

NOTE NEW SCC OFFICE TELEPHONE #,
INDICATED BELOW ON LETTERHEAD



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall (c/o Agronomy)
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)625-7719

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 17, 1986
12:10 - 2:00
300 Morrill Hall

AGENDA

Approx. time

- 12:10 1. Minutes of March 6 (sent previously).
2. Reports:
 - A. CtF Special Committee on Minority Programs. Prof. Merwin.
 - B. Governance Subcommittee. Ms. Hanson.
 - C. Finance Committee. Prof. Merwin.
 - D. SSCC Chair. Mr. St. Laurent.
 - E. SCC Chair. Prof. Stuthman.
 - F. Reports from Regents meetings.
- 12:25 3. Nominating a vice chair for the Senate and Assembly.
- 12:30 4. Special Committee on Child Care. Guest: Professor Margery Durham, Chair.
(Note: copies of the final form of the Committee's report will be sent to SCC members.)
- 1:00 5. Civil Service Committee representation: the Williams Committee report. (Note: members see enclosed table on committee composition)
- 1:20 6. Senate and Assembly docket for April 17: SCC needs to verify support for Committee on Committees' motions on bylaws and rules amendments.
- 1:30 7. Senate and Assembly business anticipated for May 15 meetings.
- 1:40 8. Accreditation site visit follow-up.
- 1:50 9. Other business.

Note: CtF Forum on Lower Division begins at 2:15.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall (c/o Agronomy)
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)625-7719

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 17, 1986
12:15 - 2:00 p.m.
300 Morrill Hall

Members present: John Aule, Ellen Berscheid, Patrick Durbin, Patricia Gearrity, Richard Goldstein, David Hamilton, Linda Hanson, Ronald Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Tim Pratt, Wanda Reinke, Irwin Rubenstein, Roy St. Laurent, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman (Chair), Bruce Williams.

Guests: Margery Durham, Thomas Ewald, Stephanie Oskie, Maureen Smith, Sue Smith-Cunnien.

1. The minutes of the March 6 meeting were accepted.

2. Reports.

A. Special Committee on Governance. Ms. Hanson.

The committee's preliminary report will be primarily on the uses of our governance system rather than on its structure. It will seek to clarify the Senate's purposes as a forum for debate and it will affirm that legislative authority should reside there, while being informed by the Senate's committees.

The Governance Committee suggests a brief forum on its interim report to precede the May 15 Senate and Assembly meetings. In a May 1 SCC discussion the Governance Committee will seek advice on the forum and will ask for feedback to the draft report, including how to structure the final report and who should be its primary audience. The draft report will have an internal focus.

Professor Rubenstein viewed the Governance Committee's purposes as similar to those of the accreditation Self-Study Committee (whose report is both for an internal audience and for outside reviewers as preparation for their visit). He asked that the report be circulated so that the community can be aware of its contents before the forum.

Professor Sorauf suggested postponing a forum on governance until next year following receipt of observations of the external reviewers, because senators may be getting too frequent a dose of forums. Professor Murphy responded that the Governance Committee has been working hard since early winter, still has its momentum and enthusiasm, and would prefer a forum this spring. Mr. St. Laurent seconded this view, adding that a number of issues have emerged which should generate considerable interest and discussion.

B. SSCC Chair. Mr. St. Laurent.

(1) Mr. St. Laurent introduced John Aule, the UMC student representative for today's meeting; UMC's election for a permanent student representative is scheduled for this month.

(2) The Student SCC will be guests of UMD on May 1 for dinner and a meeting at Glensheen. Mr. St. Laurent reported that the faculty SCC members are also invited for the dinner, a tour of Glensheen, and a talk by Chancellor Heller. It was discovered that most FCC members are unable to accept that invitation, but Professors Stuthman and Merwin will be able to attend.

(3) HECB link. The chair of the Student Senate now serves, by virtue of holding that position, as the University's representative on the Student Advisory Council to the Higher Education Coordinating Board.

(4) SSCC has established its nominations subcommittee.

C. SCC Chair. Professor Stuthman.

(1) SCC's spring quarter meeting schedule has been modified and copies of the new schedule distributed. On May 1 SCC will meet for an hour in addition to separate SSCC and FCC meetings; on May 7 SCC and Finance will meet jointly with President Keller and Vice President Murthy.

(2) Hand-out: replacement copies of Patricia Swan's February 28 memorandum on Lower Division were distributed. They incorporated editorial corrections and Professor Swan's signature.

3. Nominating a vice chair for the Senate and Assembly.

Professor Stuthman expressed the committee's appreciation for the work of FCC's nominations subcommittee. Professor Rubenstein, subcommittee chair, proposed that the Consultative Committee nominate Dr. Charles Campbell of the Department of Physics for vice chair of the Senate and Assembly for the coming year. The position includes ex officio voting membership on the SCC and FCC. Professor Rubenstein has contacted Dr. Campbell who has said he would be pleased to serve if elected.

