Professor Garrard thanked Dr. Infante—who had been trying to leave the meeting for over half an hour—for joining the meeting.

2. Research Strategic Planning Committee Report

Professor Garrard then welcomed Vice President Petersen to the meeting and apologized for making her wait.

Dr. Petersen began by explaining that the Research Strategic Planning Committee (RSPC) began its work almost a year ago (before the U2000 planning process started) because she felt there was need for a plan for research at the University. Her proposal for such a plan was endorsed by the President and Provost. The committee later added post-baccalaureate education to its charge because it could not be separated from research. The executive summary of the RSPC report has been provided to the Committee.

The committee began last January and spent a lot of time on strengths and weaknesses at the University as well as reviewing information and data on national trends. Everyone in the United States is talking about significant change in higher education, especially at research universities with a great deal of funded research. It is clear that federal dollars will not continue to increase as in the past. Because of the linkage of federal research funds to graduate education in the U.S., the latter will be affected as well. She recently heard an argument that the end of the Cold War created the current crisis in research universities because of the role the Cold War played in organizing rationales for federally-funded research and education. She said she was not sure she agrees but it is an interesting point.

It is clear that this is a transition point. Research funding actually increased more during the 1980s than during the 1960s, but they are already beginning to decline. The odds that a faculty member will never obtain funding have increased significantly in the last 15 years—the competition for funds has grown greatly. The committee also looked at the issue of the linkage between research and graduate education as the driver of doctorate production (that was less true in the humanities); this linkage increased steadily from the early 1970s through the 1980s. Also considered was the amount of funding per faculty member; that trend has been flat since the early 1970s despite increased research dollars because there are more faculty seeking funding.

Asked if these data were true of all universities, Dr. Petersen said they are national totals. In the full report both national and University data are considered; if Committee members wish it, she said she would be glad to provide the full report.

These data provided the impetus to talk about the issues. Dr. Petersen said she still has questions about whether or not the University's problems have been sufficiently analyzed and if the recommendations are the right ones but that she wanted to start the discussions around the campus. She will make this report the subject of her annual report on research to the Board of Regents in February.

Dr. Petersen told the Committee that she had met with the RSPC subcommittee chairs earlier (Professors Sara Evans, Irwin Rubenstein, and Matthew Tirrell) to review the status of the work of the committee. It was decided there was need for a recommendation on industry partnerships coupled with academic integrity, but the other topics will be as they are presented in the draft report.

The University does a lot of data analysis, Dr. Petersen observed, much of which ends up on the shelf. She said she did not want to waste time that way and sought proposals that can be implemented. She said she wishes to see a lot done and is willing to take the lead—but she does not want to step outside her own turf or overlook key collaborations. Professor Rubenstein, she said, has been instrumental in insisting on knowing "who?" and "when?" as the committee's recommendations have

been developed.

Vice President Petersen then briefly reviewed the major elements of the executive summary. She said that the recommendation on "Evaluation of Strengths and Weaknesses" consumed a great deal of time and led into a discussion of indicators. The committee identified four groups of indicators: honors to faculty and students; research funding, weighted by faculty, and trends; citations as an indicator of field-specific research productivity; and rankings of units, such as by the National Academy of Science and U.S. News and World Report.

It was pointed out that no matter what rankings one uses, they are all partial; not all units will be ranked. One suggestion has been that as graduate programs are reviewed by the Graduate School every five years or so, including by an external expert committee, the idea of ranking should be systematized and the outside national experts should be asked to rank it. This practice should be consistent and according to a protocol. Doing that would also alleviate concerns, said another Committee member, about rankings being out of date and the lack of rankings in many fields outside the sciences. Units would have to be scaled by their competition, however, pointed out one Committee member—is a unit in the top 5 in a field where there are only 6 departments? Some units ALL universities will have; in other cases, universities make choices. In some fields being in the top 20 is as good as being in the top 5 in other fields. Also important is WHO'S (which universities) in the field—are the "big guns" competing? The University of Minnesota, observed one Committee member, is certainly among the best in the country in Scandinavian languages.

The report speaks to these issues, Dr. Petersen told the Committee, and recommends unit—specific indicators as well as common ones, along with a pilot test to see how it all works. Multiple indicators are clearly needed but whether the ones identified are the best ones remains to be seen.

In many states there has been a move to assessment in higher education, she commented, although not yet in Minnesota; the University can forestall it if it takes seriously evaluation of its own strengths and weaknesses. The primary reason to do so, however, is that these are formative evaluations that help improve the University; evaluation can be an advantage for strong units—or essential units that should be strong but require additional resources or other assistance.

One Committee member applauded the effort and the way that it has proposed moving to standardized and discipline-specific assessment. Sometimes a department may have declined for reasons beyond its control—but the University may just have to say "sorry." When it is difficult to find a comparison group, this kind of evaluation is a sensible tool to have—especially when an institution must make cuts in some places and expand in others. But the proposal will not be without controversy. Dr. Petersen acknowledged the last point and said there should be controversy; it consumed more time than any other element of the report and discussion about it should begin. A good principle of assessment, it was then said, was that half of the indicators should come from within the unit and half should be general; that provides a good match and a contextual evaluation.

The slope that a department is on is important—rankings often show where a department was 10 or 15 years ago and one must guess where it is now. One can have a highly ranked department now that is on a downward slope—and be shocked to learn at the next review that it has slipped. This proposed process of evaluation is not dissimilar to the actions of a defense attorney, who puts in as much collaborative evidence as possible. If data on a number of indicators can be collected, one can make a

final judgment with external validity. These indicators, added to Graduate School reviews, should be very helpful to that process of evaluating trends in quality, Dr. Petersen said.

One current measure of department quality, said one Committee member, is the quality of graduate students admitted to the program. There is also a University-wide measure, first year Graduate School fellowships. The programs receiving these fellowships correlate with those that receive McKnight Professorships. A program having high quality graduate students to propose for these fellowships means someone outside the University thought a program was of high quality and recommended that the student apply. One must be careful about this, cautioned another Committee member; some units consciously encourage non—traditional students and those units have important strengths not always measured by these means. Dr. Petersen commented that the process will have to consider where it focuses too much on traditional indicators. Committee members also observed that there had to be indicators of diversity—and that diversity should be seen as PART of quality. Dr. Petersen concurred.

Many of these are "input" indicators, said one Committee member; there needs also be "output" indicators, such as placement and publication by students. That is expensive information to obtain, observed another. Dr. Petersen said the Graduate School will have a questionnaire to be filled out (on interactive computer terminal, it is hoped) when students turn in their final documents. Students will be asked their next address and what job they (will) have so that they can be followed more closely in the future. Students will also be asked to provide feedback on their graduate experience. Additional work is also being conducted jointly with the Alumni Association, she reported.

Another factor that could be looked at is PUF chairs, said one Committee member; do they have an impact on ratings? If salary is important, they should. The report has not considered whether or not endowed chairs increase prestige, Dr. Petersen said, but she acknowledged that the question is excellent. The University argued before the legislature that they would, it was pointed out. What about Nobel laureates? inquired another Committee member. That, retorted another, is this University's biggest problem—it is unable to keep its stars.

In terms of diversity, suggested one Committee member, one criterion ought to be how a unit is doing in recruiting women into non-traditional areas. The report does not examine faculty data that way, Dr. Petersen said, although she agreed with the proposition; there are, however, interesting data on graduate students. In minority recruitment, the University is not doing well; in recruitment of women, some units are increasing their numbers while others are decreasing them.

It is disappointing that research funding is in decline, said one Committee member, when there are so many rationales for increasing it. Dr. Petersen concurred, noting that if the Cold War was the primary rationale, we also know that much was neglected during that period.

One Committee member noted that later in the quarter there will be a committee on compensation that will, inter alia, wish to do empirical work; one dependent variable will be quality indices and their relationship to salary levels. The numbers Dr. Petersen has gathered will be extremely useful. Second, it was said, "thank God for Anne Petersen," and the report was given high commendation. Her efforts are to be applauded and one can be pleased that a group has focused on these issues.

Dr. Petersen blushed and expressed thanks for the support. The committee, she commented, had talked about disbanding after the U2000 planning process began, but its members believed they were

working on issues of importance—and the group included faculty, graduate students, deans, and department heads, so it was broadly representative.

Dr. Petersen was asked if the committee considered the role of regional universities in research because not every institution can have superb programs in every state and region; were complementary relationships considered? She said they were; she hired Professor Phil Shively to look at these relationships and he has been doing a splendid job. The recommendations he has made are embedded in the report and some of them are already being implemented. The rationale for complementary relationship certainly exists: Minnesota is a small state in population that is fortunate to have such a strong university—but if resources are tight, it will be in trouble unless it engages in collaborative and complementary activities. A number of collaborative efforts are already underway; they could be expanded. The Wisconsin and Minnesota library collections are now merged electronically—one can obtain anything in either collection—and the next step will be to share acquisitions budgets.

One Committee member reiterated a concern about the large number of graduate programs not under the aegis of the Graduate School. Her jurisdiction perhaps cannot be extended to all of them, Dr. Petersen was told, but all degrees beyond the baccalaureate should be assessed in the same way. It will be critical to do so if any handle on quality is to be obtained. Perhaps, it was suggested, she can accomplish something in the way of assessment in her role as Vice President for Research. Dr. Petersen said these issues are addressed in the full report; post-baccalaureate programs outside the Graduate School do have many of the same questions to be asked about them. The University should be aware of state needs for applied and professional programs, to decide whether to expand offerings where we have faculty strength. Dr. Petersen noted that Walden University granted more than 100 doctorates in 1992 in Minnesota, suggesting that there must be some needs not being met by the University. It may not want to compete with Walden but it should at least know what they are doing and make a decision accordingly.

What is being urged, it was said, is the programmatic equivalent of the all-funds budget. One wishes that all post-baccalaureate programs were under the aegis of the Graduate School—with the possible exception of the M.D.—but since that will not happen, some compromise is needed.

Did not, inquired another Committee member, the earlier review of the Graduate School call for more decentralization? If so, would not these recommendations run contrary to it? Dr. Petersen said not. There are two issues that are complementary. She said she liked the recommendation to put responsibility in the hands of the graduate programs to develop a program rationale and admit students accordingly. The Graduate School, in turn, can assist departments through provision of support, a data base, resources, accountability, and oversight. In the past the Graduate School controlled the "inputs"—admissions and graduate faculty status. This new arrangement, she agreed, gives the departments the responsibility to create excellence—or a mess—and the understanding that they will be judged accordingly.

The cooperation with the University of Wisconsin is a very good idea, it was said—and the same level of cooperation ought to exist with the coordinate campuses (e.g., in terms of classes taught in both locations). Technology will help a great deal, Dr. Petersen said, including such things as computer-based interactive video. It isn't of the best quality but it is relatively inexpensive and easy to put together. It could work well for graduate committees, for example, and will be tested between Duluth and the Twin Cities this spring.

It was suggested that the recommendations of the committee should be given priority so that they carry more weight. They are not now ranked, Dr. Petersen acknowledged.

Another Committee member supported the proposition that all post—baccalaureate programs ought to be under the Graduate School, including the M.D. program. The arguments in terms of oversight and accountability, it was argued, are compelling. Dr. Petersen said that once the current changes in the Graduate School are in place, such an arrangement could be discussed. The way things were organized before, however, the reaction to such a proposal would have been very negative. Once the Graduate School is seen as more attractive, and providing support, that might be a possibility. The Graduate School must demonstrate that it is providing something of value—and changes so that it does so are occurring.

There is no recommendation in the report about recruitment of high quality graduate students, it was pointed out. Dr. Petersen replied that it was the sense of the committee that this was not a problem; the problem is in retention and graduation of students once they are here. The relative lack of fellowships does put the University at a competitive disadvantage and constitutes one of the recommendations; that funding must be increased, she said.

Professor Garrard then thanked Dr. Petersen for joining the meeting and for her report. It was later agreed that the Committee on Finance and Planning and the Committee on Research would hold a joint meeting on January 18 to discuss the report.

3. Strategic Planning

Discussion then turned briefly to the budget and to strategic planning. It was agreed that FCC members would be invited to join the Finance and Planning Committee meeting on December 21 to discuss budget options being prepared for the President.

Committee members also expressed dismay at the examples (e.g., education) used in the strategic planning document, criticizing them in some cases as being demonstrably untrue and factually inaccurate—as well as bad. If they typify the process to be used in evaluating centrality, comparative advantage, and so on, the prospects are disturbing. The conclusions in the examples are where one wants to get, but the process is flawed. Committee members were concerned that this same flawed process would be applied in the future to all units.

Professor Garrard then adjourned the meeting at 3:10.

— Gary Engstrand