

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, October 18, 1990**

- Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Thomas Clayton, W. Andrew Collins, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, J. Bruce Overmier, Thomas Scott, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Shirley Zimmerman
- Guests: Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), Professor Laurie Hayes (Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women), Vice President Marvalene Hughes, Maureen Smith (Brief)

**1. Report of the Chair**

Professor Ibele began the meeting by welcoming Geoff Gorvin, the new editor of Footnote, and introducing him to the Committee.

He then reported that the Committee would be invited to have lunch with the Board of Regents on November 8. He will also be making a report to the Board earlier in the morning, he said, and has been asked to provide a brief written digest of what will be said; he solicited members of the Committee for their views on topics that he should touch on in his report.

Apropos his trip to the meeting of Big Ten faculty governance leaders, Professor Ibele told Professor Scott, there is an effort among Big Ten presidents and faculty leaders to have a joint meeting at some point this Fall to exchange views and learn of common interests.

Professor Ben-Ner, chair of the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), had inquired if FCC wished to become involved in the discussions concerning disability coverage or if it was content to leave the matter in their hands. The Committee appeared willing to leave the matter in the hands of SCFA.

Professor Ibele drew to the attention of the Committee a handout, a copy of a memo from David Berg (MPIS) to the President and Vice Presidents concerning the number of campuses of post-secondary education in the various states and the spending thereon. Minnesota, he noted, is 6th in the nation in tax money collected for higher education; it is 41st in the nation in per student expenditures. While the citizens pay generously, the funds are spread very thinly--a phenomenon related, of course, to the extremely high secondary school graduation rate and the rate of participation of those graduates in post-secondary education (about 87%, which has led to large enrollment increases in the state universities and community colleges.)

One of the reasons Minnesota has such a high graduation rate from high school, it was suggested by Committee members, is that it has among the lowest standards for graduation in the nation.

Part of the reason for the spread of the funds, however, may be the sheer number of different geographical sites of post-secondary educational institutions in the State; only three other states have

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

more sites per capita than Minnesota: Alaska, North Dakota, and Alaska. There is also a high number of small institutions, with only a few hundred students, where there are no economies of scale achieved. President Hasselmo, he concluded, is wise to call this to the attention of the State.

A related issue, it was suggested, is the problems confronted by community college faculty. One reason they are swamped is because they are providing high school--remedial--education; they have students who cannot do arithmetic and who cannot read. The legislature would not be happy to learn it was paying for this education twice, once at the high school level and then again at the community colleges. The community colleges would be less burdened if they did not have this responsibility.

## **2. Review of the Senate and Assembly Dockets**

Professor Collins distributed copies of the dockets for the two meetings and reviewed the several items contained therein.

Policy on Events During Study Day and Finals Week The background to the policy proposed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (prohibiting the scheduling of events during Study Days and Finals Week which require the participation of students except by exception granted upon petition to SCEP) was explained by Professor Clayton. The principal change from the draft which had been presented to SCC last Spring is the addition of a provision calling for students who are granted an exception to the policy (that is, the student is permitted to miss a Final in order to participate in an event) to be provided an alternative means of completing the coursework. The new proviso makes it obligatory that the alternative be provided.

There was a question about whether or not SCEP should be the body which actually makes the decisions on whether or not to grant an exemption, as is called for in the policy; this appears to be micro-management inappropriate to Senate committees. Professor Clayton concurred that such activity might be more appropriately placed in Academic Affairs, either with review afterwards or recommendation first by SCEP, although it is assumed, he observed, that the exceptions granted will be very few. When SCEP proposes a procedure to consider exemptions (which will be presented to the Senate), Professor Clayton agreed, it will likely place decision-making responsibility in the hands of an administrative office.

It was clarified that there is no policy in place now; any conflict between events and Finals is left up to the student and the faculty member to resolve. This policy is intended to remove from the student and faculty member the burden of needing to make the decision or reach agreement. The policy, it was also pointed out, covers events, not individual students.

It was also clarified that the intent of the policy is that when, for example, Study Day falls on Saturday and the first day of Finals Week on Monday, the policy covers the period from the beginning of Study Day to end of Finals; when a campus has no Study Day, the policy covers Finals Week only. The policy applies to the system, not just the Twin Cities campus; it was written with the participation and endorsement of coordinate campus representatives on SCEP. It was also suggested that the publication of the policy in the college bulletins, as called for in the comments, would be inappropriate; such information appears only in the class schedules.

It was voted to place this item on the docket of the Senate subject to a confirming vote of the full SCC at its meeting of November 1 prior to the Senate meeting.

Resolution on ROTC Professor Collins next reported that the proposed resolution on ROTC, adopted by the Senate Committee on Social Concerns, had been provided to him only earlier that day. The Business and Rules subcommittee had agreed to print it in the Senate docket; if SCC disapproves placing it on the agenda it will be withdrawn.

There was confusion about what date was intended for action on a recommendation for action with respect to ROTC; there was also objection to the proposed deadlines for action.

It was agreed that the resolution should be on the docket and time set aside for discussion. SCC could also vote, it was noted, to change the item from discussion to action. It would be, if acted on, advisory to the Board of Regents.

There was also agreement that inquiry needed to be made about the legality of a land-grant institution refusing to participate in the ROTC program. It was not known if any other institution had severed the relationship with the Department of Defense--and what result such a decision might have had on the relationships with federal loan programs and agencies which granting research funds.

Other items There will be two other discussion periods on the Assembly agenda, one on an interim report on the Task Force on Liberal Education and the other on obtaining expressions of opinion about the governance of intercollegiate athletics. Later in the meeting Professor Collins reported that the students wished time on the Senate agenda to discuss student-faculty cooperation; time has been allotted.

### **3. Closed Discussion**

Professor Ibele briefly reported on a personnel matter.

### **4. Change in the By-laws to Re-Charter the Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women**

Professor Ibele next welcomed Professor Laurie Hayes to the meeting to discuss the proposed change in the Senate by-laws to re-charter the EEO Committee as a Senate committee once the Rajender consent decree expires at the end of 1990.

Professor Hayes briefly outlined the proposed change to the Committee, most of which remains as it had been before. Additions made link the Committee to the equal opportunity statement recently adopted by the Regents and link it to the EEO Officer of the University. The Committee will assume a more "proactive" if ambiguous role in expanding the diversity of the University.

The Committee proposed a change in the language specifying which University employees are within the sphere of concern of the EEO committee.

In light of the committee restructuring of the Senate a few years ago, is it appropriate to continue EEO as a committee of the Senate or should it instead be made subsidiary to another committee (such as faculty affairs)? Committee members concluded that it was appropriate to establish EEO as a Senate committee; it had previously reported through Faculty Affairs but that arrangement had proven not to be satisfactory. It was also reported that the group which had recommended the changes in the committee structure had concluded that EEO should remain a Senate committee.

## 6. Topics for Footnote

Committee members were asked by Professor Ibele to suggest issues which Mr. Gorvin might address in future issues of Footnote. Several were suggested:

- Continuing faculty evaluation, post-tenure reviews, and the question of merit pay; faculty compensation and differences in salary levels among colleges and units
- The costs and problems of physical plant: deferred maintenance, the purchase of steam, and other high-priced items which do not usually receive much attention
- Ways to address the costs and implications of the data on the large number of post-secondary education campuses
- Access to educational development programs now that the Educational Development Programs office has been disbanded
- Follow-up to the Swan Committee recommendations on faculty development and faculty development as well as the Graduate School report on evaluation of graduate programs

## 6. Discussion with Vice President Marvalene Hughes

Professor Ibele next welcomed Vice President Hughes to the Committee and introduced Committee members to her. He told her that the Committee was interested in the position she occupies because of the range of student services which her office supervises and the need for coordination with Academic Affairs in developing a sense of community, cohesion, and purpose in the education and experience for students. He said they would be interested in knowing of her view of the problems which exist, her agenda for the office, and ways in which the Committee could be of help to her.

Dr. Hughes thanked the Committee for the opportunity to join it; she distributed a list of goals and objectives for her office but noted that they are only preliminary. She said she had already consulted several times with Professor Ibele and recognized the value of the Committee in the orderly conduct of the University's business.

Student Affairs, she observed, has been "marking time" because her immediate predecessor had been advised to undertake no new initiatives prior to a permanent appointment to the office. She said she has been reviewing for some time the relationship between Student Affairs and the agenda for the University set out by the President.

Her own view of student affairs, she observed, is that a university such as this one must have strength in student affairs to complement its strong research and teaching programs. Student affairs is a co-curricular aspect of education which should complete the experience of students. For it to fulfill that role will require a good program of access to the University for students; in this respect there are definite new directions which will have to be taken in such areas as the common entry, the undergraduate initiative, and targeted recruitment (which will require a redesign of the Office of Admissions).

These activities will require greater outreach by the University in the State, improvement of the public image of the University among students, and improvement of the quality of services delivered to students once they are here. Services should be designed to serve all the populations of students who are on the campus. The ultimate goal is to assist students to become productive citizens when they leave the University.

