

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 14, 1994
12:00 - 2:30
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club

Present: Judith Garrard (chair), Carl Adams, John Adams, Mario Bognanno, James Gremmels, Kenneth Heller, Robert Jones, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Toni McNaron, Cleon Melsa, Irwin Rubenstein, Shirley Zimmerman

Regrets: Lester Drewes, Michael Steffes

Absent: none

Guests: President Nils Hasselmo

Others: Rich Broderick, Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: FCC participation in searches; various topics with the President]

1. Committee Business

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 12:10 and began by raising the question of whether or not the Committee should reconsider its protocol calling for FCC to be scheduled for meetings with all candidates for vice presidential and provost positions. In the recent round of interviews with health sciences provost candidates, few Committee members were able to attend.

After short discussion, it appeared that the Committee believed this element of faculty participation in the selection of senior University officers is extremely important and that the protocol not be abandoned so soon after it had been adopted. Among the suggestions made were that a greater attempt be made, in the future, to poll FCC members to find out if at least three or four would be able to attend each interview session, and to make some modest attempt to accommodate schedules, and that FCC members be invited to attend other public sessions with such candidates if they are unable to attend the FCC interview. It was also not clear what FCC was to do after the interviews were conducted; in the past, it was explained, the chair summarized the reactions of Committee members immediately after the final interview and delivered them to the President within a day.

Inasmuch as the President had arrived at the meeting, the Committee members who had attended each of the health science provost interviews expressed their views about the candidates. At the conclusion of these remarks, the President expressed appreciation for the views and said he hoped to be able to make a decision by next week, following some additional consultation.

*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.

2. Discussion with President Hasselmo

The President then reported on items from the Board of Directors of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (of which he is chair; C. Peter Magrath is President of NASULGC).

There will be a new national effort to recruit minority students to graduate schools. Funded by a grant from General Electric to set up a computer system, the Minority National Graduate Feeder System will link the graduates of the Historically Black Colleges to all 172 NASULGC institutions. The NASULGC members will have information on all of the graduates and will be able to ensure that that talent pool is fully exploited, with emphasis on science, technology, and math. The University has committed to provide 10 fellowships to minority students through and specifically for this program; each will likely carry the student through at least the majority of their graduate work. Universities, the President pointed out, will NOT be able to recruit minority faculty members unless the pipeline to graduate education is open.

The President agreed with the observation of one Committee member that an equally serious problem is the loss of minority students much earlier, at the 6th grade level and thereafter. There are two bottlenecks, he said: getting those students up to the point where they can enter undergraduate education, and then getting them into graduate education. The University has a program with the St. Paul schools now to try to address that problem, at least for minority students in St. Paul (the University guarantees financial aid).

ICR funds have also been on the NASULGC agenda. The issues are causing some tension between public and private institutions; the privates are lobbying heavily not to "pause" or decrease ICR funds while the public institutions are more inclined to accept formula allocations.

Nationally, the President then reported, NASULGC has been reorganized so that it now better addresses substantive academic issues of concern as well as political issues. The collaboration among the education associations in Washington is now better than it ever has been. Right now they are seeking to ensure that higher education can continue to regulate itself, and avoid excessive federal regulation. The Department of Education has proposed very oppressive regulations, provoked by high default rates at some proprietary institutions, and the associations are fighting the regulations.

On the University budget, he has recommended an average 4.2% tuition increase and has reviewed with the Board of Regents the major educational and budgetary issues. It is possible that there will be fine-tuning of the numbers, as discussions proceed, but he told the Committee he believes it important to stay with the 4.2%.

The actual amount of money involved in the difference between 3% and 4.2% tuition increases--\$1.6 million in a \$1.8 billion budget--is insignificant, said one Committee member, but the symbolism is VERY significant. Whatever the decision, there must be clarity on the meaning of the decision; if there is not, people will make up their own views about its meaning. Other Committee members took issue with the proposition that \$1.6 million was insignificant. The President pointed out that the amount of money available to deal with is really only about \$600 million, because the \$1.8 billion is not fungible.

Asked why the option of increasing tuition 5% was not included as an alternative, the President said he wants exchanges with the Board about what should be done if the \$1.6 million is not to be realized--should it come from the SIP? from additional retrenchment?--but that he believed the administration should come forward with one budget recommendation and make the case for it as strongly as possible.

If the other parts of the University are to make sacrifices in order to advance it through U2000, the Board will send a poor message if it holds tuition increases to the rate of inflation, thus meaning students will not contribute their fair share.

Why the Board insistence on 3%, asked one Committee member? Is tuition at Minnesota out of line with some comparison group? Does the Board feel the University needs more belt-tightening and that it can handle a \$1.6 million cut? The Board wants to keep tuition as low as possible, the President said; they believe anything in excess of inflation must be argued for. He said he agrees with that approach and that the administration must argue for the additional 1.2%. The 4.2% is itself a meaningless number, he pointed out, because it is nothing more than a composite of a number of rates, all of which were decided individually, each on the merits. The President said he would not argue the symbolism of 3% versus 4.2%.

He HAS articulated the rationale for the 4.2% increase, responded one Committee member to the President; the BOARD will need to articulate some rationale if they decide to hold the average increases to 3%. The answer simply may be that that's the rate of inflation, said another Committee member.

With respect to the Strategic Investment Pool (SIP), the President said, he is VERY concerned that this budget send the right signal--and he is concerned that it must still deal with the BACKLOG of projects such as structural budget deficits and physical facilities problems. That situation makes it hard to emphasize U2000. It is distressing that investments must continue to be made in necessary but unexciting things, to the exclusion of more interesting strategic investments.

One Committee member said that for members of this Committee, the proposed SIP allocations were not a surprise. The President might think, however, about signalling what will happen once most of that backlog is removed. Another Committee member said he read the investments as clearly allocating part to catch-up and part to moving ahead--that is clear to those who have been involved. But it would be helpful if, with each presentation, there were a summary reminder of the five goals of U2000.

The important signal will come with the 1995-97 biennial request, the President said. If that does not send a strong and unambiguous message, a major opportunity will have been missed. The administration is at work on the conceptual framework of the request now and will want some extended discussion of it before the end of the academic year. The request must be framed in terms of U2000 and include specifics about the implications of the investments the state will be asked to make--in addition to providing information about the University's own bootstrapping so that it is clear this is a shared effort.

What has not been tied into this process, said one Committee member, is academic planning that focuses on 40-50 areas and a recognition that the University cannot be excellent in all areas. The major resource of the University is new faculty positions; it would help if there were a plan for where new appointments should go. A plan for program assessment has been proposed by Vice President Petersen

but there has been no indication of who will act on those assessments.

That is the difficulty in carrying 24 college plans into the budget document, the President observed. There is much underneath the budget that is not lifted into view. How to capture the overriding priorities in such a complex institution is a difficult problem.

The President then reported briefly on the status of the University's supplemental and capital requests at the legislature.

The Regents were recently provided a presentation on University College (hereinafter UC), President Hasselmo told the Committee. The foundation of UC is looking at the needs of students the University serves and finding ways to meet those needs. The concept has evolved so that the underlying philosophy is to integrate and be sensitive to students needs, recognizing that the University serves many different clienteles--but that all are to be offered the same quality education with the same standards. UC will tie CEE closer to the colleges, permitting a broader view of the many clienteles, and will also build in distance education as a mean to reach them.

The idea is powerful, said one Committee member. To put in market and service mechanisms is OK; the flaw is in the delivery mechanism. Why not do away with CEE altogether as a separate body. The separation is bad. Why not take up a revolutionary idea and have the basic delivery done by the academic units? How could units worry about quality under the proposed plan, since they'd be the ones delivering the education? Ideally, the departments would do everything, the President responded, but that isn't realistic, so there is a need for a tactical unit such as UC with specialized expertise to assist them.

The original idea of UC was attractive: that undergraduate programs be adjusted to accommodate very different kinds of students (such as the traditional full-time undergraduate to large groups of other kinds of students). The idea that both groups might profit from being treated separately should not be lost. It may be that a UC is not needed, but there should be recognition that the University does not deliver good service to undergraduates because it does not recognize their needs. That is the heart of UC, the President responded.

The question is what faculty can do, said one Committee member. One side of the discussion is especially challenging, that is, how to motivate faculty to cut back or drop activities that may have diminished in value and to enter new areas of research and teaching. Faculty have made major investments in their research and teaching programs. That is why they support research universities, to encourage independent inquiry. But when society makes new demands on the faculty, work programs can be slow to change. They are often not demand-responsive, for example, in meeting the needs of mid-career, part-time, evening, and weekend students. There is talk about UC services but not about UC and how to improve what is being done or how to identify those who are not taking advantage of what the University has to offer. But there is not talk about revolution, because that involves people like those in this room--there are a lot of interests at stake.

The President cautioned that people should remember the "2000" in U2000 and look at the vision, not the constraints that may tie the institution that cannot be IMMEDIATELY overcome.

The idea of UC that was presented to SCEP, Professor Heller reported, was that the academic responsibilities of CEE would be passed to the departments so the bifurcation of delivery is eliminated. UC would be the service and marketing arm and would also be responsible for experimental programs (such as the partnership programs) that might later be integrated into regular academic departments. The President concurred, and said that in the case of experimental programs, there would be a faculty body responsible. He also reported that two additional partnership programs have been proposed, in emergency medical services and in construction management.

It was agreed that the Committee should meet with Vice President Allen in the near future to learn about the most recent iteration of UC. The Committee should receive in advance the most recent written version of Dr. Allen's committee's report. It was also agreed that there ought to be an article about the evolving UC concept in FOOTNOTE.

The President said he wished to reiterate that the continued development of U2000 will come through strategic initiatives such as that around UC. He alone has 25 or 30 such initiatives in mind, specific plans to implement U2000. Senior Vice President Infante is working on them; the question is being asked of each if it will advance the goals of U2000 and each is being subjected to the same scrutiny that UC has been. Those reports will be drawn on as they come forward.

The idea of Responsibility Centered Management remains that; there has been no decision. The University is operating with RCM now, somewhat, but there has been no dramatic change to RCM. There will be additional discussion before any significant changes are made, the President promised. One Committee member urged that if the President believes he should start doing things because they feel right and work better, that is fine, but--recalling the earlier discussion of symbolism--it was argued that the term should be abandoned, if only to make people's ulcers subside. The President agreed the term probably should not have been used in the budget process. The idea is to get colleges and departments to "take ownership" of the students they serve, for the numbers of students they have, and the nature of the services they provide; financing will then be connected to how they carry out those responsibilities.

Asked about progress in reorganization of central administration, the President told the Committee that the message he has received is "Nils, go ahead and do it, but don't bother us with it." "If you do the right thing, it's a good idea," responded one member of the Committee. The President said he has been working on it, has received a number of suggestions, and is looking at the fine structure of what the central administration would look like with provosts offices.

Professor Garrard thanked the President for joining the Committee. She then adjourned the FCC meeting at 1:40. FCC members were then joined by several faculty and P&A members of the Finance and Planning Committee to discuss what would be said to the Board of Regents at their forum on the University's budget. The Committee voted unanimously to close the meeting.

The discussion ended at 2:45.

-- Gary Engstrand