

the Interior

* FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION
FUTURES SEMINAR

1963
25
1988

For Saginaw Valley State University employees. Published by the Office of Information Services. Call 790-4054 with news items.

August 2, 1988

FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION GATHER TO DISCUSS SVSU FUTURE

During two days -- June 3 and 4 -- in Lower Level Doan, members of the SVSU faculty, administration and Board of Control gathered to discuss the future of Saginaw Valley State University. What follows is a report, compiled by observer Marilyn Frahm, director of Information Services.

[**FORMAT:** Chaired by Mrs. Jo Saltzman, chairperson of the Board of Control. Participants included 20 members of the faculty (all members of the SVSUFA executive committee, plus others identified by President of the Association) and 20 members of the administration (all members of the Administrative Council plus others identified by President Ryder), with lists exchanged and reviewed for gaps in representation.

Four topics were agreed upon in advance by faculty and administration. Time was divided into four, three-hour sessions (two per day), with one of the four topics considered at each session.

EACH TIME BLOCK opened with a general session, at which one faculty member and one administrator presented an opinion or position statement on the current topic of discussion. Following that, discussion groups of 20 participants (10

faculty, 10 administrators) met for exchange of ideas. A facilitator and a reporter were assigned by random draw for each group from an appointed representative provided by the Association president and the University president.

Following 60 minutes of discussion in the two groups, a general session was reconvened, with summary reports from each group. Each general session concluded with open discussion.]

TOPICS:

- * Budget and Planning
- * Enrollment Management in Relation to Fiscal Resources
- * Preparation for North Central Association Focus Visit
- * Relationships between Academic Departments and the Administration

DAY 1: JUNE 3, 1988

In welcoming the group, Mrs. Saltzman reminded them the seminar's purpose was to exchange views on issues important to SVSU, and to begin preparation for the February 1990 NCA focus visit. "The futures seminar should foster better understanding of and commitment to goals of the University as approved by the Board of Control," she said.

Budget and Planning

Professor of Accounting Donald Wiseman led with a statement presenting "an alternate viewpoint on budgeting and planning at SVSU." He noted that "we can't talk about the future without talking about the past." He referred to the Institutional Self Study of 1986, Chapter 10, which he helped to prepare.

Wiseman said one step of the preparation was the conducting of a survey of faculty, administration and staff. Responses to the survey indicated most felt that budgeting was a "top down" process at SVSU; that it was authoritarian. He said the problem with that approach is that leaders need exceptional wisdom to make it work. Rather, he advocates the "funneling up" of information to the top; this will become increasingly important as we become larger.

TO DEMONSTRATE his point, Wiseman cited the denial of a market adjustment, or equity increase, to David Skinner, which resulted in losing him to another institution. Wiseman contends that a decentralized mechanism would have led to an informed decision that might have retained a talented instructor.

In conclusion, Wiseman called for three factors to become part of the budgeting and

planning process at SVSU:

1. responsibility accounting by unit
2. establishment of a budget priority review committee made up of faculty and administrators
3. initiation of an internal auditing system that would report directly to the Board of Control.

Dr. Ann K. Dickey, director of institutional research and planning, presented an opening statement for the administration team. She noted that the budgeting process had changed twice since the NCA visit in 1986. At the time of the team visit, budget planning included the entire 11-member Administrative Council. In 1986-87, the Budget Committee -- defined as a work group charged with recommending budget parameters -- was reduced to include only the chief operating officers: the vice president for administration and business affairs, the dean of student affairs and the vice president for academic affairs.

forecasts used by the committee. As work progresses, the committee discusses budget parameters with the Administrative Council and makes modifications generated in those discussions.

Dickey also discussed the evolution of the planning process, which has been in place for some eight years. She noted that during the last two years, the colleges of Science, Engineering and Technology and Business and Management have piloted an alternate process in which the dean and departments do their planning together, rather than sequentially.

Unit plans are submitted through appropriate supervisory channels and ultimately to the Planning Resource Council, which includes four faculty members, two deans, two administrators, and two students who are appointed by President Ryder from a list of volunteers.

