

OCTOBER 4, 1993

The first meeting of the University Senate for 1993-94 was convened in the Hubert H. Humphrey Center Atrium, Minneapolis campus, on Monday, October 4, 1993, at 4:00 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 58 voting faculty/academic professional members, 41 voting student members, 5 ex officio members, and approximately 250 nonmembers. Ms. Sandy Pham, Vice Chair of the Senate presided.

### I. STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

Honorable Regents, Distinguished Fellow Faculty and Staff Members of the University, Students, Friends, and Colleagues on All of Our Campuses, Alumni, and Supporters of the University ...

#### INTRODUCTION

We are only eight years away from a new millennium and the arithmetic of our calendar does seem to influence our thinking; we are facing momentous changes in our society and our world; and, the changes we face, the challenges we face, have a millennial touch not only by their magnitude but also in a sense by combining the threat of disaster with the hope of a new and better order of things.

Please bear with me for a moment, if I hark back a thousand years – to the 990s. Please bear with me if I quote very briefly from an Icelandic poem of that era, a poem that expresses the fear of disaster and the hope of a better world to come.

The poem, The Völuspá ("The Vision of the Prophetess"), actually describes the entire history of the world. I shall not! I will simply invoke some of the metaphors of great literature in the hope of inspiring our own modest efforts to deal with the fears and hopes of the end of a millennium – and the beginning of a new one.

On fear:

Sól tér sortna  
sígr fold í mar ...

I will refrain from further use of Icelandic. In my translation:

Black turns the sun,  
earth sinks in the sea,  
from heaven fall  
the stars aflame ...

The breakdown of the moral order, according to the poem, destroys the physical, biological, and social foundations of life itself.

But millennial fears do not prevail.

Rising [the prophetess] sees  
a second time  
earth from ocean  
evergreen ...  
A hall she sees  
fair as the sun,  
covered with gold,  
at Gimle;  
there the faithful  
fighters dwell  
and bliss eternal  
all enjoy.

And, now, after this flight of fancy, to the state of the University in the late 1990s.

### **A STRONG UNIVERSITY AT A CRITICAL JUNCTURE**

The State of the University of Minnesota is that of a strong and productive institution, one in which we can – and should – all take great pride. Top-ranked academic departments; nationally recognized faculty and students; very high rankings in sponsored research, patents, and private fund raising. We have the basic ingredients of a world-class university. But, like so many institutions in our society, the University is at a critical juncture this fall for two reasons:

First, we are under intense scrutiny and pressure from society and morale is low.

Second, we are at a point of decision in planning for the University's future development.

Today I will discuss with you

- our situation with regard to public support and our finances
- I will review very briefly what we have done over the last few years; and
- I will lay out my vision for the University for the next several years – even somewhat ambitiously the next millennium.

### **PRESSURE AND MORALE**

With regard to the problem of pressure and morale, I am concerned about both faculty and staff, of all ranks and responsibilities. But, right now I am particularly concerned about the faculty, because for the next decade the faculty will be the most critical pressure point of the University. We are entering a period in which there will be a wave of retirements, as a result of which our faculty will need to renew itself. Yet it is hard to think creatively of renewal when one is enduring repeated pay freezes and a barrage of criticism.

You and I are doing what we do at the University because of our desire to accomplish something of worth. But when that is continually called into question, sometimes in uncharitable ways, it can be hard to carry on. You must remember, though, that there continues to be broad support among the people of this state for what you are doing. In recent surveys, 83 percent of Minnesotans reported that they had a favorable view of the University as an educational institution and 99 percent considered the research function of the University important. (It was a bit humbling to find that only 29 percent could name the President.)

To a large extent, our recent public travail comes from the inevitable costs of opening up and becoming a university that is totally open to public scrutiny. I came to this office pledged to open things up. I have done so and I will continue to do so. Public scrutiny is good, and it helps us to be a better university. But at least in the short run, this process carries real costs. Some of these are financial – the costs of new auditing machinery, new budgeting procedures, and so on. Others are psychological; as we identify our problems and set about dealing with them, one news story after another pops up.

### **THE NATURE OF OUR PROBLEMS?**

The University of Minnesota has been faced with a management revolution in the past few years, a revolution:

- in financial management, introducing a better system to handle a \$1.8 billion annual budget where now only 28 percent comes from the State;
- in physical facilities, an area in deep trouble five years ago;
- in research oversight, including complicated – but potentially very productive – public-private partnerships; and
- in the health sciences, where enormous changes at the national and local levels present great challenges to our outstanding programs of research and teaching, and especially to the clinical activities that are necessary to support our research and teaching.

Most troubling have been the cases of malfeasance and research fraud that have been uncovered – very few in number, but casting a pall on the 99.9 percent of our faculty and staff who are honest and dedicated stewards of our research,

teaching, and outreach.

Let there be no mistake about our position on accountability. Two central principles must and will determine our response to problems:

First, we must properly use and fully account for all funds and property entrusted to us.

Second, we have an absolute duty to be scrupulously honest in our scholarship; without this a university is nothing, and we can tolerate nothing less.

These two principles have guided and will continue to guide all of my decisions as some troubling cases have unfolded.

Morale has also been hit hard by our financial situation. Over just three years the state's cuts and losses to inflation have reduced the University's funding by \$59 million. With only \$7.5 million made up from tuition income, our net loss has been \$51.5 million. We have had two pay freezes in three years, and in four of the last five years our faculty salaries have fallen relative to the other Big Ten schools. This will not allow us to maintain the kind of faculty we need, and it cannot continue if the state wants to have a first-rate University.

Whatever we can do for ourselves we will do. We have already done some significant bootstrapping. We can and will operate even more efficiently. And as needed, we will cut some programs and services in order to do the remaining things well.

But we must make unmistakably clear to the state the consequences of budgetary decisions. We need to enter into a new contract with the state, one which lays out exactly what outcomes we can provide for what investment. The people of Minnesota have a right to expect – demand – clear outcomes from us, and eagerness on our part in meeting their needs. But without the investment, the outcomes cannot follow.

#### **THE AGENDA OF THE PAST FOUR-AND-A-HALF YEARS**

As I said, we stand at a point of decision in our development as a University. When I came back to the University four-and-a-half years ago it seemed to me that we had to deal with four big problems:

We had to reestablish the state's trust in the University by opening it up and making it accountable.

We had to reform the management of the University.

We had to improve the undergraduate experience at the University.

And, we had to stem the slow decline of quality in our academic programs.

I have already commented on accountability and management. We have certainly been working hard on opening up and becoming more accountable, and we have taken and are taking a number of steps to improve the management of the University. I also must note some of the things we have done to address the other two problems: the undergraduate experience and academic quality.

#### **THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE**

We have moved with some success to improve the undergraduate experience.

- Seventy-five percent of freshmen now meet all of our increased preparation requirements, compared to 17 percent in 1986.
- Our average class size has come down 26 percent over that time, and additional class sections have solved much of our old problem of inaccessible required courses.
- The ratio of lower division students to CLA advisors has been cut in half.
- The liberal education curriculum on the Twin Cities campus has been thoroughly revised, and similar curricular reforms have been carried out on the other campuses.

° The Crookston campus reorganized its entire program from two-year degrees to four-year, polytechnic degrees.

And these are only a few high points. Much remains to be done, of course, and I will speak to that in a moment.

## **ACADEMIC QUALITY**

With regard to the slide in the academic quality of programs, we have been less successful. I do not mean that we have clear evidence of further decline over the last few years – because of lags, evidence one way or the other on this will not be in for some years. I am referring instead to our *Restructuring and Reallocation Plan of 1991*. It is addressed largely to the problem of program quality.

The plan is on schedule. We are reallocating \$58 million – 13 percent of our State-appropriated dollars – across the University, with funds going to CLA, IT, and selected professional programs on the Twin Cities campus, to Duluth, and to Morris – and to system-wide initiatives such as diversity, research development, and outreach. We are at the mid-point – and ahead of schedule – of these reallocations.

However, the reallocation has been swamped in its effects by the State's budget cuts.

Remember, I said earlier that our loss in state funds had been \$59 million over just three years. Our reallocation did protect recipients of reallocated funds from the deeper cuts experienced by the rest of the University, but it could not provide the kind of program enrichment and support we had intended.

## **UNIVERSITY 2000: THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

Where should we head now?

The University of Minnesota of the 21st Century must be a leading, global academic institution with research and graduate, professional, and undergraduate teaching second to none.

And, the University of Minnesota of the 21st Century must be a university in the community, sharing its intellectual resources with the citizens of the State through a pervasive outreach philosophy and effective outreach activities.

This vision of the University encompasses multiple campuses each with a strong, unique mission:

Duluth will continue to develop as a major provider of undergraduate and selected graduate education and research for the northeastern region, but increasingly for the state as a whole.

Morris will continue to develop as a very distinctive, public, small liberal arts college – something some other states have tried to achieve but never with our kind of success.

Crookston will develop its new unique residential, career-oriented program – a new contribution to Minnesota higher education.

The Rochester University Center will continue to grow as a cooperative venture of the University of Minnesota, Winona State University, and Rochester Community College.

The Twin Cities campus will continue to develop as our land-grant research university.

Each campus must continue to develop its own plan as we work into the 1990s – and much planning has already been done or is vigorously under way; some plans are already being implemented. In clusters of disciplines and professions, we are setting academic priorities and exploring financial strategies to focus our efforts.

Taken together those plans will define *University 2000: The University of Minnesota for the 21st Century*. This is not a university that focuses just on research, or just on graduate and professional education, or just on undergraduate education, or just on outreach. It is a university that combines all these responsibilities in the right proportions, and with strong focusing within each mission.

Today I want to go into particular detail about my vision for the Twin Cities campus, and my plan for its development.

### **A VISION OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS**

My vision of the Twin Cities campus is, first – and unambiguously, and unabashedly – a leading, global, research university.

This means that it emphasizes, and excels, at research, scholarship, and artistic activity – discovery, analysis, understanding . . . the creation of knowledge and know how, the development of intellectual resources for the state, nation, and world.

It means that it provides world-class graduate and professional education, including educating many of the future faculty members of other public and private colleges and universities in Minnesota, and expertise and professionals in a variety of fields.

And it means that it provides instruction of undergraduates who are sufficiently prepared and focused in their aspirations that they can benefit from the resources of a research University.

But, the Twin Cities campus is also a research university with a distinctive land-grant mission that not all research universities have.

We are a land-grant research university.

### **THE LAND-GRANT RESEARCH UNIVERSITY**

This is a unique American invention. In other countries, research is usually isolated from general education in academies or graduate universities. America developed a new kind of university, the research university, in which research and graduate training are combined with, and feed, the education of undergraduates who can particularly benefit from work with the originators of knowledge.

And some, but not all, American research universities go a step further. Through the Extension Service and other means of knowledge transfer, they provide for the sharing of the results of research with society as an integral part of their mission. They share knowledge and know how with families, farmers, business people, professionals, other educational institutions, yes, with people in every county of their states.

These are the land-grant research universities. They are a wonderful American invention. Right now universities all over America are scrambling to act like land-grant research universities, but we are in the fortunate position of only having to refine our land-grant mission, not invent it. We have it. We must cherish it, and hone it – and bear it as a badge of honor!

We are a land-grant research university!

The term "research university" gives some people trouble. Let me state what it means in our vision statement.

It means a university where research, scholarship, and artistic activity conducted by the faculty create special intellectual resources for society which in turn provide opportunities for graduate and professional education and a special kind of undergraduate education of very high quality.

I said we need to refine our mission. What most needs refining right now? What are the problems that require fixing? Why are we working so hard at planning?

### **THREE PROBLEMS ON THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS**

I am particularly concerned about three problems on the Twin Cities campus:

First, the continued problem of building and maintaining quality in our academic programs, both research and teaching.

Second, the continued problem of providing an outstanding educational experience for our students, especially our undergraduates; not just excellent content but a strongly supportive environment, and services geared to the needs of students with very different needs.

Third, the need for the University of Minnesota to use its unique resources to provide a new form of applied, directly employment-related education.

If we tried to address these three problems within our current organizational structure, we would just diffuse our strength. Frankly, over the past few decades we have asked our units to be all things to all people, and that has satisfied neither us, nor the people we were trying to serve. We have urged departments to adopt practitioner master's programs, to increase their public service, to give more individualized attention to students, and to maintain or enhance research and graduate education, all at a time when we have been cutting back faculty and staff.

We have run large-scale continuing education programs with many good intentions and many achievements, but also as a somewhat off-hand reflection of our regular curriculum. This has been a missed opportunity! It is time we get really serious about these tasks. It is part of our being a land-grant university.

But, we cannot do this as long as those tasks are all mixed together and thrust on understaffed departments.

To this end, I am proposing a reorganization designed to serve each type of student in ways that are suited to that student's needs. The driving concern behind this proposal is to make it possible for our students to succeed. Since we do serve, and must serve, students with different needs, it simply follows that we must have different types of services.

Before outlining the proposed reorganization, I must say a few words about our students, and who they should be in the future.

#### **MISSION DIFFERENTIATION AND OUR STUDENTS**

I firmly believe that educational opportunity is a birthright for all Minnesotans. I subscribe to Jefferson's statement:

"I know of no safe repository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

The land-grant university embodies that belief. But, both philosophically and as a practical matter, this does not mean admission to just any educational institution or any field regardless of talent and preparation. Continued opportunity has to be earned.

It is one of the glorious contributions of our land-grant universities that across socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, geographical, and other barriers students are given the opportunity to earn continued opportunity, to develop their special talents and serve society with their special talents.

Minnesota is blessed with many institutions of higher education, institutions with different missions, of different size and location, public and private. We must recognize this, and take advantage of it. This is not elitism; it is good old Minnesota pragmatism..

The Minnesota Legislature has recognized this. The Higher Education Bill of 1991 states very clearly that:

"The legislature recognizes each public post-secondary system to have a distinctive mission within the overall provision of public higher education in the state and a responsibility to cooperate with the other systems . . . . The University of Minnesota shall offer undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction through the doctoral degree, and shall be the primary state supported academic agency for research and extension services."

Thus, the University of Minnesota in the Twin Cities should not try to serve all students. This campus must, of course, share responsibility with our other campuses, each of which has a statewide role in serving students. We must share responsibility with an expanded Metro State University that will help serve the increasing numbers of high school graduates in the Metro area in the coming decade. We must share responsibility with other public and private institutions.

So, who should be served by the Twin Cities Campus?

I've already said that the Twin Cities undergraduates should be students who are "sufficiently prepared and focused in their aspirations that they can benefit from the resources of a research university." We should admit in each program as many undergraduates of this type as we are capable of offering a quality education, given the resources appropriated for that purpose by the state.

What does this mean?

At this time – exclusive of General College – 98 percent of the Twin Cities undergraduates come from the top half of their high school graduating classes; 69 percent come from the top quarter. This pattern has existed for the last half century. The Twin Cities Campus has not had open admission for a very long time, perhaps never!

If we follow what I just said – and high school rank is the best simple predictor of college success we have – the percentage from the top quarter might increase from 69 percent to something like 80 percent. But, we would still – we must – use the best possible ways to assess who is willing and prepared to be an undergraduate student at the University, given the special demands and opportunities of such an education. We must ensure that students from all socio-economic and racial and ethnic backgrounds, of both genders, with an appropriate geographical distribution, that students from all such different backgrounds have the opportunity to be admitted to and to graduate from the University of Minnesota. Fairness demands it; the law requires it; the land-grant mission was designed to achieve it!

And now to the proposed reorganization.

#### **REORGANIZATION: A NEW DELIVERY SYSTEM**

In order to serve students with different needs – undergraduate students the Twin Cities campus should serve – in order to serve students with different needs I have proposed a reorganization. It is an idea, a concept, to be tested and, I hope, developed in the strategic planning process. It is designed to achieve a better experience for all undergraduate students served by the Twin Cities campus.

We should – with apologies for larceny to the existing unit with this name – we should establish an entity called "University College."

This college would provide a new educational delivery system, a new service system for students who should have access to the University's programs and courses but who have special needs.

The specifics need much further work, but the general idea is that this college might serve:

- Students with heavy work schedules off campus, or heavy family responsibilities, which make it impossible for a student to attend a degree program in the regular day-time pattern.
- Students who need access through distance learning from other geographical locations.
- Students who need to regroup, to refresh or supplement their high school background before they enter into the regular undergraduate program.

This college might also serve – and this is where I'm proposing a new type of academic programs:

- Students who need access to special applied, directly employment-related degree programs in areas where the University has unique resources; these programs range from the new Twin Cities Educational Partnership bachelor's programs to be offered in cooperation with the Community and Technical Colleges to practitioner-oriented master's programs.

And finally, the college might serve:

° Students who need access to a variety of non-degree programs, certificate programs, diploma programs, work shops, job-retraining programs, etc., again in areas where the University has unique resources.

The purpose is to provide access to the University's educational resources, not to offer less demanding versions of regular degrees.

This new delivery system, service system, would provide new logistical support in making educational programs available to the student; it would be student-friendly. It would supplement what the regular day-time campus can provide – which must also be made more student friendly. It would draw on the teaching of the regular academic departments, their faculties, in ways that would serve the students well without overloading the academic departments with logistical detail.

We expect the enrollment of the Twin Cities campus to remain approximately stable, with some reduction in enrollments in CLA (where our staff-student ratios are at their worst) balanced by some expansion of University College enrollments over what we now have in the continuing education program. To help meet the metropolitan area's instructional needs, and to give metropolitan area students more options, we must support some expansion of Metropolitan State University, and will act as good-faith partners in the development of its programs.

This proposal addresses the lack of focus of the Twin Cities Campus, and diffusion of resources, somewhat differently than "*Commitment to Focus*." *Commitment to Focus* was seen by many people, wrongly, as a move to concentrate on our research-graduate-professional mission while cavalierly discarding the other parts of our historic mission. In what I propose, we will focus our missions in research and in graduate and professional education, but we will also focus our mission in undergraduate education of a special kind, serving our students in ways that are appropriate to their needs.

This is the way to be a land-grant, research university for the 21st Century, a leading, global academic institution and a university in the community.

#### **IDEAS AND CONCEPTS TO BE TESTED**

In developing these ideas and concepts, I have tried to listen carefully to those we serve and have analyzed demographic, economic, social, and cultural trends.

We are now in the midst of a heavy schedule of consultation on these ideas and concepts with faculty, staff, students, and alumni, and in conversations with many stakeholders. I invite you in particular, you the audiences on all of our campuses, to enter into vigorous discussion during the fall. I was in Crookston September 30, and will be in Duluth October 14, and in Morris, November 16; there will be several forums on the Twin Cities campus. There will also be other opportunities for you to participate.

And, when December of this year rolls around, I hope that we can – as a united University community – stand together and say:

This is our vision, these are our ideas. We intend to make sure that each of our campuses competes for best campus of its kind anywhere.

And when the fall of 1994 rolls around, I hope that we can – with the same unanimity – present to the Governor, the Legislature, and the citizens of the State a comprehensive plan for the University of Minnesota of the future.

The year 2000 is important, perhaps not as a change from the 2nd to the 3rd millennium but certainly as the 150th year of the University of Minnesota. It is our obligation and privilege to see to it that after 150 productive years the sesquicentennial still remains strong and vigorous.

Let's join in that task!

Thank you.

**NILS HASSELMO  
PRESIDENT**

**DISCUSSION:**

Following the address, Senators and members of the University community had an opportunity to pose questions to President Hasselmo.

**Question:** How do you (President Hasselmo) envision the Crookston campus in relation to the new University College?

**Response:** The components of the Twin Cities Educational Partnerships are similar in their intent to the programs at Crookston. One difference will be that in the Twin Cities the University will provide only the upper division component of those programs in areas where it has the unique resources not available in other systems.

**Question:** What will be the impact on the quality of the student population of the coordinate campuses if the Twin Cities campus is successful in recruiting undergraduates who rank in the top 25 percent of their high school class?

**Response:** As there is now, there will be competition among the campuses for students. However, it should be a healthy competition and the University must ensure that in resource distribution, equal opportunity is given to each campus to develop its unique profile. The richness of the system is that it provides alternatives for students and it is important for all the campuses to coordinate their recruitment efforts and take a pro-active position in seeking out students.

**Question:** How does Morris, a high ranking undergraduate liberal arts college, fit into the proposed plans?

**Response:** The Morris campus has done an outstanding job and should serve as a role model for the other campuses.

**Question:** What will the access be to the research university for those adult, parttime, and non-traditional students who are qualified to study at the highest levels this University has to offer?

**Response:** The intention of University College is to give students who have those needs access to University programs in a way that is feasible for them. The University will not be offering second versions of regular degrees (e.g. there will not be two English degrees). Only one degree in each field will be offered with access through two different modes. It will be important to sort out how many students can be served in each of those modes.

**Question:** A question concerning graduate education at Duluth was raised (the question was not audible on the recording).

**Response:** Priorities must be set within the total framework of graduate education at the University. It has been decided that selected graduate opportunities should be made available at UMD and there are some intriguing possibilities to develop access to graduate education, perhaps in cooperation with units on the Twin Cities campus.

**Question:** A question relating to possible stigmas associated with University College was asked (the question was not audible on the recording).

**Response:** It is important to remember that the degree will be a University of Minnesota degree with quality control in University College being handled by the same faculty members as in the research

university. It is anticipated that in the educational partnerships some faculty members from the University will structure the programs and maintain quality control.

**Question:** Is the current level of Student Support Services sufficient to meet the needs of U2000 and if not, how will additional staff be funded?

**Response:** The student services the University has at this time are not adequate to the task. A fundamental part of strategic planning is going to be the development of a viable financial plan for what the University needs to achieve. The University must aggressively show the State of Minnesota what the return is on the investment of State dollars in the University.

In conclusion, President Hasselmo said U2000 has been placed before the University community as a set of ideas and concepts. The University must be aggressive in setting priorities, restructuring, and being cost-effective in what it does. He then invited and encouraged all members of the University community to participate actively in the debate and then to go forward together in a united front.

## **II. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**MARTHA KVANBECK  
ABSTRACTOR**