In order to accomplish that mission, she said, she has involved her staff in training and retreat sessions. They have spent considerable time reviewing the University's mission statement as well as trying to determine the mission of Student Affairs. There are some very good programs, she observed, and there are some programs in need of evaluation and redesign. There has not been a unified understanding of the mission of the unit, she said; many of the units do not understand their role in student development and it will be her responsibility to assist them to that end. They are developing a mission statement which encompasses all of the units; when it is ready it will be provided to the Committee.

Dr. Hughes said that she has also asked each unit in Student Affairs to define its specific mission and to draw its staff into the planning process. How the units relate to the President's goals for the University must be made clear; in the process of clarifying those responsibilities there must also be development of accountability measures.

It has become apparent to her, she told the Committee, that there has been no systematic means of evaluating units in Student Affairs comparable to the reviews of academic units. The first office to be reviewed will be the Admissions Office; the internal and external teams are now being identified. The review is to be completed no later than Spring Quarter.

Vice President Hughes informed the Committee that Professor Laurie Hayes has accepted the position of interim Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; she will be responsible for Student Support Services, Student Activities, and Residence Life. Because there would be a new administration in Student Affairs, moreover, there are a number of vacant positions which need to be filled. There is also a new position, created from reallocation and reorganization, a director of budget and planning. There must be centralized budgeting in Student Affairs, she said, and there must be an individual who can train managers and monitor the fiscal process on a day-to-day basis. The present decentralized budgeting makes management very difficult.

A dilemma she confronts as a new administrator is that she arrived during a time of reallocation but with a mandate to build a strong Student Affairs office. The two processes appear to be antithetical but she recognizes that her office must be a good steward of resources.

One area that needs immediate attention, she said, is special student population services. She has already assigned one staff person to develop a pilot program for commuter students which will make them more a part of the University community. Another issue she had to confront is the representation of graduate students in governance. Yet another with which she must deal is the response to the federal statute on services for the handicapped and disabled. Specialized services are also being requested by the gay and lesbian population. The relationship with the Greek system also needs examination; the arms-length relationship of the past will not continue. Each of these groups, she said, must be attended to.

One Committee member inquired of Dr. Hughes about the involvement of her office in ROTC.

She said it was on her agenda before she even arrived on campus; students made it known to her that it was a primary agenda item for the year. Their goal is to convince the administration that ROTC should be evicted from the campus, an objective which conflicts with the view of the Regents and the administration. The Board and administration recognize, however, the conflict with the human rights policy adopted by the Regents. She told the Committee that she has spoken with Professor Ibele about forming an advisory task force on ROTC; the only thing the University can really do, at present, is try to resolve very specific issues on a day-to-day basis. Dr. Hughes did not know whether or not there is any legal obligation on the part of the University to provide an ROTC program.

Another Committee expressed concern about the change from the model of having students at the University for four years to one where they are expected to go elsewhere for two years and then come to the University as upper division students. Much of the discussion has had to do with differentiating the mission of the University from other systems; has there been any planning in Student Affairs to accommodate this expected change to upper division education and the likely different kinds of services which would be needed? Can the transition be achieved smoothly--if it is the goal--while also retaining the quality of the experience for those who do come to the University for all four years. Dr. Hughes agreed that there is cause for concern about the change--the first two years, she said, are important for building bonds between students and the University. There will, however, certainly be a need to address the different needs of the more advanced students.

Asked about her relationship with the coordinate campuses, Dr. Hughes said her role was to serve as system representative, particularly in the development of policies and programmatic activities. She works with the vice chancellors from the campuses; they will serve in her own cabinet. It was also suggested that Student Affairs should need to address non-traditional students on the coordinate campuses.

About serving the need of various groups of students, one Committee member pointed out that there is a need to build community and to emphasize what students have in common as well as responding to their differences. There is no such thing as a "class" any more (e.g., Class of 1993); the linking factor for students is now primarily the major--it is there that they are linked to the faculty and the University. How can the disciplines and majors be helped to flesh out the co-curricular activities of students so that as many as possible leave with a good feeling about the University and a sense of connection to some other group of students. The major may offer the best opportunity to achieve that goal. Dr. Hughes concurred and observed that students have told her that the institution does not "care" very much for them but that they place a high value on the education they received. Community building, she agreed, is necessary; students do have stronger feelings about their school at most other places. Making a campus more "people-friendly" is important.

Professor Ibele thanked Dr. Hughes for her comments and invited her to call on the Committee to help her if needed. She asked Committee members to feel free to forward suggestions to her.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand