

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Monday, August 8, 1994**  
**1:00 - 3:00**  
**Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: John Adams (chair), Carl Adams, Thomas Burk, Lester Drewes, Dan Feeney, Judith Garrard, Virginia Gray, Kenneth Heller, Roberta Humphreys, Robert Jones, Geoffrey Maruyama, Michael Steffes, Gerhard Weiss

Regrets: Morris Kleiner, Karen Seashore Louis

Guests: President Nils Hasselmo

Others: None

[In these minutes: Reorganization; FCC agenda items for 1994-95]

**1. Reorganization**

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed the President. Noting the number of new members in attendance, he called for Committee members to introduce themselves. Professor Adams noted that the first hour of the meeting would be a discussion of the changes in the reorganization plan submitted to the Board of Regents; the second would be devoted to possible agenda items for the Committee for the year. He then turned to the President for comments.

President Hasselmo distributed copies of a set of slides used to discuss the reorganization with the Board of Regents at their July meeting. He walked the Committee members through the actions being requested of the Board (establish two new provosts and a vice president for outreach, redefine other aspects of central administration) and the principles that guided the reorganization. The principles involve assigning explicit decision-making authority and accountability to the provosts, explicit authority to system officers providing staff support to the President, separating system and campus responsibilities, separating line and staff responsibilities, and flattening the administration (by eliminating one layer).

He then touched on the various models that were considered. After the creation of the Health Sciences provost, the question of the rest of the Twin Cities arose. After debate and thought, it seemed that two additional provosts would be optimum. Given that, there were a number of possibilities for dividing responsibilities between the two provosts. Again, following considerable review and thought, the President has concluded there should be a provost for arts, sciences, and engineering, and a provost for professional studies (including the Institute, the colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology).

---

\*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.

The President noted that thought had been given to creating an additional provost for the Institute, but it was seen as too small. Some in Agriculture also worried that doing so would marginalize it, while including it in professional studies would strengthen its activities. He reviewed a number of reasons why the Institute is appropriately part of professional studies.

This issue, he concluded wryly, is one of the thorniest he has had to deal with during his tenure as president. There are hundreds of linkages throughout the Twin Cities campus that are important, he reminded the Committee, that cannot be expressed in the structure.

Engineering could be seen as an anomaly, the President said, but he did not wish to split IT. Engineering can have a special relationship with the professional schools, he said, and recalled that there are a number of professional schools in CLA.

There will be a transition task force to assist in the reorganization; one of the things he wishes advice on is the status of the Institute of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Human Ecology.

The result of the reorganization is that there are six areas that report to the President: the three chancellors and the three Twin Cities provosts. In addition, the two senior vice presidents, the outreach vice president, and the General Counsel report to the President. The only net addition is the Vice President for Outreach, President Hasselmo pointed out; it has been his goal to not increase the expense of administration--and, if possible, to reduce it through efficiencies.

The President said he has become convinced that the reorganization is necessary if the University is to make the changes and the decisions necessary for it to achieve the goals of U2000 and to continue to accomplish its land grant mission with the funds that are now envisioned. Crisp management will be needed, which is linked to the management structures.

He has asked Professor (John) Adams to chair an advisory group from the governance system to work in parallel with the administration to look at the fine details of the structure and to consult on issues that arise. The group will also look at the interface between the governance system and the new administrative structure, including how he should interact with the governance system as well as the structures that might emerge at the campus and provostal, collegiate, and department levels.

The President then invited comments and questions from Committee members; a number of issues were raised.

- It is reasonable to expect that one of the new provosts will be on the St. Paul campus.
- While it will not be easy to find a professional studies provost, given the wide spectrum of disciplines for which that provost will be responsible, it is comforting to note that the professional school deans have clustered spontaneously. Whoever is selected will inevitably be a long way (by intellectual training) from some of the units--Law and Agriculture, for instance--but the model is that professional competence in many fields can be applied to the problems of society, the President said. Just as Physics and English are a long way apart in the arts and sciences, they are nonetheless thought to have commonalities.

