

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
joined by members of the Faculty Consultative Committee
Tuesday, September 7, 1993
Room 238 Morrill Hall
3:00 - 5:00**

- Present: (SCFP) Irwin Rubenstein (chair), David Berg, David Dahlgren, Mark Davison, William Gerberich, Karen Geronime, Michael Hoey, Karen Karni, Craig Kissock, Fred Morrison, Roger Paschke, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Thomas Scott, Mary Sue Simmons, Dianne Van Tasell, Albert Yonas
- Present: (FCC) Judith Garrard, John Adams, Kenneth Heller, Geoffrey Maruyama, Shirley Zimmerman
- Guests: Senior Vice President Robert Erickson, President Nils Hasselmo
- Others: Ken Janzen (Regents' Office), Martha Kvanbeck, Professor W. Phillips Shively, Robert Super, Jane Whiteside

[In these minutes: Plans for the University]

Professor Rubenstein convened the meeting at 3:05 and welcomed the President. This meeting begins this year's discussion of the planning process. Last Thursday and Friday at the Board of Regents' retreat planning proposals were presented; the President is now present to discuss them with the two Committees. Committee members were provided handouts totalling 1.25 inches in height.

The President then spoke at some length without interruption. He began by noting that the University did not quite control the process of the release of the proposals; the first airing of the ideas, beyond the Regents' retreat, was the announcement in the media. The original intention was to make the proposals public on October 4, with internal discussion prior to that date. Inasmuch as reporters were at the Regents' retreat, however, the proposals became headlines. The President said he hoped to avoid distortions of the proposals and ideas and expressed gratitude he would be able to meet again with the two Committees at their retreat later in the month. There will be an extensive schedule of consulting on the plans, he said, with Board of Regents action on a honed document in December.

In terms of the proposals, the President told the Committees, they are based on, and develop, ideas from Commitment to Focus and the 1991 Restructuring and Reallocation, pulled together and made more explicit. The planning horizon is the year 2000, although some proposals out of the planning process have already begun to be implemented and others will be begun soon. By Fall Quarter, 1994, there will be an institutional plan, which will have been preceded by intense unit participation and cluster planning.

*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 then said he wanted to review seven basic ideas.

First, the direction being set accords with the basic spirit of the land-grant philosophy, even given that "land grant" is susceptible of several definitions. It is a fine heritage, the President said, that should be honored. Being land grant means the University will be a leading global research university--unambiguously--but that it will not exist in intellectual isolation. It will, rather, be in the community so that its intellectual resources are shared.

Second, the different components of the University must be treated on their own terms, especially the different campuses; to paint one picture covering all units and campuses would require too much vagueness. Each of the campuses has a particular role to fill, and must fill it well. Morris is an outstanding liberal arts college and should continue to be one. Crookston, for example, is not a research university but it should be the best of its kind of school. Duluth is a highly productive comprehensive university with some research activities. The Twin Cities is clearly and should unambiguously be the leading research university with all that that term entails in terms of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and research.

Third, in the Twin Cities the responsibilities of being a major research university and a center for community education have been wrapped together. The basic function of the Twin Cities campus is to be a leading research institution; given the University's mission, however, the second function, that of making University's intellectual resources available in community education, is very important. The "University College" idea being proposed (with apologies to the current University College) is that it will be an arm of the University, in partnership with other institutions, that offers career education. This will be the most complex part of the shaping of the University--it will not be a second-rate education but will be a different way to market the University's educational opportunities. It will be a way to forge partnerships with other institutions and to provide the University's expertise in selected areas in community education.

Fourth, it may seem paradoxical but shaping the undergraduate experience on the Twin Cities campus is the most important element in establishing the University as a leading global research university. Nationally, the best research universities offer outstanding undergraduate experiences. The University has the content and the right elements, but the overall undergraduate experience--the student body, the culture, the ambience--has not "clicked." Part of the problem is infrastructure, part of it is the way students are recruited and the standards of admission, and part of it is the requirements for what it takes to be an undergraduate on the Twin Cities campus. The student body needs to be shaped; for example, perhaps 80% of the students should have been in the top 25% of their high school class--which requirement would be a tightening of standards. It will be important that students who come must expect to enter the intellectual life of the research campus.

Ideally, there should be an individual admissions process, and the University will be challenged by outcomes-based education in elementary and secondary schools to get away from relying heavily on numbers (class rank, SAT score, etc.). He would like to see students recruited because of their special abilities--in music, math, art, athletics--even if not in the top 25% of their class. Students with special talents should be present as part of the shaping of the undergraduate experience.

This may mean that the way undergraduate instruction is delivered could change. There are many exciting instructional activities occurring on the campus and there is much very good traditional instruction also taking place; the University must draw on the best of both, while avoiding gimmickry. The President's Forum on Teaching and the Committee on the Learning Community of the Future are intended to help identify what is occurring and to institutionalize innovation and good practices

Fifth, it is also important that the University be user friendly--it must treat students well, and in interacting with other constituencies, the University must make clear that it is serving them.

For some reason the University has never been able to pull all these elements together; they must be conveyed in their totality to others. There is much good at the University, but the good that is identified is almost seen as an exception to an otherwise negative image. So it is time to take stock and to recognize the many marvelous ingredients that already exist but that have not come together. The President cautioned that he was not by any means denigrating the work of those who have for years worked to create a community at the University. There are many centers of excellence on the campus, some of which have been obscured.

Sixth, adoption of these plans will present a financial challenge, if the kind of educational quality being discussed is not to be accompanied by prohibitive tuition rates. The University must thus lay out for the State what it is and what it can provide and negotiate what it will do--and see if it can obtain a budget to make that possible. But the University cannot rely solely on the State. Tuition must not create socio-economic, racial, or ethnic barriers. Some rates may be lowered while others may be increased. The University must continue to have an outstanding sponsored research budget, and it may look increasingly to public/private partnerships (perhaps including contracts with employers for training, for example).

Seventh, this will require a grueling process for setting priorities in order to accomplish the plans. The Twin Cities has been divided into about a dozen clusters of disciplines for the purpose of setting priorities. There is no question that the University will have strong humanities and social science programs, for example; the question is how to achieve or retain them and how to set priorities for quality within each major disciplinary area. In the planning process, the clusters will be used to drive the priorities and perhaps reorganization; the existing college structure, for example, may in some cases need change in order to obtain the best management and use of resources and to further interdisciplinary activities.

The President concluded by pointing out that the traditional criteria for program evaluation will be used: centrality, quality, future demand, relative advantage, and efficiency and effectiveness. For this planning process, however, centrality has been split into two parts: (1) critical to meeting the needs of the State, and (2) central to the research mission of the University. These are not necessarily the same, he observed. Especially in the University College, service to the State is a driving force; it will have components that are not essential to a research university.

The objectives of these plans are to stand the University in good stead for the future, to capture the public's imagination, and to help raise the University's excellence into full public view.

Committee members then posed a number of questions to the President.

- Planning usually takes place in departments and colleges; how will the clusters fit into the process?

The President pointed out that the colleges are deeply involved in planning now and those processes will be relied upon. The clusters have been formed over the last few weeks; teams will be appointed across (or in some cases within) colleges to look at broad intellectual areas. Cluster planning will be matched with institutional planning (as will collegiate planning). The clusters may change; as planning continues, different configurations may be seen as necessary. In terms of the process, college planning will be merged into cluster planning, which will then be merged into institutional planning.

- What is the relationship between Continuing Education and Extension (CEE) and the University College?

The President said that the projected 7750 FYE (full-year equivalent) students in University College (1993) includes CEE students (and it should be understood that those 7750 FYE students could be comprised of 20,000 or more individuals). It is assumed that CEE will continue as it is but marketed through University College. University College will be a separate organization in order that needs of students coming to it will be served, rather than having them mixed up with students in the research university. Continuing professional education could also be marketed through University College, but there are borderline questions that will need to be addressed, the President said.

CEE does not offer degrees, one Committee member noted. The President said that English degrees, for example, will still be offered as part of the leading research university; there will not be a separate English degree from University College. One question is whether or not an English degree can be offered to a working student who cannot attend day classes; that question, he said, has not been resolved.

- One Committee member speculated that faculty in University College might be second-class citizens? There has traditionally been a problem in hiring good people to teach from the community at low rates--they are ill-treated. It is possible to envision a cadre of people being used by the University at low cost, a shift to part-time employees away from people holding satisfying full-time jobs.

The President responded that teaching in University College must be recognized as a valuable contribution to the University. The mix of faculty in University College is projected at 30% University faculty (teaching a course or two in University College as part of their teaching duties), 30% community leaders, and 40% from cooperating institutions. This mix recognizes that the University cannot and should not fully staff University College with full-time research faculty but that other faculty and individuals should be drawn on. The intermingling of the two roles has not necessary produced quality on either side; by clearly separating the two functions, the University hopes to do better at both.

The core responsibilities of University College are clear, the President said: partnership

arrangements (such as the Bachelor of Management Information Technology with North Hennepin), taking University expertise and combining it with what other institutions can do, thus providing a new educational experience. It is appropriate to use practitioners, with quality control and leadership provided by University faculty. University College and the research university would be two different activities equally valued by the University.

The 30% of the University faculty, the President clarified, would be 30% of the faculty OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, not 30% of the 3000+ faculty on the Twin Cities campus. The actual number of University faculty needed would depend on the number of students in University College, which is projected to have an enrollment of 10,000 FYEs by the year 2000.

Nor would University faculty necessarily be full time in University College, the President said; faculty could straddle the two responsibilities. But University College teaching should be part of regular faculty responsibilities, not an add-on; it will be necessary, through the University College structure, to decide who will be recruited to teach the courses that will be required.

-- What existing programs might be incorporated in University College?

CEE would be a start, the President told the Committees; the educational partnerships; possibly developmental education/General College, or at least part of it. He should not at this early date be the one who decides, the President noted; the issue should be on the table for further discussion and analysis. The University will clearly continue to have a role in developmental education--it does research in the field and it must stay involved with it.

-- One Committee member said the research university program is understand-able--largely full-time students studying in a research-oriented institution. The partnerships are also understandable--the University working cooperatively with other institutions to provide degrees. It appears there is a big middle ground; one can be concerned that the University is shedding part-time students into University College--students who will want English degrees. Is this more than bookkeeping entries? The English degree will still be a CLA degree; it may just take a student 10 years to obtain it. There is the potential to shift several thousand part-time students into University College who could not be absorbed by the partnership degree programs.

Many of those students, the President responded, may have to go to Metro State to get an English degree. The University is talking with Metro State, the President amplified, about partnership arrangements; there are a number of possibilities that could be explored. To what extent they would be under University College remains to be determined, but University College could act as a broker to establish such relationships.

-- What of students who enter University College and subsequently decide they want to change to the other track, the research university?

There will be some flexibility, the President said, but the degree programs will not be the

basis for graduate work--and the University is clearly saying so, such as with the Bachelor of Information Sciences. Some courses will not transfer from University College to the research university; the courses will serve different purposes and programs. The developmental coursework would presumably be directed towards entry into the research university. The University is putting the community on notice that it will not cater to casual students (which has nothing to do with full- versus part-time).

-- Could some units be split between the University and University College?

The President said that right now it will be CEE; the academic department sets the standards but the programs are marketed through University College. It will also provide services to students; the department provides the academic content and standards and some of the faculty. University College will NOT have a research function; the department will be in the research university. There are, again, borderline cases, and they must be resolved by further analysis and consultation. The fundamental idea is that the two functions must be separated if the University is to be a high quality research university while also providing high quality educational opportunities through University College.

It is in the last respect that this plan differs from Commitment to Focus: CTF focussed on developing the research university, to the exclusion of the other services the Twin Cities campus has historically provided; this plan includes both.

-- One of the largest groups of students in General College, it is said, consists of students from Edina; has the political fallout from this plan been considered? There could be a considerable number of students from wealthy suburban areas who will no longer be able to get into the University.

The President said the political implications have been taken into account and they are not easy to resolve. The University must make up its mind to say that it is not for everyone. That is hard to do in Minnesota and has not been done in the past. But the developmental function must be kept in mind: there are social injustices that the University must help students overcome and admit them to the research university. Is that a different clientele from that now served by General College? The question needs to be addressed. One can certainly ask, the President added, whether or not the University should be attracting students who need developmental education from outside Minnesota.

-- What is the difference between the casual and the part-time student?

The casual student, the President responded, does not take intellectual activities seriously; the part-time student does, even though he or she may take it in pieces because of work or other obligations.

-- To oversimplify, how will the President answer critics who say this is just a different way to account for graduation rates?

The graduation rate, he said, will be a byproduct of the plans. It is unrealistic, given what

the University has been doing, to expect a high rate. Goals must be realistic. If the University is to continue as an "open" institution for casual students, it will continue to be dead last in the Big Ten in graduation rates. He does not want that to happen.

It is also an inefficient use of the University's resources, added a Committee member. This is an expensive place; permitting casual students to consume resources deprives others of a place.

- Within a department, faculty members could be largely in the research university or in University College?

Yes, the President said, but NOT because they are not good enough to be in the research university. It may be that the best teachers are in University College, and those who stay in the research university do so because they are not good enough for University College. It **MUST BE GOOD**. The role of Metro State should be expanded; the metropolitan area needs it. But it would not be efficient to have Metro State take over all community education responsibilities because it would be very expensive to duplicate many of the University's facilities and expertise.

- Will these changes require a re-writing of the promotion and tenure regulations? The President thought not, for University faculty. Practitioners would be hired through University College; other institutions do so and they are a valuable teaching asset. As careers of faculty evolve, and a faculty member wants to devote most time as an outstanding teacher, the structure should accommodate him or her. Alternatively, it should permit playing to the strengths of a research faculty member. There must be flexibility, the President said, but faculty members must be rooted in research/scholarly/artistic accomplishment.

But if research is not part of the University College mission, and a faculty member in it is not required to do research, would that not mean separate promotion and tenure documents for that track?

The President said he did not see that necessary now; there will be research faculty who have some teaching responsibilities in University College. Individuals from the community who teach would not have tenure-track appointments.

- This is an exciting proposal, in that the University is finally and clearly distinguishing itself from other institutions of higher education in the state. All of the incentives, however, for research faculty are for research; has anyone thought about building incentives to foster teaching?

Faculty leadership has already begun to move in that direction with the faculty workload principles, the President said; it is to be hoped that college applications of those principles will give teaching its due. Anyone who is teaching must be anchored in a discipline, as an intellectual renewal process, but a premium should be placed on outstanding teaching. This is a separate issue, but it is important to what is being sought--and it is essential to

improving the undergraduate experience in the research university on the Twin Cities campus.

Professor Rubenstein thanked the President for joining the meeting, noting once again that this only begins the conversation. President Hasselmo said he did not have solutions to a lot of the problems but has tried to lay out some basic ideas that he thinks are important. They are not original with him, he said, but have evolved through a lot of conversations with community leaders. He invited the help of the faculty in honing the plans--to reject that which will not work and to support and refine that which will.

Following the President's departure, the Committees turned their attention to how they might deal with the many issues raised by these proposals. It was suggested that broader University faculty and staff involvement in the discussions is essential, because if the faculty do not like these plans, they will not get done and the effort will turn into a fiasco. A number of procedural and calendar points were made in the ensuing discussion.

- A faculty forum will be held on October 21, in which the President [it was later determined] agreed to participate. Later, on November 11 [it was subsequently decided] there will be a Faculty Senate meeting at which action can be taken, in order that the Board of Regents will have the benefit of the advice of the faculty prior to their meetings in December.
- Four Senate committees should be asked to consider these proposals from their particular perspectives: Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, Finance and Planning, and Research; the committees should then be asked to present their views at the faculty forum on October 21. The four committees, or chairs, might work together in advance of the forum but they each bring their committee's perspective. Other Senate committees that wished to express their views on the issues are also welcomed to do so.
- There will be a Senate committee chairs' orientation on September 28; they can be informed about these plans and their roles in responding to them.
- Broader faculty participation should not be precluded, perhaps through an "email hotline" or telephone hotline. [Subsequent to the meeting, arrangements were begun to arrange such an email hotline.]
- The focus of committee/Faculty Senate deliberations should be on whatever action the Board of Regents will consider taking in December. Those items will, at a minimum, be on the Regents' November agenda for information.
- The plan either has a lot of implications, requiring a lot of work fast, or it is only bookkeeping. If the former, it could be frightening--the University could be walking the plank. It will affect the life of every faculty member--and it will be difficult to get much done by December. It may necessary simply to mark out issues that need further study and assign the work to committee chairs, who would be asked to report to FCC. Email may be the only way to accomplish the work in the short period of time available.

- Information for faculty, staff, and students will be needed in the next couple of weeks, including ways they can participate.
- Mr. Erickson said the timing fits the longer-term calendar established in June by the Board of Regents: the planning process is to drive the next biennial request, and is to inform budgeting. The linkages between the units, clusters, and institutional planning are being developed now; all are concerned with the process. By March/April of next year, unit and institutional plans must be integrated, so there is much work to be done.

Committee discussion also touched on some of the substantive issues in the plans.

- The concern about shedding part-time students must not be lost. One rarely hears about CEE participation in the planning; is it? Mr. Erickson assured the Committees that Dean Miller is actively involved.
- The question about how an English degree, for example, might be obtained in University College must be addressed. One can make the case that people should have the right to expect they can attend the University and obtain a regular English degree, even if it takes them ten years. Why can't they? Perhaps that would not be possible in the specialty fields, but it might be in English and Biology. Other Committee members expressed support for the President's distinction between part-time and casual students--and that the distinction answers the question. One should be able to obtain a regular English degree, even if it takes ten years, said one Committee member.
- Some students will want to go to the University and will be creative in finding ways to do so; will this be a reshuffling of students? It may be, said another Committee member, that there will be a queue to get in--if a service or commodity is valued, there is either a queue or a black market. Casual students from wealthy suburbs may not be able to get in. This plan sends a message that they will not be able to do so. But if they are properly motivated and prepared they will have a fine university to attend.
- Focus of governance and faculty attention should be on the six ideas laid out by the President and the goals of the plan. Are they worthy and what the University wants? If yes, then the next level needs attention. But the committees should NOT be talking about specific courses or degrees.
- It may be that the principles the President has laid out are not controversial. That has not been established, responded another. There are big issues at hand, such as cooperation with other institutions.
- Some of the comments in the planning documents appear to focus on the negative in terms of faculty; perhaps the governance system should do a little self-promotion of faculty. This depiction of faculty must be addressed. Perception is reality, and if that is the perception among key state leaders, it behooves the faculty to consider the comments seriously.
- One key assertion in the plan is that shaping and strengthening undergraduate education on

the Twin Cities campus is key to strengthening the research university. There are a LOT of faculty who would categorically disagree with that assumption. Many faculty do not understand that the delivery of undergraduate education affects the public view of the University; parts of the State do not believe the University cares about undergraduate education. This difference in perception about the importance of undergraduate education will require work. The public perception creates serious problems for the University and haunts it politically among undergraduates and alumni. A robust institution with positive public sentiment can withstand having bad things happen to it--if the underlying sentiment is supportive.

- Expectations for students, said another Committee member, have not been well articulated up to now. This new plan is the first time it has been said that in recruiting students, the University must get students who are serious about their education. That view must permeate the institution, and students must come expecting to study and not to do 100 other things after they enroll.
- What keeps faculty at the University, opined another Committee member, is PRIDE in the institution. To the extent this restructuring plan undermines faculty pride it could be in trouble.
- This process will go fast, pointed out another Committee member, and will go forward with or without the faculty governance system--so the governance system cannot permit itself to be sidetracked. The committees must get off the dime and identify those issues it wants to express an opinion on or the train will leave the station without their views. The two or three most important questions for the faculty must be identified and answered. Those questions will likely revolve around the clusters to be used in planning, around the separation of effort, and resource allocation. If the committees are unfocused, faculty may as well "turn out the lights." Moreover, the questions must developed in such a way that the administration can respond to them.
- Are the faculty willing to say the University should go after top students and give up the middle? Another Committee member responded that not every top student wants to follow a traditional academic program that does not offer preparation for employment. One tenet of this plan is that the University must pay attention to what the customer wants. The educational offerings of the University at the undergraduate level have typically been supply-side oriented--what the faculty want to teach; students then complain to the press and legislature. This plan will help respond to that problem by segmenting the market and assigning tasks--it seems a reasonable answer. Faculty will not get "beat on" to participate in the delivery of this education--or get fired if they don't, but if faculty in the traditional units do not want to teach in University College, then instructors will be hired from elsewhere.
- The Finance and Planning Committee, Professor Garrard suggested, must consider the funding of University College. If student tuition is not expected to cover its entire operating cost, and some part(s) of the University budget must be invested to make it work, Finance and Planning should explore the implications of such transfers. Mr. Pfitzenreuter

agreed, noting that much of the financial work remains to be done. It was pointed out by one Committee member, for example, that in discussions of recruiting more tuition-paying students from non-resident/non-reciprocity/international locations, it must be remembered that many of these students are attracted here for reasons of diversity--and the University often SUPPORTS them rather than obtaining additional tuition revenues.

- Another Committee member urged that while cuts, and their philosophy, need to be discussed because there has been a sense that much of the plan is geared to cutting programs. But that may not be so. There could be cuts, and their consequences, along the way, but they should not be the focus of the discussion. It was also pointed out that Michigan, in the early 1980s, decided to get smaller and better--and ended up getting better but no smaller; it raised tuition to meet the market and the state-funded portion of its budget declined to 12% (compared to 28% at Minnesota). The University does not know, another Committee member observed, how elastic its demand is.

As long as the President and Board of Regents say that tuition will be held down, observed another Committee member, quality will also be held down--that is a logical and necessary corollary.

- Nowhere in the documents, it was noted, is the link between quality and faculty salaries discussed. If one goes back to the 1970s and studies faculty salaries, it is clear what one will find: faculty, compared to other state employees, have slipped considerably compared to inflation. It has been estimated that faculty members on average each donated \$60,000 to the state because of salary increases below the rate of inflation.
- For years, said one Committee member, CEE has not granted degrees. Under this plan, it suddenly becomes a major grantor. This plan sounds in part like a new name for inloading.
- Is there a likelihood that some entire units could be transferred to University College?

Professor Rubenstein assigned to every Finance and Planning Committee member the task of reviewing the materials distributed and identifying the major issues, as they see them. Professor Garrard issued the same assignment to members of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

-- Gary Engstrand