Dickey noted that, during contract negotiations last spring, all four faculty members boycotted the joint

other Michigan universities, and particularly at the University of Michigan, where there is significant faculty involvement in budgeting. It was agreed to study patterns of participation on unionized campuses as well, since this would be likely to lead to a workable model for SVSU.

After the task force met several times, the Association placed a proposal for a budget committee on the bargaining table and withdrew faculty appointments to the task force. To resolve the issue of the budgeting process, Dickey called for re-establishment of the task force. She said agreement is achievable in a relatively short time if there are no boycotts.

Dickey said the faculty should accept the idea that a budget committee would be advisory and would make recommendations to the President, who is responsible for presenting a budget to the Board of Control. "We would regard as frankly unacceptable any assertion that a faculty/administration committee should decide budget priorities or present an alternative budget to the Board of Control ..."

She asked for assurance that faculty named to a task force or committee would be faithful about attending meetings and would demonstrate good will and balanced concern for all aspects of the institution.

DICKEY CONCLUDED with a question: "Is it better to have two advisory groups, one (the PRC) concerned with planning and a new one concerned with budgeting, or should we think about a single group that carries out both responsibilities?"

THE COLLEGES OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT HAVE PILOTED A PROCESS IN WHICH THE DEAN AND DEPARTMENTS DO THEIR PLANNING TOGETHER, RATHER THAN SEQUENTIALLY.

THE SECOND CHANGE, initiated in 1987-88, was designed to assure representation of priorities established during the planning process. To insure the link between planning and budgeting, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning was added to the committee.

Each year, Controller and Budget Director James G. Muladore prepares most of the revenue and expenditure

meeting with the Administrative Council. Also the manner of appointing PRC members was laid on the bargaining table.

AS A RESULT of a 1986 Self Study recommendation, President Ryder appointed a "Task Force to Investigate a Model for a Budget Priorities Review Committee," which included five faculty and four administrators. The group was to study how the budget process is handled at

Discussion Group Summaries

Group I: Barker, Corser, Dalgarn, Hansen, Harley, Kickham, Willertz, Decker, Ross and Weaver (faculty); Apsey, Dickey, Fallon, Muladore, Ryder, Saft, Thompson, Nelson, Kullgren and Torrez (administration); [Facilitator Fallon; Reporter Barker]

Discussion identified six themes: adversarial relationship vs. collegiality, top down nature of present budgeting process (decisions often come as announcements, or are a "total mystery"), confusion between cost and value (faculty and administration may use different words, or attach different meanings to the same words), mutual trust as a necessary foundation for effective budgeting, a difference of opinion on whether the long-range planning process is directly linked to the budgeting process, and the overall relationships between various campus constituencies.

DURING THE DISCUSSION, Kay Harley spoke from her perspective as previous chairperson of the English department. She noted that the department is relatively large and complex, with multiple responsibilities for instruction of Basic Skills and General Education courses as well as majors, minors and graduate programs, plus faculty research, scholarly work and other assignments that require release time. She said she had two concerns: her role of responding to decisions made elsewhere, and how the expertise of faculty is being received. "Long-range planning is the current process. That process is not seen as a very satisfactory method. Information from it is not properly distributed."

Group II: Castenada, Mahajerin, McNett-Fettinger, Novey, Rathkamp, Wiseman, Mondol, Bachand (a), Elashhab (a), Pelzer (a) (faculty); Barnett, Coppola, Dwyer, Fitzpatrick, Hamilton, Jones, Lange, Mitchell, Woodcock and Yien (administration) [Facilitator Mondol; Reporter Lange]

Themes identified were: support for establishing an internal auditor, building trust and recognition that the NCA report may not be directly reflective of what is going on at SVSU.

THE GROUP AGREED on the concept of adding an internal auditing function, and Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs Jerry Woodcock indicated that a process is set to add a part-time position that will move to a full-time position. The proposal will be presented to the Board of Control in the next academic year.

'OUR DIFFERENCES ARE NO GREATER THAN AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS. THERE IS MORE FREEDOM HERE THAN AT MANY INSTITUTIONS -- FREEDOM TO CRITICIZE, FREEDOM TO HAVE MEETINGS SUCH AS THIS FORUM.' -- Dr. Donald Novey

There was consensus that faculty and administration are working together to improve relationships. Improved communications will assist this effort, and Lange urged participants to communicate orally with colleagues about activities of the University, since most individuals already are confronted with more material than they can read.