- There will be basic science departments in some of the professional school units (such as Agronomy in Agriculture), but that is now the case in the Medical School and the arrangement appears to be effective. Moreover, the President repeated, there must be many interdisciplinary linkages below the provostal level of planning and financial decision-making. The biological sciences must be considered independently of this reorganization; that is an issue that needs to be studied and addressed.
- This represents a significant change in the Academic Affairs vice presidency, with much of the money now flowing through it to be directed through the provosts instead. The President said that Academic Affairs will be a system function as well as a staff function for his office (which it always has been, of course, in the ultimate sense, in that recommendations came to him). The biggest change will be that the Academic Affairs vice president will no longer deal directly with the colleges; the provosts will have responsibility for planning, budgeting, and personnel--those duties will be transferred from Academic Affairs to the provosts.
- The President demurred from a characterization of the provosts as dealing with day-to-day issues and the vice presidents as dealing with long-term policy-making. The provosts must do long-term planning; the institution will set parameters for the institution and the provosts will be given planning instructions and financial parameters, which they in turn will share with the colleges. The plans they make will be reviewed centrally, and the institutional plan along with provost/chancellor, college, and department plans will be reviewed in annual cycles in order to approximate what the University seeks to achieve.
- In terms of a faculty member trying to teach and do research, the person to whom the faculty member would turn to get an answer, to get something done, would be the dean or perhaps the provost. Some things, such as changes in grants, are governed by federal regulations and would perhaps go through ORTTA. One of his principles, the President told the Committee, is that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level--and the burden of proof will be on those who argue that a decision should be made at a higher level. This will require cultural changes that may be difficult. One Committee member observed that one wants decisions made where there is the most knowledge and the most flexibility, but some decisions have an impact on the institution, so there must be mechanisms for interaction between the levels of decision-making. And some decisions, because of economies of scale, are best made centrally. Another observed that habits will have to be broken; the vice presidents will have to tell people to go elsewhere for answers, which will be a big change.
- What happens with departments that now have dual reporting relationships? The President said another of his principles is that if something works well now, don't disturb it. It is to be hoped that good working relationships will continue and the provosts will support them.
- Asked about the communication between the provosts and Academic Affairs, the President noted that the latter will be in charge of institutional planning and will also manage the

academic infrastructure on his behalf. There will also absolutely need to be connections between the provosts and the vice presidents for research and for undergraduate education and student development, because duties in these areas will be shared. The transition task force will address what might be managed centrally in student affairs and that which the provosts and deans should be responsible for.

- The question of phasing out the Graduate School is left open. Some believe it is not needed; others believe it is so badly needed that the dean's position should be separated from the research vice president. The task force can help address these issues; his assumption, the President said, is that the two positions will continue and will be held by one person.
- No changes are proposed for ORTTA, so there should be no impact on funded research obtained by faculty. It is to be hoped that some questions about research and funding could be decentralized; that may depend in part on federal regulations. Rather than impeding or slowing the process of getting grants through, the reorganization should make it easier. In response to a query about enhancement of research or building maintenance, however, the President said there is nothing in this reorganization per se that would specifically have that result. The reorganization is only one piece of reform; there have been major changes in Facilities Management, and reviews of all administrative processes are being conducted to ensure they are effective and to save money where possible (although not all are being reviewed at the same time). The reorganization will not solve all the problems, but it holds out the hope that the structure will permit them to be addressed.
- Information technology will be increasingly important as an enabling service for faculty members to do their jobs. One concern is that this reorganization continues the present arrangement of split responsibility for information technology, one individual in Academic Affairs and one in Finance and Operations--while a number of reports over the last several years have called for a single Chief Information Officer. The present structure has been competitive and led to overlaps. How much consideration was given to changing that arrangement? That level of detail was not addressed, the President related; his view is that the direction in which the University is going is to have an integrated infrastructure of academic computing, with administrative computing separate but not with a separate infrastructure. Academic Affairs will have the clear lead role on the information technology infrastructure.
- Asked about the relationship between the current Vice President for Student Affairs position and the proposed vice president for undergraduate education and student development, the President said he believed there are aspects of undergraduate education at the pre-major level that ought to be better linked to undergraduate student life. There have been improvements; this is intended to highlight the fact that there is a central officer who has responsibility for undergraduate education, just as there is a central officer with responsibility for research. The new vice president would not have responsibility for curricular matters, although the office might help to implement general education requirements. The intent is to highlight the concern with undergraduate education--before

the point when students are distributed to colleges and departments--and to link recruitment, retention, student life, and the early classroom experience.

- Asked about the role of the outreach vice president vis-a-vis the Minnesota Extension Service, the President said he envisioned the vice president having two major responsibilities. First, to continue what the Outreach Council has begun in terms of planning and mapping out outreach activities in a more systematic fashion and identifying where to put money, and second, to respond to the urgent need to lead the University into distance education. New modes of delivering education are already rampant, and the University better have someone who leads it into those activities.
- Asked about where responsibility for faculty development would fall, the President said he planned no changes in that area. Academic Affairs would continue to be responsible, but the provosts can be expected to take an active part in it as well.

The President had to depart at this point; he invited additional questions from the Committee to be directed to him. He asked the Committee to help him cut the Gordian knot. He said he is comfortable the scheme is one the University can move forward on and would appreciate any help in making the go/no go decision. Asked if he wished any statement from the Committee, the President said he would welcome any statement the Committee might wish to make.

Professor Adams thanked President Hasselmo for joining the meeting.

## **2. Continued Discussion of Reorganization; Major FCC Agenda Items**

Professor Adams then inquired of his colleagues their overall thoughts on the reorganization. One Committee member maintained that the underlying philosophy of planning and decision-making seems to be a top-down method of handling things; will that persist? Will there be increased faculty comfort with decision-making, or will it continue top-down? This needs to be made a consensus system so people feel comfortable with decisions.

Another problem is the perception that the administration is always taking things to the Regents for final action in September, thus "doing stuff" during the summer. That isn't true, because the calendar drives events. It would be better if things could be moved up, even if the discussion takes place during the academic year and final preparation occurs during the summer, because the schedule militates against faculty participation.

One suggestion was to put all administrators on 9-month appointments; another was to put all faculty on 12-month appointments (thus moving teaching to when the customers want it rather than according to the plowing schedule); yet another was to do both!

The President views this reorganization, contended one Committee member, as decentralization that should lead to more collegiality in decision-making. He is attempting to create more collegiality and have fewer decisions come from "on high."

Committee members continued to discuss various pieces of the reorganization plan. They

deliberated whether to take a position on it without consulting with colleagues, but concluded that it was the responsibility of the Committee to say something, if it believed it would be wise to do so. Committee members then expressed support for the reorganization or concern about specific issues.

- The provosts are like chancellors, in that they are the chief operating officers for the unit--they are in charge, after they receive financial wherewithal from the administration.
- One can be concerned that the concept of the Twin Cities campus will be lost, and perhaps such things as the liberal arts curriculum and coordination of the Undergraduate Initiative--undergraduate education could fall between the cracks, unless the new vice president will have the coordinating responsibility, which people do not want. To the contrary, it was said, there will be undergraduate education in all three provostal units and the system officer will be charged to coordinate it so there is less confusion. If so, the position must be defined very differently from the traditional dean of students.
- The materials associated with the reorganization--and all materials presented to the Board of Regents--should be made available on Gopher.
- The details of the reorganization remain unclear--as they should be, at this point--but those details will need discussion and faculty must be involved.
- The provosts should come from inside the University, not be outside saviors who are unfamiliar with the culture of the University. They also need to be sympathetic to the goals of U2000, added another.

The Committee then unanimously approved the following statement:

**The Faculty Consultative Committee endorses the President's recommendations on University reorganization as an excellent first step that addresses some serious deficiencies in the current organizational structure. We look forward to an extensive continuing consultation that fleshes out the details. The University would be well served if it moved promptly to fill the positions indicated in the new organization.**

It was agreed that the reorganization should be an item of information and discussion at the first Faculty Senate meeting, in order that the faculty feel they have had their chance to be consulted and to learn how they can "put their oar in" if they wish.

It was noted that none of the searches have begun, because the reorganization must first be approved by the Board of Regents.

Professor Adams inquired if there are other issues that warrant Committee attention during the upcoming year that should be noted in the record. It is important, he maintained, that the Committee not only react to issues important to the central officers but that it also identify issues important to IT. Committee members suggested several.

- The issue of clusters. The establishment of two provosts may make cross-unit work more difficult. Committee member discussed why cluster planning had never gotten off the ground (the attention was devoted to the clusters themselves and they were unstructured, rather than having a set of issues to address).
- The future of the Graduate School. The need for it, and the argument for letting its functions devolve to the colleges, were briefly discussed. Graduate students dislike it; the deans, however, tend to see their responsibilities almost exclusively in undergraduate education, and not all graduate programs are responsible enough to manage themselves.
- The Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Student Development. The Committee needs to consider the similarities and differences in arguments about the "dean of undergraduate education" and the Dean of the Graduate School, and must argue that the former is not based on the model of student services and admissions and records.
- Development of a systematic legislative strategy, by working with the faculty legislative liaison, and making sure that faculty concerns are voiced.
- Competitive compensation for faculty and P&A employees. This is an issue that has never been popular at the legislature, and the faculty need to push it. Related to this is the reward structure.
- The need to rebuild community among the faculty and how to get people integrated into institutional governance. When faculty increasingly play to their national and international communities, and turn their backs on their institution, it is the responsibility of the faculty to think about campus citizenship. The reward structure is also related to this issue.
- The integration of computer services and infrastructure. A Chief Information Officer is needed and there must be a more aggressive approach to computer services.

Professor Adams thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand