

# UC Office of the President

## Working with University Constituencies, Within and Without

### Title

Faculty Conference [Open Forum with President Gardner], University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/840324sp>

### Author

Gardner, David P.

### Publication Date

1978-10-01

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

February 14, 1979

TO: University faculty,  
administrators and  
ASUU officers

FROM: Ad Hoc Faculty Conference Committee

SUBJECT: Autumn 1978 Faculty Conference

During Fall Quarter 1978, a faculty conference was convened to discuss matters related to the future of the University of Utah. A brief listing of materials presented at this conference is attached along with a transcript of an informal, spontaneous "open forum" question and answer session with faculty and President Gardner.

This is an internal document furnished for your information. Additional information concerning the conference, including a complete set of papers presented, is available in each dean's office. If you have further questions or suggestions concerning this or future conferences, members of the ad hoc faculty conference committee (listed on the first page of the attached material) or Tony Morgan (ext. 5482) would appreciate hearing from you.

"THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH IN THE 1980s"

Summary Report

of the

FACULTY CONFERENCE

October 27 and 28, 1978

Following six months of preparation by an 11-member planning committee, (\*) a concentrated two-day faculty conference was held at Snowbird. Conference participants were 90 faculty members, selected largely at random from all colleges and ranks, and 11 administrative representatives. The purpose of the conference, as defined in President Gardner's invitation was "to involve faculty in important planning and policy discussions concerning the University's future."

Conference chairman James Gardner stated in his opening remarks: "This conference at once results from and symbolizes the peculiar nature of the University made up of colonies of quite diverse, but specialized cells which must cooperate in order to thrive. But the conference also expresses the conviction that the University is not a jellyfish, at least not with respect to exerting the will necessary to influence its fate. It's not some vast Portuguese man-of-war floating in the current, tacking always at the same angle to the wind. Our presence here is earnest of our determination, faculty and administration alike, to chart and to fulfill our institutional destiny."

(\*) *Planning Committee Members: James H. Gardner, Chairman; James Clayton; Noel deNevers; Alvin Gittins; William Gonzales; William Guillory; Robert Huefner, Marigold Linton; Anthony W. Morgan. Cecil Samuelson and Kristrine Strachan.*

The Friday session, beginning at 10 a.m. and concluding at 10 p.m., presented the following series of papers (\*) and discussions:

- ..."CHANGING CULTURAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES AND THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION," O. Meredith Wilson, former president of the University of Minnesota, former president of the University of Oregon, and former Director of the Institute for Behavioral Studies at Stanford University.
- ..."UTAH CULTURAL VALUES AND THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY," Sterling McMurrin.
- ..."DEMOGRAPHIC AND STUDENT CHARACTERISTIC TRENDS LIKELY TO AFFECT HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 1980s," Thayne Robson and Frank McKean.
- ..."FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION -- A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE," Larry L. Leslie, University of Arizona.
- ..."HIGHER EDUCATION AS A POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PRIORITY IN THE STATE OF UTAH IN THE 1980s," R. J. Snow.

Concurrent Sessions

- ..."IDENTIFYING EXCELLENCE: WHO DECIDES AND ON WHAT BASIS?" David Grant, Kenneth Eble, Blaine Huntsman, chairperson.
- ..."THE GOAL OF EXCELLENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION: OBSTACLES AND OPPORTUNITIES," Lori Clarke, James Croft, Fred Emery, chairperson.
- ..."DEVELOPING AND CONSERVING AREAS OF EXCELLENCE: PRIORITIES AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION AT DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS," Irv Altman, Chase Peterson, Larry Lattman, chairperson.

(\*) Copies of the full texts of these papers are available in the Deans offices of all University Colleges.

The Saturday session was an open forum discussion with President Gardner (9:30 a.m. to 12: 30 p.m.) and three brief presentations synthesizing the previous day's concurrent sessions.

The discussions with President Gardner were taped so that the issues raised and the responses offered could be shared with the entire faculty, in printed form.

#### OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

PRESIDENT GARDNER: May I first say how appreciative I am of the presence of everyone these past two days. I hope the sessions have been as much help and benefit to you as they have been to me. They've been enormously helpful to me, and I'm very pleased to be here this morning. My purpose is not to present a paper, or even a summary of one. I have none in mind. Instead, I prefer to have a conversation with the faculty and members of the administrative team who are here. Let me say no question could possibly be too awkward or too embarrassing (even about my salary). I meet regularly with legislative committees, students, members of the faculty and administration, donors, alumni and others, and so I think the important thing is that we have a forthright and as thorough a conversation about matters of interest to you as we possibly can.

FACULTY QUESTION: *What's ahead for the U in the 1980s?*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: What I'll say on that is not likely to be a surprise to any of you. We've gone through an era of enormous growth since World War II -- unrelenting growth. All of us in this room have, for the better part of our professional lives, functioned within the context of growth, as an assumption animating our sense of the future and mode of planning. Few of us have any experience, really, in dealing with anything other than that. The problem we're going to have in the 80's, less so here than in many other universities, however, will be this: how do we adjust our perspective, our style

and our arrangements so as to take advantage of a period of stability -- so as to consolidate our gains and improve the quality of what we do. That will not be easy because it introduces into our arrangements a certain measure of structure and planning and resource allocation problems that we've not been obliged to contend with in any explicit way, heretofore. Our problem will be how to improve the overall quality of the university, assure its continuing momentum, and provide the environment and conditions on campus supportive of creativity, new ideas, initiatives and a sense of future on the part of faculty and administration alike. I have a sense of what can be done, where we're likely to be successful and where it's going to be harder to be successful and I hope to share those with you. The other side of the coin is that the whole political process, the attitudes of the public, attitudes of the legislature, the attitudes of the people who analyze budgets in state government, are all essentially geared to the same expectations as are we regarding growth. We tended to oversell the importance of numbers in the sixties to secure our resources, paying less attention to the qualitative and programmatic aspects of our work than we should have: and now we have to come back and make the point that there's more to consider than merely growth, as our needs and budgets are analyzed and reviewed. This will not be easy to do.

*FACULTY COMMENT: In effect we created our problem by our very quantitative approach to resources. This was not unique to Utah, but was a change in the whole national thrust. But do you also see a change in the cultural and external environment that might, even had we not created a bit of this problem ourselves, be less responsive to education as an abstract value? Most of the speakers yesterday I felt were saying that the basic values of society are not changing. I don't know whether I would agree with that. How do you feel about it?*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I was, as a matter of fact, thinking rather hard about this as the issue came up in the course of our discussions yesterday. We are now seeing a drop in participation rates in college-going by Utah high school graduates. In the past Utah has ranked consistently in the top four states, and by and large we have ranked No. 1. Why has the change come? Is it because the colleges and universities of the state are less accessible? No. Is it because we have fewer institutions of higher education than we had previously? No. Is it because Brigham Young University has decreased its in-state admittees and increased its out-of-state admittees? I think not. Is it

because the people of the state today are not fundamentally the same people who were here in 1940? I don't think that's the case. Utah is a very stable place and most of our population growth is a function of the birth rate, not in-migration. I think that the participation rate is overridingly a function of the high rate of employment in the state. There is little question of that! and I also think there's little doubt that, depending on the job market, there is a significant group of young people who will either move into employment or into higher education. In 1974-76, we had a very significant recession in the country, even though it was not as severe here. Our enrollments jumped 2,500 during that 2 year period. It's now going the other way. What should that tell us? Frankly, I'm not sure, Is it a matter merely of weighing at any given time, the opportunity for employment as against that of enrolling in the University? Or is it that Utah has been economically marginal for most of its history and only since the mid 60's has that situation changed -- for the better, and I think permanently so. The economic base of the state is substantially stronger and more diversified than at any time in its history. We're less reliant on the mining industry and the federal government for employment. We're less dependent on agriculture. What I'm wondering is if the high rate of college attendance in Utah has reflected as much the fact of there being no real alternatives available to them as it has been to the more publicized emphasis on the importance of education. Today, there is a migration back into the state and the percentage of our young people who are graduating and staying in the state as against leaving, has been going up every year; it's up to nearly 85% now. There are real opportunities now in Utah. So what I'm wondering is whether or not the drop in the participation rate is a temporary phenomenon related to the availability of jobs and the increasing costs of education, or whether it is a fundamental expression of an attitude on the part of our young people who would always have preferred the job market to education but most recently did not have the job option as readily available to them. I don't know the answer but I think it's a question we really ought to inquire into, because it will affect our overall expectations about enrollment for years to come.

FACULTY COMMENT: *If I could comment on this: I think they are going to work at the high income jobs. A lot of them are going into construction which has really been the boom thing here. So the trade-off is not competition with the average job. They're going into the very high paying jobs. But my question is to what extent do they perceive the University as associated with vocational preparation and to what extent do we perceive the university as an opportunity for a self-fulfilling education?*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: *I think the answer is we don't really know, but we do have enough data to give us some insight. The average student at the University of Utah tends to be more vocationally oriented than students who would be found at institutions of our size and kind elsewhere. Let's take the state college system in California. There is no graduate work except master's work in certain professional fields in that system. No Ph.D. work is offered and only nominal research is undertaken. My guess is that the students in that system tend to be more like our students than those in the University of California, by way of contrast. We're also living in a state that is highly egalitarian in its political outlook and, therefore, excellence, of the kind we've been discussing is, by definition, less well understood and even suspect. I don't mean by that that such reservations are consciously expressed; I only mean that there's a certain underlying unease about it.*

FACULTY COMMENT: *Switching a bit, assuming we'll have some students, and they'll have some definable characteristics that we might or might not find out about, what interests me is what we do with them when they get here. Agreement on excellence seems to be fairly well established. I probably am the only person who would make much of a case for mediocrity, which I think is useful, but that's a separate speech. There seems to be a uniform agreement we ought to be excellent, but there seems to be kind of maximum disagreement about what we ought to be excellent about. I have a feeling, and I would like you to respond to this as to whether I'm right or not, that the administration has a kind of legitimate fear of overcentralization and that therefore the opposite pattern is one in which, say, colleges have maximum autonomy, faculty members maximum autonomy, everyone maximum autonomy. That makes it difficult to answer, or even have provisional answers, to what the University might be doing in the kind of central ways that get down to the question of allocation of resources, and the like that we've been talking about. What do you see in the way of opportunities for preserving autonomy and yet bringing people together to assert some kind of common purposes for university education -- back to what happens to students when they come here?*



PRESIDENT GARDNER: To answer that question, I will first have to refer to the fact that we're part of a nine-institution system of higher education governed by a single Board of Regents. The Board has responsibility for adopting the policies under which we operate, for approving our academic programs, or disapproving them, of hearing our budget and making decisions about it and allocating resources, for fixing our tuitions, and for exercising virtually all of the leverage that's needed to govern. This tends to homogenize and not differentiate the component parts of that system, in spite of an honest and determined effort by the Regents to make the kind of crucial distinctions that are necessary to preserve the integrity of each of the nine institutions in their charge. It's almost inevitable. This would similarly be true in the University of Utah if we were to be highly centralized. So my concern is, how does the University of Utah survive the governing arrangement within which it's obliged to function? Well, I believe that the more we tend to be like the other institutions in this system, the more like them we will become. The more dissimilar we are from every other institution in this system, the less likely we are to be regarded as the same, and if the fundamental distinction is one of quality and excellence, that will carry its own influence. I think that's where our future rests. That may, seemingly, contradict the statement I made a moment ago about this being an egalitarian state, suspicious of the kind of elitism that may be implicit in my statement. Nevertheless, quality carries its own power and its own influence, however grudgingly they may be given. Look what's happening at the University of California right now. It's a good case in point, and I could refer you to other examples around the country. Where are the students wishing to go? Enrollments are way off in the community colleges in California. They're way off in the state college system. Are they off at Berkeley? Or UCLA? Those campuses are turning away thousands of students. There's a message there. Students are going where they can get educated. My feeling is that we ought to take the next few years, when there's a sort of settling in on enrollment, and try to define the nature and character of our institution in ways that accent the quality of our work. I'm convinced that under those conditions, if we in fact are successful, that the sense of that will be communicated and we will have sufficient influence to assure ourselves a continuing and viable future. Therefore, what I'm

looking for in the next four or five years is not significant increases in enrollment. At the same time, we can't have too much slippage on the downside, or we do tend to become budgetarily vulnerable because of the customary ways of looking at us. So my concern will be how do we recruit students to maintain a relatively stable enrollment so that at the end of that period the general quality level of our studentbody will be higher than it is today. Now I had to say that in order to answer your question, because it seems to me there is no way that that kind of institutional objective can be realized through a wholly laissez faire attitude on the part of the central administration, leaving each college and department to do exactly as it wishes. At the same time, we can't have the kind of centralized leverage that tends to characterize the system of which we're a part, because it blunts creativity; it demoralizes and it, in fact, tends to stifle the kind of expressions of opportunity and future that can only come from the faculty. So what I'm hoping for is that there will be some greater measure of attention paid institutionally to the general quality of our work so that we can maximize our influence and accelerate this process, as against leaving it to mere hope and circumstance. Once we've lost our capacity to determine our own future within this system, it will never be regained.

FACULTY COMMENT: *I'd like to change the subject a little bit, to another very important funding matter, and that's funded research. Traditionally on our campus we've received more money from the federal government than we have from the state legislature. I find a problem developing among our faculty, among those people who are able to bring in the money. They report: "I'm having more and more trouble administering my contract." I think it's a given that the only reason we have administrators at the university is to facilitate the needs of the faculty and the students. They ought to provide the resources, they ought to provide the funds and everything else to help us go.*

*Yet there seems to be a deterrent effect developing. One of my colleagues expressed it to me this way: He said, "I finally figured out how the funded research thing works. I go to Washington and get the dollars, and when I get them, the Park Building takes part of the money for overhead, and with that overhead money they go out and hire people whose sole purpose seems to be walking down the path in front of me and sprinkling tacks in my way." We have auditors on our necks all the time and there is a great deal of worry that we're going to jail if we do something wrong.*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: "That's right." And the administrator is the first one to go to jail.

FACULTY COMMENT: I'm almost overwhelmed by these vice-presidents. I think the top level of administration understands the problem, but when you get down below that level, we have a different attitude. I'd like to offer a suggestion and maybe get you to comment on it. One of the problems I see is that the people who are largely being paid out of that overhead are not accountable to the deans of the academic colleges where the research is being done. In fact, the academic part of the campus has very little influence over that part of the organization. The accounting is done for the accountants by the accountants, and not for the P.I.'s, the people who really need the data most. I'd like to propose that we consider a decentralization process, using some of that overhead money to at least place some of those people out in the colleges where they could work closer with the programs and get a little better acquainted with what's going on and begin to develop some kind of understanding that the P.I. has, as he's trying to run his program.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I understand exactly what you're saying. We've talked about it before. Let me offer one introductory comment with respect to the role of the administration. When I came here, I was not acquainted with the University of Utah and I knew no faculty members here. Yet I was obliged to make some key appointments early on, so I met with about 35 faculty who may or may not have been the right people to meet with, but they were as good a cross section as I was able to see. I met with them one on one, asking them who I should consider for the position of vice president for academic affairs. One of the individuals with whom I met said "Well, whom do you have in mind as your chief academic officer." "The president of the University of Utah is the chief academic officer," I responded. I believe that. There's no way that the administration could administer this institution without being as much caught up in the academic work of the institution as in the administrative work of the institution. If there is a tenure appointment made in this university, it's made only with the signature of the president. If there is a new degree approved in this university, the

president recommends its approval to the governing board. If there is a new department approved in this institution, the president concurs in it. And so forth. To suggest that there is a sharp division between the academic work in the University and the administration of the supporting services is to mistake the motivation and understanding of the administration's own view of its duty and obligations. There is no question that there is frustration on the part of our P.I.'s and our faculty with "the Park Building," as you put it; and I understand what you mean. It's equally true that there's a greater measure of frustration between the University administration and the funding agencies of the federal government and their auditors than ever before. And what we're obliged to do not only frustrates me but engenders a high degree of resentment on my part toward those funding agencies. I read the federal auditor's reports. What they are attempting to require of us is absurd. What they're really asking us to do is to insist that our faculty punch a time clock with respect to their work. We have resisted this, and have tried to devise mechanisms that both respond to their sense of perfection as well as to the working needs of those who are the recipients of the grants. In trying to respond to both we satisfy neither, and that's the dilemma we have. We are, on the one hand therefore, risking that the auditors will order substantial disallowances with respect to the grant monies that have been made to the University of Utah or, on the other hand, risking a complete alienation of our P.I.'s, or both. If there is going to be a decentralization along the lines that you suggest, then the college that has the administration burden is going to have to be prepared to pay those disallowances. I pay them now. Some P.I.'s are frustrated, but still attempt to accommodate to the requirements imposed on them. But there is also the P.I. who is indifferent to those requirements and either falsifies or indifferently completes the paperwork and then the auditors come in, make inquiries and discover that the P.I.'s reports are incorrect and disallow the expenditure. Last year I paid out \$200,000 in disallowances because of the indifferent attitude of some P.I.'s. I wish there were an easy solution. I'd like to propose two things: I'd like for example, to have a committee of P.I.'s working with our Vice President for Administrative Services and Vice President for Research and their staff, so that if we have a problem, we understand we have one, and why we have it, rather than speculating about one another's motives. That would be useful. Secondly, in the larger colleges, where there are very substantial grants -- millions of dollars -- you need

competent assistance, and if you don't have it, we ought to try and get it to you. But I don't think we can just decentralize the process. I think what we need to do is make sure that there is communication between the colleges and the central administration, so that at least our differences can be narrowed to acceptable levels. So it's a problem and I want to pick up on it. Thanks for raising the question.

*FACULTY COMMENT: Another topic. Let's take the austere scenario, and assume that we'll have constant or dwindling resources which are both the same thing. How vulnerable are our new initiatives in liberal education? If I look at the university and see a situation in which it will be department vs. department, college vs. college, a scrambling, ever more desperate, for dwindling resources, and also see, outside the University, high placed critics of anything called liberal education, I wonder if we can sustain a commitment to this. It seems to me that we're moving into the 80's on the one hand with this difficult funding problem and on the other hand, with a new initiative which I think is very important.*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I think that if one makes the assumption that we are to experience austere times of a kind that were described yesterday by one of our participants, and we have failed to take the steps internally to bring about the kind of evolution that I described earlier, then there's no question at all that anything reflective of a cooperative arrangement, any new initiatives, any changes, will be subject to intense pressure. I don't mean from the administration as much as from the departments. I think that liberal education and similar efforts that assume a high degree of institutional interest on the part of individual faculty members, and cooperation among and between departments, could clearly come under pressure, as not directly benefiting the work of the particular department. It would be a great tragedy for this University if that scenario were to be realized. I think it accents the need for us simply not to sit back and circle the wagons. If we do, what will happen is that which you have described. We need to try and find a pass through the mountains for those wagons rather than circling them. There is a possibility that if we spend two weeks trying to get over Donner Hill, as the Donner party did coming into the Salt Lake Valley, and then fell short as they moved through the Sierras, we'll get caught too, and then

we'll wind up eating one another. Frankly, in spite of all the emphasis in this state on vocational and technical education, there is a sufficient reservoir of understanding and support of the idea of liberal education that only we ourselves will kill it through our own shortsightedness or individual greed. It will not be killed externally; I don't sense any ground swell whatsoever on the part of legislators to demean that part of our work or regard it as unimportant. That is not to say that there isn't clearly an effort being made by those most interested in vocational and technical education to advantage those institutions at our expense, but they have thus far proven to be unsuccessful.

*FACULTY COMMENT: You mentioned the quality of education and in a very practical sense a period of declining enrollment or maybe declining budget. Our own school might be asked to look at three different forces influencing it. One, for example, at the undergraduate level, a need to expand and reach out to the community through a larger group of students. These are those big classes that we spoke about in some of our areas of discussion previous to this. The second pressure might be to look at graduate levels -- of keeping up in the field, introducing those new courses that are badly needed in new areas. The third pressure could be in research. All three of these areas, even though they influence different size groups, deal also with the quality of education and the quality that is felt outside. Will it be up to us to determine, given a chance to move in only one direction, which direction we should move, or do you feel that there are already certain directions that will perhaps suggest research over new courses, or over reaching larger groups?*

*PRESIDENT GARDNER: Put yourself in my shoes for a moment. I'm not an architect, I'm not a physicist, I'm not a neuroradiologist, I'm not a psychologist and I'm not an engineer. My understanding of your field is limited. But I have an affirmative obligation to learn as much about the various departments at the University as I can, so that I have a general sense of what it is they're about, if they're alive or dead, if they're on the cutting edge, or if the morale is good or bad and if there is more a sense of coherence or of divisiveness within the faculty of any given department. But as to the weight and emphasis that should be accorded one's area of research and professional service, as to how the curriculum should be devised, and as to the general direction the enterprise should take, I must rely basically upon the faculty to make those decisions. I recently sent out a memorandum which asks the departments to think about these things in a hard and considered fashion and then share with*

the administration their views as to where they are and where they'd like to go, and then to calculate the resource implications associated with those decisions. This document is intended to provide us means of moving with the future without blunting the morale and hope of the faculty. That's an elusive line to find, by the way, and all I can tell you is that we are trying to find it, so that our decisions, as we're obligated to make them at the level of the central administration, to put X dollars here, and Y dollars there, can be as informed as possible and as knowledgeable as possible, and as responsive as they can possibly be to the aspiration of our faculty and students. I hope that departments will take that opportunity seriously -- and that's the way I see that -- as an opportunity. We are trying to encourage that kind of self-evaluation and view of the future. All I can act on is the information that I have before me, not on the information that I don't receive; and so to the extent that the departments take that exercise seriously, it will be in their interest and in the administration's interest. It would be presumptuous of me to suggest what you should be doing in your school. That's as honest an answer as I can give you.

*FACULTY COMMENT: What might we do institutionally to improve quality, the question of centralization vs. autonomy? There may be a way of having our cake and eating it too in one respect, and as far as the humanities are concerned at any rate, it would be to strengthen the library and our resources. I know that you've taken one or two dramatic steps such as pledging the income of the President's Club to the library. In my almost daily visits to the library, I think I see a kind of decline in services. We are beginning to resemble a supermarket in terms of self-help, which may be a good thing, but I think it also means a manhandling of some very valuable resources over there, and one has to travel miles of corridors and take endless time to find somebody who can be of assistance. I'm wondering what might be done to provide even more assistance to the library which would be an institutional way of strengthening the departments and colleges again, particularly in the humanities, so that even though we go about our autonomous ways, department by department, in improving quality, we would have that grand resource. Perhaps related to that would be your thinking on extension which is an important way of communicating to the community what the quality of the University's offerings are. I suppose a lot of us are worried about Mickey Mouse offerings in extension that are not truly becoming to a university community.*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I needn't be persuaded as to the importance of the library in the work of the University of Utah. I'm well aware of it. We've pumped a good deal of gift money into the library the last several years, and we have had, two years running, significant base adjustments to the library's operating budget. For example, last year we added \$65,000 in addition to price level increases caused by inflation. On top of that, we have in our budget this year, another \$75,000 base adjustment for our acquisitions budget, in addition to a full price adjustment in the base for acquisitions. To the extent that the service is perceived to be eroding, I think it is not a function of inadequate support budget. Somebody would surely have to persuade me that it is. We worked hard to provide the money there. There is a faculty committee that advises the library and questions ought to be raised with them and with the Director of Libraries. That's the level at which it ought to be dealt with. As to budgets, I think we're OK on that. We're not all right in terms of the acquisitions budget. We've been getting a consumer price index adjustment on libraries and that's not what it's costing. It's costing twice that. And I'll have to say that the Regents and the Legislature have been pretty good about understanding that, and I think they will continue to help as they can.

With respect to DCE, I'm well aware of the fact that some of the things that extension programs offer around the country are not always well regarded by the faculty of the institution which sponsors it. It's equally true that many of those courses which are looked upon with less enthusiasm by the faculty are the very courses that the people wish to take. I'll have to say that those courses tend to subsidize those that the faculty by and large wish to offer, but which cannot carry themselves. That's the practical answer to that. The Division of Continuing Education at the University of Utah was moribund for many years and it is alive today. It is a reasonably vital force in the community and I think increasingly so. Not only that, the courses they've offered have reinterested a significant segment of our community in what the University can do for them, and they in turn have moved back into the University proper. That is especially true of women. Our enrollments are a witness to that. As was mentioned yesterday much of the growing number of women now enrolling in the University, age 30 and up, is a function of the work of DCE and the Women's Resource Center. There are real gains to be had for the University of Utah by an aggressive and well-administered DCE program; and I think there is real benefit to be derived by the adult population of the state from our efforts. That's not to say that we don't have our problems. We do. There are jurisdictional problems between DCE and the departments, funding problems and so forth, but by and large I'm glad to see us doing something.



STUDENT COMMENT: . I want to refer to what you were saying about why students stay in school. As a student, I feel fairly involved with other students and I perceive three things happening: The first is I agree with you they're in for the job preparation, but I also see a lot leaving because they are no longer guaranteed a good job just because they have a college degree. I think that is a major problem. The second thing that surprises me is a lot of students are in school to avoid the job market. It's a safe, socially accepted place to be while they either end up being professional students going on and on, or semi-part time students spending the rest of their time in sports, skiing, things like that. The third thing, and probably the most important is, that the students are in school for an education. I don't think most of them enter school with that in mind though. Most of them are in school because of social pressure, parents, friends, nothing else to do. Once they are in they begin to realize they are getting an education and they enjoy it. That's why it's important to me that the first year in college is excellent and the liberal education program especially. I think you're a proponent of that. The second thing is that they not just see it as just as a place to go to classes, but as a total educational experience. In my opinion a lot of the better learning I've had has been in my extra-curricular activities. Also I'm a proponent of student government because I think it can add to the education. I wanted you to comment on these things, and especially why you have to make the university appealing to those students who aren't necessarily going primarily to become educated.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Your description of the attitude of entering freshmen is probably accurate. I think you also described what many of us in this room felt when we were 18 years old. We tend to forget what we were like then because we've been caught up in our own biases and our own professions and our own later interests. In 1973, 25% of the U's teaching faculty were T.A.'s. That was true because the place was fundamentally underfunded. In order to secure salary levels for our regular faculty competitive with those institutions with which we were compared, the University bought the salary money by increasing the proportion of T.A.'s. Since '73 we've reduced the percentage of teaching assistants from roughly 25 percent to 17 percent, and the Regents and the Legislature and the Governor have all cooperated. Why do I mention that? I mention it because much of the loss that we experience in student interest and commitment and persistence is a function of the experience good or bad, that they have as freshmen. We can turn them on or we can turn them off. When I left Berkeley, Glenn

Seaborg was teaching the introductory course in chemistry. Ed Teller was teaching Physics Ten, an introductory course for non majors. There were a thousand students in those classes, but what's the difference? Once the class has more than 50 students, what difference does it make how many you have if you can spend three hours with those two men . . .

The fact is that Seaborg and Teller aren't going to be communicating any more information about chemistry and physics than a good T.A. could do, but that's not the point. The point is that there's stimulus and inspiration there. I realize how the reward system mitigates against paying attention to our freshmen and sophomore students, but to the extent that we can overcome some of that or weight it a little differently to encourage some of our best faculty to take one quarter and deal with those young people as they come into the University, we'll have a better institution and far more favorable attitudes on the part of our freshmen students and a higher persistence rate on their part. I'm absolutely convinced of that. My daughter is a U freshmen this year, and she really wasn't sure she wanted to come here, because her father was president, I suppose. Apart from that, she wasn't really sure she would enjoy it. The fact is she is having a wonderful time. She loves her professors; she likes the courses she has enrolled in, and she is very happy. But that was an unexpected happiness, and I think that her attitude was not dissimilar from that of her friends graduating from the high schools here. There's not the sense of excitement about going to the University of Utah that there really ought to be. There is instead, from what I sense, a feeling of "well, we can always go to the University of Utah." That's no good. That is bad! Well, administration needs to work on that and we're beginning to do so in pretty aggressive ways. I think the faculty needs to work on it too, in terms of attitudes toward those younger students. Now with respect to your other two points: Why students say they are here, I have found by and large, is a function of what one is expected to say that given year and that will vary according to social circumstances. With respect to not believing that the University will provide them with the kind of economic advantage (let me put it in those terms), well the facts refute that assumption, flat out -- even for liberal education graduates. One of the problems is that economic considerations really ought not to be the overriding reason for their coming, even though we simply cannot wish away the fact that it is a significant part of their reason. We should try and broaden the students' sense of why they are here and encourage them to think about it in a more inclusive way. Someone made the point yesterday or

maybe this morning, that more students are presently moving into high income jobs and out of the University. They are: If you can make \$10 to \$12 an hour on the construction gang, because the job is there now and may not be next year, the tendency will be to stop out for a year. I understand that. In many ways that may be good for them, and if they are that marginally committed, they probably ought to do that. Then I hope they will come back with a greater sense of their own future than they would have had if they had simply remained at the University.

FACULTY COMMENT: When I joined the University of Utah faculty, my department chairman told me that as we lived in a poor state, we had to function under very austere conditions. If we wanted anything more than just the status quo, we had to seek external funds. And we do that. My question is: are we getting our fair share in a state that supposedly is poor compared to other states with the same kind of economic base?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: The answer to that is an unequivocal "yes." As a matter of fact, we are at the high end of it. If you measure the taxpayer effort in support of higher education, I think only three or four states exceed us. The problem is one that was mentioned yesterday by someone, namely that we produce children at an extraordinary rate in the state. And so the appropriation per student is quite modest. But in terms of the efforts of the people of the state, they really cannot be faulted. I think we are getting our fair share of the state budget. I don't think we have grounds for complaining about it. Now what that really means is that at the University of Utah we have to work harder to have the kind of University we want. The fact is we do, and this place has been unbelievably successful. It is one of the great success stories in American higher education. It is just phenomenal what the University of Utah has been able to accomplish with the relatively meager resources made available to it by the state, however much of a fair share that may be. And I am really proud of that. Not only that, there is something to be said for the arrangement. We are less complacent, we are more vigorous with respect to our opportunities, we are more uncertain and insecure, and that can be good as long as we can benefit from initiative and efforts. Thus far we have.

FACULTY COMMENT: Yesterday, Sterling McMurrin and Meredith Wilson brought up two topics which are very important to the faculty and they are academic freedom and due process. I agree that academic freedom is sometimes abused by us as faculty members and used as an excuse. I also agree that academic freedom and due process are necessary to protect the faculty from sometimes capricious actions of administrators or their fellow faculty members. However, I feel that these two concepts have from time to time been abused. We all must agree that while on the whole we have a rather outstanding faculty, considering some of the constraints we operate under, we also agree pretty uniformly that in every college and perhaps in every department we have what has sometimes been referred to as "dead wood." I am not sure I know what is the definition of "dead wood." If someone is dead wood here, I would like to have him stand up and identify himself so that I can really see what that means. But we do have some people who are irresponsible, flaky, or whatever you want to call them. More importantly, however, I feel that perhaps the concepts of academic freedom and due process have been used as a smoke screen or as an excuse or a crutch on the part of the administration to avoid making some of the tough decisions when facing up to faculty who are not responsibly carrying out their duties. I see in the departments and the colleges with which I am familiar a rather good job being done lately with the culling out of the untenured faculty who appear to have a high probability of becoming dead wood or irresponsible in the future. But then that leaves us with the problem of reviewing a tenured faculty member. I would like to know what the administration's position is on the review of tenured faculty and whether if a department or college has the fortitude to face those tough decisions and bring a tenured faculty through the very tedious and drawn-out process of review does the central administration have the fortitude to back up the departments and colleges and go to the mat with them?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: You should know that I have very strong feelings about the significance of academic freedom and its importance. I did my doctoral dissertation on the loyalty oath controversy in the University of California. Having been immersed in that study, I emerged with strong and firmly held views about its importance. It is protected in American higher education by governing boards who understand it and support it, by administrators who adopt procedures to protect it, and by faculty who are willing to adhere to the principle without abusing it when it comes to their individual interests. So I don't have to be talked into understanding the importance of it. However, it will work only if the faculty wishes it to work. The Regents can

protect it, the administration can protect it, but they cannot force it to work. The faculty has to make it work and then it has to be supported by the administration and the governing board. I am perfectly aware of the kind of anxiety that characterizes junior faculty in American higher education today. Not only am I aware of it, but I understand it, and it is one of the great problems of our profession. Tenure is not under explicit attack, because people are on the whole comfortable with it. But there is some latent apprehension. We have therefore to be scrupulous in administering the tenure system. To the extent that a department makes a hard decision and it is reviewed by the appropriate committees of the Senate and if it is reviewed even on appeal, and then if it comes to Ric Davern or Chase Peterson and then to me, and we get pressure on us to reverse the judgment and we cave in, the system is destroyed. You won't take a stand again. I wouldn't either if I were sitting in your chair. At the same time, the administration has the reverse obligation. There are times when we feel the decision has just been bounced up to us because no one wants to make it. I can give you cases of people who voted for a faculty member on the record and then made a telephone call and said, "We really don't want this person -- he is my next door neighbor or our daughters are friends, or whatever." Bad! But I am convinced that to the extent that the departments of the University make these decisions fairly and honestly and on the basis of sound internal and external review of the qualifications of that individual, and you do it fearlessly, you can count on the administration of this University supporting that decision unequivocally. I am in court on 50 cases right now. Arvo Van Alstyne, who takes my summonses every Friday afternoon can, I think, affirm the viewpoint that if we believe we are right, we are going all the way and no one is going to push us into a decision to the contrary

COMMENT FROM VICE PRESIDENT DAVERN: We have heard a lot about dead wood in this meeting and it bothers me in the following respect. It has been uttered as an absolute statement and I think there is an element of relativism that should be brought into this. How much dead wood does this University have say vis-a-vis Berkeley or some university we recognize as a fine place? We haven't addressed ourselves to that fact. What right have we to expect perfection? I just pose this rhetorically and won't answer it. There may be virtue

in dead wood. I could take a stoic view about it. You know the purpose of a flea is to awaken the sluggard. Is a purpose of dead wood to remind us constantly of our level of humanity? You may even say that it provides the fuel for the flame that the department needs to go on with, for it is a constant reminder of the fate that you do not want to share. So I have another image at this point. I have an image that we are evaluating ourselves to death. Already we are cursing the government for evaluating everything in sight in an OSHA-like fashion, and it would go very much against my personal grain to be party to introduction into this University of another round of bureaucratic evaluation which would have these OSHA-like qualities. We do have the instrumentation at hand to deal with those clinical cases that are profoundly bad, and that should be sufficient to our purpose. We don't use them probably as often as we should. This may be a measure of our temerity or humanity, I don't know. But we have years of opportunity to make this tough decision on tenure. I think this decision is going to be necessarily tougher as we go into the steady state, and there should be a conscious effort to think about the institution, the long-term concerns of your department, when you decide to admit or not admit another person to your ranks.

FACULTY COMMENT: I would like to discuss an issue that we have not discussed yet. That involves retirement. I would like to know what is the current policy on retirement. It seems to me that in the 1980s we will be stuck with a lot of people who refuse to retire. I recently talked to a graduate student in Social Work and he told me he had been retired. I said, "How come you are retired at this time?" He said "I have served 30 years in the army and that is it. I am getting my pension." What I am saying is many of us can figure out our life expectancy and consider that 68 years or longer is really a burden on us. I don't want to spend all my life in college teaching. By that time I will burn out all the energy I have, and I would rather go fly fishing. So the important thing I am getting at is whether we have a sound retirement policy that will encourage people to take the option of retirement.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I appreciate your raising that question. Perhaps the thing we should do immediately is ask Dean Gordon to offer a course on fly fishing in Continuing Education. I remember Meredith Wilson yesterday raising this issue. My own view is that we're not likely to have much difficulty dealing with that. The evidence around the country suggests that irrespective of the mandatory retirement age, people tend not to work until the mandatory

retirement age.' I suspect there are some faculty who at age 30 are as inactive as some people are at age 80. Liveliness is not necessarily a function of age. I think that the raising of the retirement age is probably a wise thing. The University Senate has reviewed an early retirement plan which I think may work. There was one proposed 2 years ago which was flawed in certain important respects, but the most recent version looks rather promising. We're staffing it out in terms of its legality, its financial implications and the procedural implications; but to the extent that I'm properly acquainted with it, I think it has the possibility of really working. We ought to try and do those kinds of things, but I don't really see a major problem at that end of the pipeline. Frankly, I see a much greater problem at the other end of it. That's where the real problem is. How do we attract into our profession the best and the brightest, against a backdrop of a situation that appears to be declining, at least in the short run? With our tenure policies, how do we give the best faculty the encouragement to stay in the profession. That's where I think we have the greater problem; that's where we really ought to be concentrating our time, not so much at the other end, which I think is a more manageable situation.

*FACULTY COMMENT: I'd like to take issue with Vice President Davern. It seems to me incredible that we should have such a searching review at the time people get tenure and then not continue some constant form of review over everyone in this University. We have the best jobs that there are in the world to have. We have the leisure to think about the ideas that we find intensely interesting. Perhaps 1% of the world can do this, and for someone to go up and say, as has been said again and again, we don't know how much dead wood there is, we don't know what's going on, strikes me as very unusual. If there's a reason to examine people for tenure, there's a reason to continue to examine them. If somebody has a reason for being here, who looks like dead wood to the outside, but really he or she is playing a vital role, that role should be identified. We shouldn't leave it to the outsider to look in and say "You guys don't know what's going on." We ought to be able to say we do know what's going on, and that this person is good.*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I appreciate that. Let me offer a comment on it that Rick may want to respond to. My guess is that you're not in disagreement.

*FACULTY COMMENT: I'm in disagreement with the basic attitude, which is characterized as the more relaxed,*

*gentlemanly idea about higher education. I enjoy being of that era. I'm impressed with how lovely that would be, but I just don't believe that a responsible person today can take that attitude, and I feel because I have such a good job I have to justify holding this job.*

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Let me comment, then Rick may want to. I see a difference between evaluating someone for a tenure appointment which we do once, in the final sense, and evaluating someone's performance, independent of tenure. There is a distinction to be made. We are not on a salary schedule in this University. We're not on steps, we're essentially on a merit system and that works well in some departments, and it works poorly in others. The idea is that we should evaluate one's performance every year as we adjust one's salary. We are not evaluating that person's tenure, however, and if we were to evaluate the tenure, it by definition doesn't exist. But we should evaluate that person's performance, and I agree 100% with that. If we don't do it, then we deserve everything we get, and the only way I can defend the arrangement that we have at the University of Utah for merit review, (which does allow for cost of living and promotion, but not as explicitly as at other places) is to be able to represent to the Legislature that by and large we do a good job of rewarding performance and a good job of using salary administration to help improve performance. I know of instances around this institution where there are faculty members who have gone without salary adjustments for years, and I get a lot of flack about that. With respect to whether that's just or not, I believe that if the person is in fact doing all he or she can, and for whatever reasons the performance falls short of what might have been possible earlier, we have an obligation to that person, out of a basic humanity, to try and accomodate their salary and move it up at least for the cost of living. But for the person who's gone to sleep voluntarily, we need to get their attention, and we in fact do that. Every department doesn't do it equally well, I agree, and I wish they did. It's our responsibility to push them to do it. However, if you undertake to assert the proposition that tenure is subject to annual review, there isn't such a thing as tenure. Period. Flat out. And I believe in it. As a principle I believe in it. I don't think we do a perfect job of administering it, but that's a different matter. I was in the University of California administration in the 60's and I can tell you that if there were not tenure the ability of the University administration to resist the political pressures to fire this person or that person would have been irresistible.



So there are occasions when that principle becomes operative. The only way we can protect the principle, however, is to be as conscious about its administration as we can. That's the point you're making, and it's a very good one, and one that I think we've missed in our conversations today. My own view of the "dead wood" question is that we probably have about as many people who are asleep as any other institution of our size, whether it's in the private sector or public sector; whether it's in government or business. I don't think we have any more and I don't think we have any fewer and we get by as best we can. There are instances of persons abusing tenure, abusing their privileges. You may not hear about it, but we do something about it. We dismissed a tenured member of the faculty two years ago here. You haven't heard about it, but we did it properly and for good cause. I appreciate your making the point. Ric, would you respond?

Ric Davern: I think the distinction President Gardner has made is the one I was going to make. As an administrator I've used salary as a device to deliver a message, and I learned just two weeks ago that one of the persons to whom I delivered the message a year and a half ago, who was tenured, has decided to leave. My purpose there was to address myself to a problem of a person, well before retirement age, who elected for one reason or another to stop in his tracks. But I think these are clinical events and shouldn't be confused with the environment and atmosphere we want to generate in the University as a whole. I'm not here because I feel accountable to anybody as an academic. I'm here because I want to do certain things and it animates me enormously. I'm excited by my peers who do equally exciting things. If I thought that my productivity was a function of accountability, I would perversely stop producing, because that's the nature of the genuine academic beast. I'd like to populate this rather ideal community with more and more people of this kind; I realize this is a platonic ideal but it is one that cannot be ignored if you're going to have a quality university.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: This has been a good conversation. I'm glad to have had that exchange.

FACULTY COMMENT: My question is on the same subject, only in a broader context. As you know the Graduate Council has been reviewing departments and colleges for the past seven years. How useful have these reviews been to you and wherein can we improve them?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I think the main usefulness of the graduate review is a function of the impact it has on the department being reviewed as a function of the review itself. That is, they're obliged to explain what they're doing to their colleagues and to make sense of it; and then they're obliged to respond to the suggestions and comments offered by the review committee. I don't know whether the interested members of the Senate who receive copies of the reviews read them, or if they read them, if they do anything other than that. I do know they're read carefully by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and by the Vice President for Health Sciences in his area, and I read every one of them. They are also reported to the Institutional Council. They have helped me in putting into perspective what they themselves tell me about themselves. They help me to again to gain a kind of balance and perspective that would otherwise be absent. That's useful, but not really the reason for the review. The chief reason for the review is to oblige the faculty involved to think about what they're doing and explain it to someone else who will bring the proper measure of skepticism to the process.

FACULTY COMMENT: I'd like to return to the question of the quest for excellence again and it's very much related to what was said earlier. As far as the library is concerned, it is the problem of acquisitions to which I wish to address myself. In the humanities, French literature and musicology are disaster areas, and a graduate program, in humanities, which is to be excellent and to attract students, relies very heavily on the library. It seems to me, and I've talked about this with my colleagues that it is singularly wasteful that we should be duplicating scholarly editions and historical sets in fields where single volumes cost as much as \$500.00 apiece. I'm wondering if the roof would cave in and the University of Utah disappear into the clouds if we were to get BYU's and our own acquisitions committees together and, instead of duplicating tens of thousands of dollars of materials every year, select things so that between the two universities we would have, in this time of diminishing finances, greater library resources for our graduate programs in the humanities?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: The fact is that we do exactly that with both Brigham Young University and Utah State University.

FACULTY COMMENT: In our acquisitions we do duplicate to a very large degree.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Yes, that's true, and I think it's inevitable that we will.

FACULTY COMMENT: Is there no way we could do something?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: With respect to materials that are used almost routinely, they must necessarily be duplicated. We both offer English courses, too. There may be rare collections that are available, and in those instances there can be a real measure of cooperation. There is also a degree of competition. For example, there are certain collections that we want very much to have in our library to complement an already existing strength. They want it too, for their own purposes, and we're going to outbid them if we have to to get it. But with respect to other expensive collections, where there is not that kind of competitive need, two institutions do work cooperatively and it makes sense. And we have an interlibrary loan arrangement already in existence which is very useful so I think we're doing quite a bit along those lines.

FACULTY COMMENT: All I'd like to do is take 30 seconds to encourage the Graduate School to continue with those departmental reviews. I think they're probably as important a thing as we're doing right now, in the light of all we've talked about concerning the isolation of departments and colleges. The University through this is at least expressing some sense of quality control, of interest, as an institution, in the quality of each of these departments. We could spend some faculty time in departments and colleges examining curriculums, programs and other things that are important to the quality of our education. I have to say in all honesty that it's most unfortunate that the things that should be done on those reports are not done by my colleagues and myself on the faculty. I think the Senate gives short shrift to them; I think they are not discussed; I think they may be read and passed on; I think that it's time that we in the Senate begin to concern ourselves with the University as a whole and particularly with these reports, so I hope you will continue them.

FACULTY COMMENT: I'd like to echo the concern that was raised by our student representative a few moments ago about extracurricular activities, and to me that means anything other than going to classes and doing homework. I continually tell my students, when the issue comes up, that they shouldn't allow attending classes to interfere

with their college education. Even in recent years and on other campuses, college was a total experience, and something that was an adventure. Here students generally leave the campus, go back down into the valley at noon every day to go to work. I know we have had the experience that when we offer a course one quarter at 10 o'clock we get a hundred registrants, the next quarter we offer it at 1 o'clock and registration drops to 35. The campus really bears an uncanny resemblance to a commuter college. I think that's detrimental to the education of our students and I'd like to know if there's anything we can do to keep our students up here for a few more hours every day?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: I think you call our attention to one of the problems the University of Utah faces in its effort to engender a sense of community and affiliation so that the student does not perceive the experience here as going to Z.C.M.I. to buy a pair of shoes and then going off to some other place. It's a real problem. Eighty percent of the students at the University commute, and we tend, I think more readily than we should, to explain away the problem you identify by attributing it to that fact. U.C.L.A. has a full 82% of its student body commuting, but there's a different feeling on that campus than there is here, so I don't attribute it merely to commuting, although the commuting student obviously offers us a special kind of challenge. I wish there were some ready answer to the problem you pose. There is not. The ASUU this year, however, is working with the administration in an effort to examine this problem in a fairly systematic way, and there is a group of alumni, faculty, students and administration who have just been appointed for the purpose of at least trying to define the problem and then perhaps there will have to be some other means of attempting to discover assistance in resolving it. The more enduring kind of problem is how to help the students benefit out of class from an increased and enhanced contact with one another; how to encourage them to audit classes; how to encourage them to attend the lectures of distinguished people who visit our campus; how to encourage them to visit and talk and converse with one another -- those are the kinds of problems I think you are really asking about, and I agree that it is a problem and we ought to do everything we can to solve it.

FACULTY COMMENT: One quickie response. The faculty can do a lot of things. For instance try having office hours one night a week. It's remarkable. Back to the other end of the pipeline you mentioned a moment ago: There is a general belief not only here but around the country, also backed up with an extremely small amount of real data, that during the last 20 years one of the things that put vigor

and response into the system was the new blood, the new young people coming in because we could grow. We're reaching the stage -- it seems like everyone agrees -- that we're slowing down, if not coming to a standstill. There have been some attempts, I believe, to respond to this, but I think it is hit and miss. The Math Department and the English Department, for example, have tried some part-time or three year appointments. I think that's really been in response to the T.A. problem to a large extent. Is there any thought about making a systematic study and program for responding? If you think it really puts new blood and new vigor into a system, could there be systematic response, for instance, on an exchange between universities?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: We've significantly increased the percentage of positions that we hold for visiting faculty. I think that makes sense. Rather than using all of our personal services budget for permanent appointments, or those that are on the tenure track, it does seem to me that a somewhat larger share of that budget might well be reserved expressly for the purpose of bringing in faculty who don't intend to stay -- distinguished people who want to come for a year, or for a quarter, in and out. They'll make a contribution as well. We don't get locked into a higher percentage of our faculty who are tenured. We are in a geographically isolated part of the United States, and we need that kind of flow of ideas through here and that's one way to get it. The greatest problem of course, is that if you institutionalize a solution, we're likely to so discourage the junior faculty that it will be countereffective. In other words, the only way you can deal with it in a formal sense (unless you're willing to have the average percentage of faculty who are tenured rise indefinitely, and the average age of the faculty rise indefinitely) is to alter the present flow of people into the tenured ranks. If you do that in a systematic way, institutionalizing it, not enabling us to respond to the kind of individual cases that we might confront department by department, we may in many ways run a greater risk of defeating the very purposes you have in mind, and that's what I worry about. I think what we need to avoid are institution-wide solutions and try as Ric says to take a more clinical view of it and deal with it in a more personal and individual way as against a more bureaucratic way.

FACULTY COMMENT: It seems to me that a certain amount of impetus from the administration could present a program for encouraging departments to try to work out senior member faculty exchanges among the various universities where appropriate.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Thank you. I appreciate that suggestion. I'd like to pursue that. We have endowment monies from the gifts we have received over the years, as well as earnings the University has been making on its investments. A substantial portion of that income has been going for graduate fellowships, scholarships and things like that and also a chunk of it has been placed in Ric Davern's office for the express purpose of bringing in visiting faculty, using the budget in his office -- soft money -- for that purpose as against cutting in on the departmental base. These are things that need to be paid more attention to and I will pursue it further.

FACULTY COMMENT: Well, I was happy an hour or so ago when the subject of teaching was getting a little footage on the tape, and earlier when you discussed the relationship between quality and the attractiveness of the University for students. I'd like to point out that this attraction for students is directed as much toward quality in teaching as it is toward quality in research, and I think that excellence in research is obtainable by some fairly well-defined institutional strategies, but excellence in teaching is not. I think that we have a machine at the University that is quite efficient in teaching the students how to do research and in assuring that the faculty who are involved in it maintain excellence in that regard. But we really don't have a machinery for the teaching component. I think we are doing some things as a faculty, but all too little, and I would encourage a lot more attention toward the teaching skills. There are some definable teaching skills - there are definable teaching confirmations that can be directed toward very effective learning. I think -- and I don't want to be stoned -- these are often used in the high schools and industry, perhaps even in the military, more than they are used in the university, and I think we ought to get busy on them.

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Thank you. I think the burden for improving teaching rests right with the faculty. That's where it rests. The president of the University can make all the speeches he wants about it, he can issue all the directives that he wishes to issue, he can encourage resolutions from the Senate, he can pretend all those statements are going to somehow affect the reward system. But none of that is going to have any influence whatsoever

unless the faculty itself wishes to do something about it. We can encourage quality teaching and we ought to, just as I earlier tried to indicate how I think we ought to pay a greater measure of attention to our freshman and sophomore students. Whether or not that happens, however, will be a function of how the faculty and the individual departments respond and feel about their teaching opportunities as against their research. For some departments, it's a clear choice; for other departments they're inseparable and that will vary from discipline to discipline. I understand it's in the university's self-interest and in the faculty's self-interest to pay more attention to it. To the extent that we assume this is still the 60's when our future was guaranteed by a willing and enlarging student body, we delude ourselves. We need to pay greater attention to the teaching part of our business for our own self-interest, independent of the kind of help and assistance and stimulus and encouragement it affords our students.

FACULTY COMMENT: I have two comments I'd like to make. First of all I have a small sample, but I've noted for a few years that we're getting a different type of student now in engineering. That's a student who has gone to Trade Tech, who's gone to Weber, who is now dissatisfied with that educational experience and therefore wants to upgrade. That may be the reason why the average age of the entering student is increasing. We need to get more information out earlier so that students have a more intelligent decision-making capability before they make the commitment to go to one of those schools, and we may be failing there. The other comment I have is relative to lobbying the legislature, and that's a task which you take on primarily yourself, whereas in public education, they have not only the superintendent of public education but also the U.E.A. which makes them a very powerful lobby. Is there some manner in which faculty can assist in lobbying and in what manner would you feel that would be helpful?

PRESIDENT GARDNER: Well, that's a mixed blessing. Let me try and answer that question as directly as I can. It's not possible to answer it in any complete way with the time we have. It's a very complicated business. The state legislature appropriates money to each college and university in the state directly. They do not give a block budget for example to the State Board of Regents. They appropriate dollars to the University of Utah; dollars to Weber State College; dollars to Utah State University and so forth. Our budgets are not the same.

We are different institutions; justification for our needs is substantially dissimilar. Compare that with the public schools. They rally around and unify behind one political objective, and that is the weighted pupil unit dollars that are going to be appropriated that year, whether it's going to be \$860 or \$877 dollars. That is the principal budget issue for them, so their capacity to facilitate a high degree of cooperation among the school districts of the state is greatly enhanced. The Superintendent of Public Instruction has less of a problem in balancing the needs of the Jordan District against the Salt Lake District, as against the Box Elder district, than does the Board of Regents in trying to determine the needs of nine separate colleges and universities. The Public School formula permits them to unify internally. That's point one. Point 2: The public school teachers have a political arm. A number of their members serve in the legislature and they contribute to those legislators' campaigns and to other legislators in the state. It's overtly a political arm. They have hired staff. They work at it all year long.

Take higher education in contrast. There is no political arm. Our budgets are not the same, and our rationale for needing them is different. Plus, there is not a single appropriation of dollars for higher education as there is for the public schools. There are nine different budgets that have to be approved by the legislature directly.

Despite these complexities, Utah's state-wide higher education system functions admirably and, over the years, has a record of producing citizens and leaders at a rate greatly out of proportion to either the state's population or its dollar investment.

Next, within the state's system of higher education itself, apart from that issue, there was a time, as President Emery can attest, when the Board of Regents was so geographically divided and the budget process so politicized and the coalitions of the other institutions was so effective that if there were reductions to be made in the Regent's requests for the system as a whole, every penny would come out of the University of Utah. Well that won't happen today. But at the same time, our lack of ability effectively to engage the support of the entire system does us harm. I mentioned yesterday that if we were fundamentally threatened with respect to our independence, or prerogatives, or the essential integrity of our fiscal base, the system could do nothing about it for us. There is no capacity for the



system really to help us. Some regents can help us, the commissioner can help us, but the ability of the system to help us is negligible. We have to protect ourselves, and so we've had to handle our arrangements with the external political constituencies in such a fashion that there is a capacity independently to secure our own interests. We can do that, absent a series of untoward incidents on the campus that would cut away my capacity to hold that influence. There's always a balance we've got to work out. That's the reality of it. You may say it shouldn't be that way. But I don't live in that kind of world. I live in the world that is, and that's how it is. Finally with respect to this whole issue, I still don't understand what motivated the governor to recommend that higher education take 40% of the effective savings that he ordered to be realized in the current fiscal year, when we represent 20% of the budget.

Now, the question is "What's the state likely to be doing in the short term with respect to funding arrangements for higher education as against the rest of state government?" My hope is that the state will not feel obliged, in the form of actions on the part of its elected public officials, to stop the clock in Utah with respect to the rendering of public services. We have momentum here. All you need to do is check with your colleagues around the country. We have momentum here and we ought to keep it, because once it is lost, years will be spent getting it back again. We're not like a spigot to turn on and off. There is no reason the state can't fund education and still afford the population tax relief. We can have both. The political leadership, rather than vying to see who can give the most back, ought to be taking a somewhat more visionary view of the quality of life that the populace and citizenry of this state is going to have. My own opinion is that if the people of this state knew what the choices were and understood them, they would make the right choice. Namely, they'd find the balance between assuring a continuing momentum for the educational system and other public services while making sure that their dollars are spent effectively and stretched, as much as possible.

My hope is that after the elections this fall, there will be some countervailing efforts made to bring that particular view into the arena. If that should happen, then I think the momentum of the University of

Utah will continue. We'll have to be frugal and we'll have to be careful, and we'll have to think pretty hard about what's important and what's less important, but we won't be facing a devastating kind of fiscal problem. If, on the other hand, there is a willingness to starve us, then all of us in higher education will be obliged to respond to that in overt and explicit ways. The initial burden rests with the Board of Regents to advocate the needs of this system -- to advocate it, with the presidents backing them. If they do it, and the system unified from Logan in the North to Dixie in the South and the College of Eastern Utah in the East, we can pull it off. There's no question of that. We've got the whole state. It can be done. If the Regents, on the other hand, don't, that leaves the presidents, and that only leaves them to be more explicitly engaged in the political process. That may mean speaking out more publicly about the merits of recommendations being made by the Governor and legislators and others than we have ordinarily been accustomed to doing. If that is required we're going to be in the rough and tumble of that process up to our eyeballs. If we win, then we're all right, and if we lose then the tenure of all of us who are serving in the presidencies will be abbreviated. That's the reality of what we're going to be confronting as I see it.

May I say that I'm sorry to go well beyond my time. I apologize for that. Let me also say that I genuinely appreciate your taking time to come here. I've benefitted enormously from learning what it is that interests you and troubles you, and makes you happy. I appreciate a number of suggestions that have been made, and in that respect I have selfishly benefitted from this conference in very real ways. I also hope just as much that there have been new friendships made, that there is a greater appreciation on the part of everyone as to the nature of our overall work, that there is a greater understanding of the work of other departments and schools and colleges, -- an offsetting of the tendency to be encapsulated in our own particular sphere of interest. To that extent this conference will have a rippling effect. Through your conversations with colleagues upon your return, we can hope to improve the general level of understanding of our problems as well as a sense of the opportunities that are clearly there for us if we play our cards right. Then not only will my life be easier, but infinitely more important the University of Utah will have a basis for being optimistic about its future as against being unduly and unfairly pessimistic about its chances.

So I want to say thank you very much.