NOVEY INDICATED that the NCA report may have overstated differences between faculty and administration. "Our differences are no greater than

at other institutions. There is more freedom here than at many institutions -- freedom to criticize, freedom to have meetings such as this forum. I would like to see it continue."

General Session

During the general discussion that ensued, Dr. Willertz raised the question of whether the legislature was hearing our plea for sufficient funding to support our growing enrollments. "How do we get the power to move them? How open is the legislature to what higher education has to say? We need more faculty here at SVSU. How do we get the legislature to see that that is a serious problem?"

President Ryder noted that the state has limited resources, and limited control over those resources, since some costs are federally mandated. The money for

education is the largest single block over which it has control, and there is great competition between K-12 and higher ed, as well as among individual schools.

WEAVER SAID preliminary work was necessary to establish trust between faculty and administration before efforts at participative budgeting would be effective.

Ralph Coppola pointed to the model of the athletic task force as an example that groups composed of faculty, staff and other representa-

tion could work well together and perform valuable services.

Kay Harley said we often have no knowledge of what the budget implications are for the priorities set forth by the planning process. "What is being sacrificed to make that a priority? (for example) The budget implications of release time are not made part of the decision process." Harley added, "We need to be clear that if faculty and administration efforts are going into this seminar, it must be important."

Enrollment Management in Relation to Fiscal Resources

Dick Thompson's opening statement summarized the background of the enrollment control committee, presented the complex issues of enrollment management, explored future enrollment trends, and offered the administration's point of view and recommendations.

funding; Basic Skills (committee recommended that SVSU continue to make such remediation available); attrition/retention; minority access; and admission standards.

THOMPSON DISCUSSED the process whereby the Enrollment Control Study Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the President, who reviewed his recommendations with the Administrative Council and forwarded them to the Academic Policies Review Committee. The APRC proposed revised admissions standards and presented them to the faculty for adoption. They were not approved.

He presented a chart showing that the revised admission standards would have denied admission to only 22 of the 647 students admitted fall 1987.

Thompson presented data showing there is likely to be

John Willertz distributed a sheet of faculty questions in response to the administration background paper on "Enrollment Management in Relation to Fiscal Resources." He asked that discussion groups examine the issues raised by the questions.

Group I: Castenada, Elashhab, Mahajerin, McNett-Fettinger, Mondol, Novey, Rathkamp, Bachand (a), Pelzer (a), Wiseman (faculty); Apsey, Dickey, Dwyer, Fallon, Fitzpatrick, Kullgren, Lange, Nelson, Saft and Yien (administration) [Facilitator Mondol; Reporter Nelson]

NELSON INDICATED, "We very much agreed that the issue of enrollment management is one everyone is interested in." He listed eight related issues discussed:

1. Attempt to raise admissions standards while retaining flexibility.
2. Consider enrollment relative to needed support services.
3. Examine enrollment changes in specific programs.
4. **INFORMATION** should be distributed on undergraduate admission requirements and procedures. People do not know what our requirements are, nor how they are administered.
5. Explore how we can best attract a wide variety of students.
6. Recommend utilizing our alumni to assist in attracting quality students.
7. Articulate our Special Admit program.
8. Use financial aid/scholar-

'WE NEED TO BE CLEAR THAT IF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION EFFORTS ARE GOING INTO THIS SEMINAR, IT MUST BE IMPORTANT.'

-- Dr. Kay Harley

He pointed out that the state level of funding has dropped from 73.5% of our total budget in 1973-74 to a low of 60% in 1983-84 and currently is 65.8% of the total budget. Our growth has outstripped our state support.

THE ENROLLMENT CONTROL Study Committee was appointed in October 1985 and concluded its report in December 1986. Its study uncovered numerous complex issues surrounding enrollment management: improving the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty; the unevenness of the growth rate across departments; enrollment growth related to building

a decline in future enrollments, since there is a decrease of some 25% in the number of students in junior high school in the 12 counties that account for most of our enrollment. Also, as our graduating classes grow larger through greater retention, and freshman classes are smaller through enrollment limitation, we eventually will become smaller.

THOMPSON CONCLUDED by saying he endorsed the revised admission standards proposed by APRC and will resubmit them to the Curriculum Committee next year.

ships as recruiting tools to attract well qualified students.

Group II: Barker, Corser, Dalgarn, Decker, Harley, Hansen, Ross, Willertz, Kickham (a), Weaver (a) (faculty); Barnett, Coppola, Hamilton, Jones, Mitchell, Muladore, Thompson, Torrez and Woodcock (administration) [Facilitator Coppola; Reporter Barker]

Group II expressed concern about the fact that some departments, notably English, are involved in nearly every program that students must pass through. Therefore, changes in enrollment become a crucial factor in their planning.

MINORITY ENROLLMENTS -- the group recognized that many minority students need more help in being able to pursue their education. There are several new programs at SVSU that attempt to offer this help early in the student's academic career.

The group discussed the relationship of education programs at community colleges such as Delta College with those at SVSU. Should all remediation be done at community colleges with open enrollment? Can they and will they provide the same level of help that would be given through SVSU's Basic Skills program?

The central issue is that of balancing quantity with quality -- dollars and students in relationship to resources needed for a quality education. "We need to determine how to maintain both of those (quality and quantity) in reasonable amounts."

In open discussion, Doug Hansen pointed out that

quality may rise even without a change at the university level. He noted the more stringent requirements for athletes imposed by both NCAA and NAIA. He noted that the first high school seniors to be covered by new and more stringent state standards will graduate from Michigan high schools in June 1989. We should note an improvement in their preparation for college, Hansen said.

SEVERAL PARTICIPANTS expressed concern about the public relations impact if we have to limit enrollment, or if we adopt higher admission standards and later wish to lower them if enrollments decline.

Board member Charles Curtiss asked why neither group talked about pricing as a method of enrollment limitation.

'WE NEED TO DETERMINE HOW TO MAINTAIN BOTH OF THOSE (QUALITY AND QUANTITY) IN REASONABLE AMOUNTS.'

-- Dr. David Barker

There was discussion as to whether or not SVSU has significant unused capacity. Dr. Barnett contends that we do not, since many of our required General Education classes are filled to capacity.

AS AN INDICATION of the difficulty of predicting and managing enrollments, Jim Dwyer noted that statewide distribution of 10,000 new admission applications resulted in actual enrollment of only 50 students.

DAY 2: JUNE 4, 1988

Preparation for North Central Association Focus Visit
Administration View: Dr.

Robert S.P. Yien, presenter

Dr. Yien called attention to the first two paragraphs of the administration background paper, stating that SVSU is scheduled for an evaluation focused on the relationship that exists between the Faculty Association and the administration. The dates are Feb. 12 and 13, 1990. A steering committee of faculty and administrative members will be formed in the winter of 1989 to prepare a report, which will be forwarded to the NCA by Dec. 1, 1989. The report will include issues surrounding the relationship and steps both groups take to improve the relationship.

YIEN NOTED that six to 10 months are usually needed to prepare for a focus visit. He also reviewed the history of accreditation at SVSU, noting that the University had

received five-year accreditations on three occasions: 1969-70, 1974-75 and 1979-80. The visit originally scheduled for March 1986 was delayed until November 1986 because of a job action taken during faculty contract negotiations. Further, Yien noted that concerns and complaints expressed during the November visit led to the call for the focus visit in 1989-90.

WHILE YIEN does not want the campus community to hide problems, he urged faculty and administrators to work together in the best interests of the University. "We have many positive things here," he said.

Faculty view: Dr. John Willertz,

Willertz told the group that in his opinion the five-member NCA team, which included four administrators and one faculty member, submitted a report that contained a "lot of anti-union bias." He responded to language in the report point by point.

On 'adversarial' relationship between administration and faculty: this is evidence of biased language. Further, Willertz said he did not know what the team meant by 'mistrust' and he felt that evidence does not support the charge that each side moves in a 'calculated' fashion.

WILLERTZ SAID the Association does talk with the administration and wants communication back. He said the NCA team seemed to see three groups on campus: the administration, the faculty, and a third group -- the Association -- which destroys collegiality. He feels this is a mistaken view.

have we travelled so far in 15 short months?"

Discussion Group Summaries

Group I: Bachand, Castenada, Elashhab, Mahajerin, McNett-Fettinger, Mondol, Novey, Pelzer, Rathkamp and Wiseman (faculty); Dickey, Hamilton, Jones, Kullgren, Lange, Mitchell, Torrez and Yien (administration); [Facilitator Hamilton; Reporter Mondol]

SOME PARTICIPANTS felt the NCA report was highly biased against the Faculty Association; others felt this was not so. Novey said collective bargaining is not necessarily adversarial, but rather can be a problem resolution technique. He said there is a great deal of academic freedom at SVSU.

Wiseman supported this view. "We have a jewel here in the Faculty Association. Our academic freedom is assured. We have something that is very, very precious."

possible definition of 'mistrust' a lack of confidence in the adequate leadership of administration.

IN SUMMARY, THE group felt that a great deal of progress has been made, and that we must continue to work effectively before the focus visit of 1990.

Group II: Barker, Corser, Decker, Harley, Weaver and Willertz (faculty); Apsey, Barnett, Dwyer, Fallon, Fitzpatrick, Nelson, Ryder, Saft, Thompson and Woodcock (administration) [Facilitator Barker; Reporter Fitzpatrick]

President Ryder said that while we do not agree with all items presented in the NCA report, we all have to respond to them in the focus visit. Fallon said his perception as a relative newcomer to SVSU was that we have a definite identity crisis; an inferiority complex. "We don't talk enough about our strengths." He said we are changing as we develop, and we have a lot more changes coming.

'WE HAVE A JEWEL HERE IN THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION. OUR ACADEMIC FREEDOM IS ASSURED.'

-- Dr. Donald Wiseman

In regard to planning and budgeting, Willertz said, "My guess is that we are on the way to solving this problem." Similarly, he said both faculty and administration are working to address the issue of enrollment management and resource availability.

In summary, he said the NCA team identified nine issues. "Six of the nine serious problems are either resolved or are being resolved." He said the report exaggerated the problems. "Why then (if the differences are so acute)

Participants agreed that Willertz's assessment of achievements (in resolving problems) was accurate. Yien noted that events were the same, but perceptions of them were different because our roles are different.

Kullgren said there are peaks and valleys in the faculty/administration relationship that are linked to negotiations. "Perhaps we should do something to reduce tension and even the flow."

Castenada offered as a

While some members urged separating personalities from issues, Weaver said we must keep issues and personalities going in a parallel direction to accomplish change. Thompson commented on the positive effects of this meeting and said he felt more openness of communication than he had witnessed for some time.

WEAVER SAID THE job action (committee boycotts) that occurred during the last negotiations was a "unique event." "We had a more honest (NCA) report as a result of it. We broke tradition; we changed the way things were done. This meeting is proof positive of that. The NCA

team heard conflict; they did not hear what was really going on. Differences exist; we should learn to face them and utilize them for the collective best interest of SVSU."

DURING THE GENERAL discussion session, Wiseman said "There are profound questions about how we make decisions at the University. Decentralization is needed. How large do we have to become before we decentralize decision making?"

Corser raised the question of whether administrators, as well as faculty, are overloaded and therefore unable to perform as well as they would like.

Elashhab suggested that it might be desirable to reconvene members of the bargaining team in a special session to 'bring closure' to the hurts of the last negotiating session. He said the healing that usually follows agreement on a new contract seems not to have occurred this time. "If Larry Fitzpatrick were there, things would have been better."

Relationships between Academic Departments and the Administration

Faculty view: Don Novey, presenter

Novey cited two passages from the faculty background paper: "The Contract is predicated on the departments as a whole having substantial autonomy, rights and responsibilities, with the department chairs as their representatives for certain functions" and "More than anyone else, department members know their subject, classrooms and students." He said conflict is "likely to arise between this position and the traditional administration position."

Novey urged greater reliance on consensus in decision making. He said most faculty want department chairs to be elected by department members, not appointed by the administration.

Administration view: Dr. Barnett, presenter

THE TOPIC OF departmental/administration relationships is tied more closely to negotiations and the contract, and the futures seminar agreement was not to talk about contract issues. Barnett expressed the view that the growth of the institution called for change from past practices regarding election of department chairs and handling of departmental duties. "The administration would like to see the department as a viable unit with more authority and more responsibility," he said.

of accountability -- in the absence of defined authority, how can SVSU hold departments accountable for decisions?

Barnett pointed to problems of disciplining or removing department chairs who do not adequately perform their duties. Elashhab said that having trouble with certain departments does not mean that the model has failed, since it works very well for most departments.

BACHAND ASKED whether the current contract carries language to cover removal of department chairs, and Fitzpatrick informed him that it did, although the process is cumbersome.

Group II: Barker, Corser, Decker, Harley, Weaver and Willertz (faculty); Dickey, Hamilton, Kullgren, Lange, Nelson, Ryder, Saft and

'DIFFERENCES EXIST; WE SHOULD LEARN TO FACE THEM AND UTILIZE THEM FOR THE COLLECTIVE BEST INTEREST OF SVSU.'

-- Dr. David Weaver

Group I: Bachand, Castenada, Elashhab, Mahajerin, McNett-Fettinger, Novey, Pelzer and Wiseman (faculty); Apsey, Barnett, Dwyer, Fitzpatrick, Fallon, Jones, Mitchell, Torrez, Woodcock and Yien (administration) [Facilitator Bachand; Reporter Jones]

THERE WAS DIVISION of opinion on the future role of department chairs. The faculty generally is not interested in seeing the department chairs have a great deal of authority; however, the administration feels that department chairs should have authority and should be accountable. There is a question regarding the idea

Thompson (administration) [Facilitator Hamilton; Reporter Decker]

THE GROUP DISCUSSED the differences between the concept of an elected, collegial coordinator and an appointed authoritarian, administrative department chair. Perhaps there could be a compromise or combination of the two positions. The group raised questions about the mechanism for reporting, questions about the power assigned to department chairs, questions about how chairs of large departments can handle their responsibilities, and related issues of release time,

compensation and support for department chairs.

Questions were raised about how departments and department chairs compete for resources, how they are recognized for performing well, or sanctioned for performing poorly. The group noted that the topic relates to the topic of balancing enrollment growth with resources.

WEAVER AND WILLERTZ commented that it was not clear how departments should secure resources to make their departments viable. While they might know what was needed to run a department well, there were no apparent rules or guidelines for achieving the means to make changes. Departments that performed poorly seemed to receive incremental increases on the same basis as those who performed well. "The rules need to be creatively redefined," Weaver said.

discussion of the remedies available to discipline poor performance by department chairs. "The SVSU contract has two provisions: one to teach at SVSU and also to be a member of a department. Duties are defined," Willertz said.

HARLEY DESCRIBED the frustrations felt by those who had chaired the English department. She said more time should be available to develop policies and engage in planning important to the department, and routine duties should be delegated to clerical support staff. Recognition should be accorded to the faculty expertise that exists in departments. She also raised a question: "What can department chairs do when administration is not accountable to them?"

It was generally agreed that the futures seminar had been

IN PARTICULAR, the group recommended further study of the role of departmental relationships to the administrative structure, with attention to providing a sufficient level of support for the system to function effectively. Levels of control (authority) and accountability (responsibility) ought to be defined by mutual consent.

'THE SVSU CONTRACT HAS TWO PROVISIONS: ONE TO TEACH AT SVSU AND ALSO TO BE A MEMBER OF A DEPARTMENT. DUTIES ARE DEFINED.'

-- Dr. John Willertz

Lange said that problems at the departmental level affect what goes on in the classroom. She called for more exchange of ideas. "We all benefit from sharing successful procedures."

IN THE CONCLUDING general session, there was further

productive; that open communication had occurred and progress was made toward solving problems or establishing a framework within which they could be solved.

Many participants felt additional seminars would be helpful.