The chair called for a vote on the nomination, which the SCC approved without dissent. The SCC will make that nomination in today's Senate and Assembly meetings.

4. Special Committee on Child Care.

Professor Stuthman welcomed Professor Margery Durham, chair of the special committee, and the other committee members present, and commended them on a good report. He reminded the meeting that President Keller and the SCC had jointly created this special committee. SCC members had been sent copies of the committee's report in advance of this meeting.

Professor Durham introduced the committee members present, Tom Ewald, Stephanie Oskie, Sue Smith-Cunnien, and Ron Kubik. She distributed copies of an April 16 memorandum she had received from Patty Finstad, Director of the

University Child Care Center, which supported the thrust of the report but urged attention to additional needs she regarded as slighted in the report. Professor Durham corrected some misunderstandings reflected in the memorandum: first, the special committee favours continued Student Services Fee support for subsidizing the cost of child care for low-income students in the three University Centers; second, the committee favours University provision of space, utilities, and building maintenance for the parent cooperative child care programs in the Como and Commonwealth Housing communities; third, the committee favours some rehabilitation of the existing University spaces used for child care.

Professor Durham commented further on several points in that memo:

- Committee hopes child care on campus will get a greater subsidy through loans of space;

- Committee views the argument over removing child care fees from the spectrum of Student Services Fees as a legal one, not a pragmatic one, since it is obvious that students are differential users of many of the fee-supported activities;

- Committee could not go deeply into the concern that child care workers are undervalued and their pay too low; it is one of the questions the coordinator would attend to. Professor Durham noted that some of the University's child care employees receive the University's fringe benefits, which increases the value of their real wages.

Professor Durham then summarized for the SCC the major conclusions and recommendations of the special committee. The University should attend to the matter of child care for two reasons: because it has a social and intellectual responsibility to do so and because it is in the University's own interest.

(1) The University's social responsibility and intellectual opportunity.

Neglecting the need for good child care will not get more women to go back home; we must deal with the fact that large numbers of children need child care. We should bring the University's intellectual resources to bear on this issue. The needs are now being met on an ad hoc basis, and someone had better take a look at how that is working. The subject requires scrutiny and evaluation by the University and presents an intellectual challenge.

(2) The University's self-interest.

The student population and the faculty are aging. To attract the best students and high quality young faculty the University will need to provide good services, including child care.

Professor Sorauf asked what assumptions the special committee makes about the shift which would take place as the University's price structure and quality of service lure University people to move children out of other centers into University centers. Professor Durham said the committee acknowledges that demand will grow as supply grows, but added the University would work cooperatively rather than competitively with other care suppliers. Child care is still a growing business.

In answer to a question, she agreed the proposed changes are not expected to change significantly the proportions of those who pay full cost and those who are subsidized.

Professor Sorauf read the report as focusing more on service than on research and asked whether the 16% of costs currently covered by academic departments might therefore decline. Professor Durham said that would not necessarily happen. The committee did not go into detail on what research should be done, leaving that up to the faculty members. She said it is true the University now has more purposes in providing child care than at the time of the 1973 proposal. Also, in contrast to then, it now looks like a condition that is here to stay for awhile.

Ms. Smith-Cunnien said that one of the committee's hopes is that renovation will render the child care spaces more amenable to research, such as by including observation rooms.

Professor Latterell said that if research is to be accommodated the units which might perform it should be consulted; he inquired whether the Institute of Child Development, as a whole, had been asked to respond to the proposal. Professor Durham said the committee had not asked it to, but could do so.

NEXT STEPS. Professor Stuthman suggested that a subcommittee of SCC be charged with developing a proposed SCC position in response to the report; that position would identify which aspects of the report and recommendations should be taken to the Assembly and which to the administration, and might identify units SCC would want consulted.

Professor Stuthman again praised the high quality of the report and thanked Professor Durham and the other committee members.

5. Civil Service representation on additional Senate and Assembly committees: The Williams Committee report.

SCC members had received a memorandum describing the recommendations of the Committee on Committees.

Professor Murphy moved that in the case of those committees for which Committee on Committees and SCC are already in full agreement, a motion for those membership changes be submitted to the Senate and Assembly for the May 15 meeting. The motion was carried without dissent.

Professor Sorauf recommended that SCC defer to the expertise and experience of Committee on Committees. He moved that where SCC and Committee on Committees differ, SCC accept the recommendation from Committees. (For membership, this difference occurs only with respect to the Finance Committee; FCC proposed two civil service representatives, Committee on Committees recommended one.) The motion was carried without dissent.

With respect to a new experiment of adding, on a three-year trial basis, non-voting civil service representation on four additional committees, Professor Sorauf moved that the SCC endorse Committees' recommendation for one such representative per committee. (The Williams Committee had recommended two representatives for some of these.) Mr. St. Laurent indicated that the SSCC had concerns about introducing civil service representation on some committees, particularly Student Affairs, and would prefer one to two. No dissent was voiced and the chair declared that the committee approved the motion.

IN SUM: The Consultative Committee fully approves the recommendations of the Committee on Committees with respect to the Williams Committee Report, and approves submitting to the Assembly and Senate the appropriate motions to amend

the bylaws and rules to accommodate those membership changes, as well as making an informational report about the new experiment. The membership changes recommended would add the following voting civil service representation to Senate committees:

Research - 1	Animal Care - 2
Physical Plant and Space Allocation - 2	Finance - 1
Services to the Handicapped - 2	

and to one Assembly committee:

Calendar - 2.

The experiment would place one civil service representative on the Senate Committee on Extension and Community Programs, and one each on the Assembly Committees on Convocation and the Arts, International Students, and Student Affairs.

6. Senate and Assembly dockets for April 17.

A. The chair ascertained the SCC's being in accord with two bylaws and one rules amendment, discussed at an earlier meeting, which Committee on Committees was to move in today's Senate meeting:

(1) To add to the Senate Committee on Social Concerns ex officio membership from the Office of the Vice President for Finance. (The request originated in SCSC which seeks investments-related information to assist it in advising the University on proxy voting.)

(2) For those Senate committees where Senate membership is now required of some appointees, relaxing the limit to require Senate membership within the last five years.

(3) For the Senate Planning Committee, to increase the faculty membership from at least four to at least 6, thereby codifying what has become current practice because of the Committee's larger and altered role since the Planning Council was abolished.

There were no SCC objections to any of these amendments. The chair announced he would report to the Senate the SCC's unanimous support for the amendments.

B. Motion on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements. Professor Stuthman distributed copies of amendments which had been submitted to the motion and an April 16 memorandum from Professor W. A. Collins, special committee chair, giving the committee's position on each amendment. The Consultative Committee took the same position as the Collins Committee in regarding as a friendly amendment only the one requiring the SCC to report annually to the Senate on this subject.

SCEP had submitted a motion of amendment to add that in implementation, "...the University should adhere to all recommendations in the final report of the Special Committee..." The Special Committee suggested this rewording: "Implementation of these preparation standards should be guided by the full set of recommendations in the final report..." While some SCC members saw no

difference in meaning between the two, others found the SCEP wording unnecessarily admonishing.

Professor Sorauf moved that the SCC support the wording suggested by the Special Committee, after asking the Special Committee chair if he would not prefer to use "requirements" consistently in the sentence instead of using "standards" in some places. There was an SCC consensus of support for this position, as well as for requesting that "requirements" (which is used at many points in the overall motion and report, and is understood to be the intent) replace "standards" throughout the motion and report.

Encouraging arts and computer preparation. The Special Committee proposed inserting a new sentence immediately following the sentence which states the proposed requirements:

"In addition, one year of instruction in the arts (music, drama, or the visual arts) is strongly recommended as valuable preparation for study at the University; and familiarity with microcomputers and common types of software is recognized as an important skill for university work."

Professor Stuthman reported to the SCC that, because there had been considerable attention outside as well as inside the University to the Special Committee's interim report, particularly to the interim list of preparation requirements which included courses in the arts and computer skills, it now appears to people on the outside that attention to those has been abandoned. Many people called or wrote with ire to protest what they saw, particularly for the arts, as a big step backwards for the University. The Special Committee's added wording attempts to highlight the two areas and demonstrate a step forward. The SCC concurred with this amendment; some members hope it is a step towards eventually requiring arts preparation.

7. May 15 Senate and Assembly meetings; anticipated business.

Senate: Distribution of indirect cost recovery funds
Strategic Defense Initiative
Committee nominations;

Assembly: Grading policy
Child Care (possibly)
Committee nominations.

Forum: Interim report from Governance Committee.

Mr. Pratt asked whether the SCC planned to act with respect to the motion on SDI, particularly since the Research and the Social Concerns Committees have reported out opposite positions. Professor Stuthman said he would be meeting with the chairs of those two committees and the vice chair of the Senate to discuss handling the motion within the Senate, given the differing recommendations; he can report on May 1 on those discussions.

June 5: Added Assembly meeting to address the semester issue and coordinating lower division education.

8. Accreditation team site visit: follow-up.

Professor Stuthman recognized the year-long self-study preparation effort, and called upon Professor Rubenstein for comments. Professor Rubenstein said that when he had asked the team what surprised them about this University, they answered that although this is a major research university, they encountered surprising provincialism at all levels.

The team reports to the president within a month or two. He will choose the ways in which he wants to use the report.

The Consultative Committee responded warmly to Professor Murphy's call for a round of applause to Professor Rubenstein's Self-Study Committee for its good work.

9. The chair invited the introduction of new items of business. None being offered, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant

For Consultative Committee meeting of 4/17/86

MEMORANDUM

To Senate Consultative Committee

From Committee on Committees*

Subject Williams Committee Report on Civil Service representation

Committee on Committees is generally supportive of the Williams Committee report. Professor Williams, a member of C on C's, took part in the April 14 meeting being reported, and supports the modifications recommended by the Committee.

General principle: If and when civil service representatives are added to a committee, it should be with voting rights.

There is some concern about having a clear faculty voice, and this led C on C's to recommend one civil service member instead of two in some cases. Assume the CS people named will be mature and able people, so are not persuaded by idea ^{one would be intimidated.} The Senate must place a good deal of trust in the Civil Service Committee's being able to do a good job of identifying committee members. C on C's appreciates Professor Williams' concept of community, and the value of opportunities which help civil service employees feel a part of this University community.

When considering committees to which a new experiment might be extended, the Williams Committee was working from the handbook definitions of the committees only, and not from acquaintance with the operations of the committee, in developing its rationale.

* RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTICAL TO FCC'S regarding CS membership

ACIA: remove from list for current consideration
Research - 1 CS voting
Physical Plant and Space Allocation - 2 CS voting
Services to the Handicapped - 2 CS voting
Animal Care - 2 CS voting
Library - no CS

* DIFFERENT C on C's RECOMMENDATION regarding CS membership

Finance 1 CS voting

* RECOMMENDATIONS ON A NEW EXPERIMENT WITH OTHER SENATE AND ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES
(Differ from FCC in recommending just one non-voting civil service rep. for each):

Extension and Community Programs - 1 CS Convocation and the Arts - 1 CS
International Students - 1 CS Student Affairs - 1 CS

* 4/15 telephone call from Shirley Clark to Meredith Poppele reporting Committee on Committee's positions taken in its April 14 meeting.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Civil Service 5/29
SCC 6/5

May 20, 1986

Dr. Deon Stuthman
Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
c/o Department of Agronomy
and Plant Genetics
418 Borlaug Hall
St. Paul Campus

Dear Dr. Stuthman:

On behalf of the members of the Civil Service Committee, I would like to thank the Senate Consultative Committee, the Civil Service Representation Committee, and the Committee on Committees for making it possible for civil service employees to have permanent and voting membership on various Senate Committees. We are pleased that the University Senate approved the recommendations which were presented at the May 15 meeting. The efforts made by all individuals to help us secure this participation in the University governance system are greatly appreciated. Civil Service employees play an important role in the University as it strives to carry out its mission of teaching, research, and service. This role will now be strengthened with our continued involvement on committees which discuss and make important recommendations on a variety of University issues. As new representatives are selected for committee assignments the screening committee will continue to match experience, skills, and interest to available committee openings.

Again, my thanks for your efforts on behalf of the civil service community.

Sincerely yours,

Raleigh Kaminsky

Raleigh Kaminsky
Chair, Civil Service Committee


cc: Dr. C. Arthur Williams, Chair, CS Representation Committee
Dr. Shirley Clark, Chair, Committee on Committees
Members, Civil Service Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall (Agronomy)
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612) 376-2479

March 21, 1986

To: Shirley Clark, Chair, Committee on Committees
From: Deon Stuthman, Chair, Senate & Faculty Consultative Committees 
Re: Report of the Williams Committee: Business for our committees

You'll remember that in November the SCC appointed a special Civil Service Representation Committee to evaluate the three-year experiment of non-voting civil service participation on several Senate and Assembly committees. The Williams Committee has done its work carefully and thoughtfully and has submitted its beautifully clear report. I'm sending you now a copy of that report and requesting that the Committee on Committees consider it with a view toward making a recommendation to the Senate. My hope is that Committee on Committees and the full Consultative Committee will jointly sponsor motions based upon the report's recommendations for presentation to the May 15 Senate and Assembly meetings.

Art Williams of your committee joined the FCC meeting yesterday and gave us a good description of how his committee had gone about its work and of how helpful the chairs (past and present) of the included committees had been. FCC members were positive about the recommendations. Here are the points on which some alternative suggestions were made:

- ACIA: There was a consensus, with Art Williams concurring, to put a hold on the recommendation for ACIA until we see whether any restructuring of that committee is proposed by the Athletics Task Force. (At any rate, two non-faculty voting members cannot be added in the current structure because that would violate the Big Ten requirement of a faculty majority.)
- Finance: FCC did not arrive at a consensus in the course of yesterday's meeting as to whether civil service representation should be on a voting or a non-voting basis, or whether it might even be designated ex officio, specifying the kind of background desired in the reps.

In addition, the FCC wants to talk about the new committees proposed for a similar experiment, which there was not time to do yesterday.

Shirley Clark

3/21/86

page 2

FCC members were unable to recall why the Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility has for some time included voting civil service members. We have to do a little historical research here.

And finally, on our end, the Student SCC will be looking at these recommendations on their own and letting FCC know their views.

Altogether, it would be great if we had a complete meeting of minds among Student and Faculty Consultative Committees and the Committee on Committees by late April so we can all together enter motions by the May 1 deadline for assembling the docket. My thanks to you in advance for fitting the business into your committee's busy schedule.

c: C. Arthur Williams
Roy St. Laurent (with enclosure)
Tim Pratt
Caroline Czarnecki (with enclosure)

Enc.

:mp

CHILD CARE AT THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS
of the
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Submitted by
The Special Committee to Develop
Child Care Policy Recommendations for the Twin Cities Campus
April, 1986

Margery S. Durham, Chair
John S. Adams
Michael L. Baizerman
Thomas C. Ewald
Vanne O. Hayes
Raleigh E. Kaminsky
Ronald Kubik
Shirley G. Moore
Stephanie Z. Oskie
Paul C. Rosenblatt
Sue Smith-Cunnien
Anne T. Truax

ABSTRACT

Available child care is insufficient to meet the needs of many parents associated with the University of Minnesota. Since neither market forces nor government assistance seem likely to fill the gap, the University should assist parents who are current and prospective students, staff, and faculty to obtain high-quality child care. Providing such assistance will help the University to recruit and to retain outstanding people. Because it is in the University's interest to promote the best learning possible from its students and the best work possible from its employees, child care that frees students, staff, and faculty from these time commitments and concerns is economical and productive. For these reasons and because it provides unparalleled opportunities for research into this area of great and recent social change, a well-planned coordination of various child care services furthers the Commitment to Focus.

The Committee therefore urges the following action:

1. Creation of a new position: the University Coordinator of Child Care.
2. Creation of a standing committee on child care as part of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.
3. Creation of at least 100 new child care openings by December 31, 1986 and of an additional 100 by June 1, 1987.
4. Inclusion of child care expenses as a criterion for student financial aid.
5. Insertion of pay-deducted, tax-free child care into the University employee benefits program.
6. Addition of both new and renovated child care space to the 1987 Legislative Request.
7. Inclusion of new and renovated space, equipment and other start-up funds in the University's Capital Campaign.
8. Affiliation with the two major Minneapolis and St. Paul child care referral services.
9. Commitment of start-up funds for research and facilities to already-organized constituencies.
10. Provision of subsidies for low-income students and employees.

CHILD CARE AT THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Introduction

Since 1970 child care in America has changed in ways that require serious attention. The rapid change in family structure over the past 15 years has made high-quality child care one of the most pressing of the social issues now before us. The proposed Consortium on Children, Youth and Families shows that the University is aware of the need for further understanding and for constructive, timely action on behalf of our society's youngest, most vulnerable, and most potentially valuable members -- those who in 20 years will be shaping the nation's future. Clearly, the University has the responsibility for asking questions about such long-term societal needs, and for evaluating critically their alternative solutions.

So pressing was this matter as long ago as 1973 that the University established one child care center on campus. This center has continued to function well, though its facilities and staff are strained and can meet only a small fraction of the present need. Two other child care centers subsequently opened on a cooperative model and are also doing well with their slender resources. But these centers, however excellent in their particular ways, cannot begin to fulfill the University's responsibility in research, innovation and education, as folk wisdom disappears faster than scientific knowledge can replace it. On the other hand, present needs provide an opportunity for national leadership in this crucial area. This opportunity should be pursued in two closely related modes: in research and in providing immediately needed access to child care facilities for University students, staff and faculty.

Child Care and the Commitment to Focus

Both these modes are consistent with and will contribute to the Commitment to Focus. This plan, aimed at making the University of Minnesota one of the top public universities in the country, is an appropriate goal and an attainable one. Obviously, however, it requires certain changes and innovations to bring it about. Our proposals concern 1) focusing the University's considerable intellectual resources on what is now recognized as a public policy problem of staggering proportions; and 2) raising the University to a competitive level in its effort to attract top quality students, staff and faculty.

1) Intellectual focus: Years ago child care was considered to be largely a private matter. Statistics show beyond question

that it is not so today. The University can contribute innovations in child care policy, in methods of child care delivery, in the evaluation of care and the examination of evaluating standards, and in the training of child care workers. The state's two-year institutions can train the workers, but the education of those who do the training, and the scrutiny, evaluation and adjustments in such training so as to meet society's changing needs, can only be done here. The University has been a pioneer in medical practice, surgery, psychological testing, agricultural research and other areas. Surely our children deserve -- and the University can provide -- comparable investments of scholarly effort. Furthermore, in addressing immediate child care needs, we can learn more about what businesses, government agencies, and parents themselves need to know.

It comes as no surprise that until the last decade women have made it possible for men to work efficiently elsewhere. This arrangement has disappeared to the extent that almost 60 percent of the married men in the work force have wives working full or part-time. By 1990 it is estimated that two-thirds of the new entrants to the labor force will be women.¹ The disappearance of extended families, as well as the huge increase in single-parent families and in the number of families in which both parents work outside the home are causing businesses and government institutions (including, for example, Honeywell, 3M and the U.S. Army) to provide alternatives for traditional family child care.² Businesses have found that male absenteeism increases in proportion to wives' absence from the scene of child care, and this fact has provided additional incentive to meet the new needs. The arrangements, however, have been necessarily ad hoc, and require responsible testing and evaluation. The claim on the University's attention is imperative, and the opportunity for leadership is here.

2) Attracting high-quality students, staff and faculty: Recruiting the best undergraduate and graduate students, as well as staff and faculty, will be helped by a strong University child care program. Stanford and Harvard/Radcliffe have such programs already and are developing them further. (See Appendix C.) Other major institutions are following. Demographic studies show that the student population is aging: that 43 percent of University students are aged 25 or older. Between 1970 and 1982 the number of women aged 25 to 29 who were enrolled in higher education rose 249 percent. The number of women aged 30 to 34 rose 314 percent.³ We can assume that the pattern for male students is similar to that in business: that as men assume more responsibility for child care, their attention goes increasingly in that direction. Therefore, although the provision of equal opportunity for women suggests that the University community help its members find high-quality, affordable child care, the problem is not only a women's problem. The facts of family life today

require that male students, staff and faculty, too, be relieved from anxiety concerning the care of their children. Because it is in the interest of any university to promote the best learning possible among its students and the best work possible from its faculty and staff, the provision of child care whose quality, flexibility and cost meet their needs will serve the entire University well.

It is becoming generally known that in the early 1990's, about one-third of the University's faculty will retire, and that colleges and universities elsewhere in the country will face a similar situation. In the competition to attract, develop and retain young, high-quality faculty, child care can form a significant part of the benefits of teaching at the University of Minnesota. Directed by the University and delivered by appropriate private, public, partnership and cooperative service providers, child care is an appropriate and essential activity for a major university whose ambitions and goals are high.

Specific Needs

Available high-quality child care is insufficient to meet the needs of some parents associated with the University of Minnesota and others who would be associated with the University were appropriate child care available. Needs assessment is not straightforward where demand for services is likely to increase as the supply of the services increases. However, we estimate that at least 4,500 additional child care slots are needed by current members of the University community. At least 1,200 of these openings are needed on or close to campus. Currently, there are 162 FTE slots on campus.

Many different service providers and types of service must satisfy many different needs. For example, child care must take different forms for children of different ages, for parents who have different conceptions of the kind of care they want, who differ in their feelings about enrolling a child in a facility that might be part of University faculty research, and who differ in their interest in and capacity to participate in parent cooperatives. Child care must be different for children who will be present only occasionally, for children whose care is needed on a walk-in basis rather than on a prearranged time schedule, for children needing evening or weekend care, and for children who are sick. There must also be a plurality of service providers and types because of the realities concerning facilities available on and close to campus, because of the complexities of financing child care, and because of the University's interest, wherever feasible, in public-private partnerships. We do not want to compete with the private sector, but to complement it and facilitate its work. Finally, the University's commitment to study the effects of different approaches to child care and to

educate the public would be aided by a diversity in care arrangements. Given this complex array of needs, we propose the establishment of a University Coordinator of Child Care.

The University Coordinator of Child Care

A Coordinator of Child Care Services would identify needs and match them with child care services available on and off campus. Such a person would minimize the competition of the University with existing providers of high-quality care and existing referral organizations. A Coordinator would keep the issue of child care visible in and relevant to continuous University planning, would be an advocate for child care, and would promote the development of facilities and services that meet the changing needs. This office would also encourage collaboration between appropriate University units and child care programs, to facilitate training and research projects.

As described above, these needs are complex, including as they do on-campus, near-campus and close-to-home facilities for daylong care, drop in and odd hour care, infant care, sick child care, and summer and after school care. The University will have to play a variety of roles, providing space in which others can provide services, providing services directly, stimulating private services both close to and at a distance from the campus, and both supporting and using existing referral services. Similarly, the University should provide funding by taking advantage of federal, state and county subsidies, by providing facilities, and by working out options for child care among employee benefits. Appendix A contains further descriptions of the mission of the Coordinator's office and of the Coordinator's position.

A Standing Committee

There should be added to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly a standing committee on child care. This committee would make policy, serve as liaison with the Child Care Coordinator, and provide support on campus for the campus child care programs. This will help to insure that the issue receives its necessary attention as plans are made for the future.

Recommendations for Action

As a guide to the Child Care Coordinator and as an example both of reasonable action and specific priorities, the committee recommends the following:

I. A Timetable

The goals set below represent what the committee considers a practical start on providing campus facilities. Additions should follow. The Twin Cities Campus student population is very large and child care needs are correspondingly great (see Report, p. 4). The following list merely suggests a beginning:

- A. July 1, 1986 - Set the budget for the Child Care Coordinator's salary and office.
- B. December 31, 1986 - Have in place 100 new child care slots; this is to be achieved in part by supporting already-existing plans (e.g., in the Health Sciences and the Law School).
- C. June 1, 1987 - Have facilities and staff for an additional 100 children in grades K through 6 to meet summer school students' needs.

II. In addition to the goals described above, the following steps require a minimum investment of administrative time and money:

- A. Direct the Financial Aid Office to include child care expenses among its criteria of need.
- B. Place child care on the University's priority list for foundation funding, with particular emphasis on low-income students and staff.
- C. Insert pay-deducted, tax-free child care into a flexible employee benefits program. See Appendix D.
- D. Obtain cost estimates for remodeling space in such buildings as: Boynton Health Service (St. Paul) and Appleby Hall (Minneapolis) for child care. Consider the acquisition and use of former Marshall-University High School for child care, among other things, and add the acquisition of child care space to the 1987 Legislative Request.
- E. Allocate capital improvement funds for the renovation of space to make suitable child care facilities. See relevant pending federal legislation, Appendix E.

- F. To replace, if necessary, student fees currently allocated to child care and to replace lapsing community grants, the committee 1) endorses the plan of the Office of Student Affairs to fund space, maintenance and utilities for various student activities in a separate budget item in the Legislative Request (see Regents' agenda for January 9-10, 1986); 2) recommends a continuing University subsidy, for which current federal legislation is relevant. See Appendix E.
- G. Commit start-up money for organized constituencies, these funds to be awarded by the Child Care Coordinator.
- H. Subsidize research, for example through the proposed Consortium on Children, Youth, and Families.
- I. Affiliate with the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association (GMDCA) and the St. Paul Resources for Child Caring (RCC) to provide referral service. See Appendix F.

III. Special Needs

The following must be addressed in the future. At least one is of high priority because of the large need.

- A. Infant Care. This is what the largest number of people need. It is also the most expensive to provide. But in conjunction with steps II, A, B and C above, the University could make a start.
- B. Evening Care. Flexible hours are an essential part of any University child care system, to allow students time at the library and to accommodate night shift staff in University Hospitals and elsewhere on campus. See I, B above: Health Sciences staff have been especially active in planning for this type of care.
- C. Sick Child Care. This is hard to find in the community at large and is usually too expensive for students and low-income staff.

IV. Review

The child care program and its Coordinator should report annually to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Child Care Committee, as well as to the administrative officers assigned in Appendix A.

V. Funding

Since the problem of child care affects every University unit, it cannot easily be assigned to any single department. Research, as well as the designing, equipping and staffing of the facilities themselves, concerns too many different programs and departments to be the responsibility of only one. Hence coordination is needed in funding as well as in directing child care efforts. The project needs a dependable connection to both administrative and funding structures, and yet is unique perhaps in the variety of its relationships to many different units.

Therefore, the Committee suggests the assignment of as yet undesignated, discretionary funds directly by the University President.

Conclusion

The leadership that the University of Minnesota can supply in providing child care for members of the University community should be a useful guide for the state as a whole and could very likely affect how this widespread social need is perceived and met throughout the country. The issues that affect the University affect also other educational institutions, government agencies of all kinds, and businesses. It is becoming a standard employee service in local corporations and is a concern of both recently-passed and pending federal and state legislation, as well as a growing operation within government agencies. Thus far the need has been met on an ad hoc basis. The University can contribute its superior knowledge, its creative talent and its standards of rigorous examination to these on-going social experiments. Considering the gravity of the issue and the consequences at stake, the University's duty seems plain.

Furthermore, University leadership in exploring, rationalizing and providing child care is consistent with the goals set forth by President Keller and endorsed by the Regents. Such leadership will enable us to meet the challenges of the next decade in ways that are practical, observable, and essential to the quality of this University.

APPENDIX A

Mission Statement: Office of Child Care Services

The purpose of the Office of Child Care Services is to facilitate high-quality, workable child care arrangements for University of Minnesota families. The Office accomplishes this goal by identifying child care resources on campus and in the surrounding community, by informing University parents of these resources, and by assisting in the development of innovative child care programs when needed services do not exist. In addition, the Office interprets and carries out University child care policies, provides technical assistance to existing campus child care programs, and represents the child care interests of University parents and their children on campus and at the local, state and national levels. Finally, the Office encourages collaboration between appropriate University units and child care programs to facilitate training and research projects.

Position Description - Child Care Coordinator

The Child Care Coordinator position is a full-time, 12-month professional administrative position, \$1,667-2,000 a month, to begin July 1, 1986. This person will report to the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations and the Office of Academic Affairs jointly.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Coordinate child care centers on the Twin Cities Campus;
- Advise on and monitor University child care policy;
- Maintain knowledge of state and national legislation which affects child care; cooperate in lobbying efforts on needed child care legislation; develop grant proposals;
- Develop and maintain liaison between GMDCA and RCC and the University; develop computer linkage;
- Develop and maintain campus information systems on child care, a registry for cooperative child care arrangements and other parent assistance;
- Act as consultant with college task forces in developing new child care centers on campus, or in developing other forms of care (sick children, summer school care, evening care, etc.);
- Coordinate University units to facilitate joint teaching and research arrangements;

Communicate child care needs and interests to University Administration and units or committees with interest in child care;

Supervise the publicizing of child care information on campus to both prospective and present faculty, students and staff;

Provide staffing for the Child Care Council of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Operations Committee.

QUALIFICATIONS

Broad knowledge of child care operations, regulations and legislation at state and federal levels;

At least four years' experience in child care administration;

Undergraduate four-year degree, preferably in early childhood education or other relevant field;

Good communication skills and speaking ability;

Familiarity with the University of Minnesota/Twin Cities helpful.

TO APPLY:

Applications should include:

1. Letter of application detailing how your experience qualifies you for this position;
2. A copy of your curriculum vitae;
3. A 1,000-word statement on the future of child care in four-year and graduate level institutions of higher education in Minnesota;
4. Names of two references with telephone numbers.

APPENDIX B

I. Notes to Committee Report:

¹"Corporate Financial Assistance for Child Care," Dana Friedman. Research Bulletin No. 117 (The Conference Board Work and Family Information Center, New York, NY, 1985), p. 5.

²"Corporate Financial Assistance. . . .," pp. 14, 18-19. "Uncle Sam's Minding the Baby," Working Mother, (Jan., 1986), pp. 36-40.

³"Colleges Hard Pressed to Meet Demands for Child Care" Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Sept. 25, 1985), p. 29.

II. The Committee received considerable help from two University staff members: Cheryl Baldwin and James Elicker.

III. Bibliography: In addition to the legislation listed in Appendix E, the Committee consulted the following printed sources, among others:

"A Status Report on the U. of M. Child Care Center," U. of M. Child Care Center Policy Advisory Board. Spring, 1985.

"Campus Child Care Programs: The State of the Art. Results of a Selective National Survey," James G. Elicker, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, Univ. of Minn., March, 1986.

"Campus Child Care Survey" (Draft): Table 1. [James G. Elicker, CURA, 1986].

"Child Care at the U. of M.-Twin Cities: A Preliminary Needs Assessment," James G. Elicker, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, Univ. of Minn., Jan, 1986.

"Child Care Finds a Champion in the Corporation," William Meyers, The New York Times Sunday, Aug. 4, 1985, Sec. 3.

"Child Care for Employees' Kids, Special Report," Dana E. Friedman. Harvard Business Review, March-April, 1986, pp. 28-34.

"Ch[ildcare] Services and Programs at Stanford," Dorothea K. Almond and Phyllis H. Craig, Consultants on Childcare. Stanford University.

"Child Care Workers," Newsletter #98. Commission on the Economic Status of Women, St. Paul, MN January, 1986.

"Child Day Care Policies and Procedures Manual," Hennepin County Community Services Dept. June 1, 1984.

"Colleges Hard Pressed to Meet Demands for Child Care; Funds Called Inadequate," Elizabeth Greene. Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Sept. 25, 1985), pp. 29-30.

"Colleges Permitting Employees to Tailor Fringe Benefits to Their Own Needs," Scott Heller. Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 32, No. 2 (March 12, 1986), pp. 1, 31.

"Corporate Financial Assistance for Child Care," Dana Friedman. Research Bulletin, No. 177. The Conference Board Work and Family Information Center, c. 1985.

Corporations and Families: Changing Practices and Perspectives, Helen Axel. Report No. 868 The Conference Board, c. 1985.

"Day-Care Programs Take Hold on Campuses," Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 27, No. 23 (Feb. 15, 1984), pp. [21]-22.

"Evening Child Care Available at University of Kentucky," Project on the Status and Education of Women. Assn. of American Colleges. Vol. 15, No. 3 (Winter, 1986), p. 2.

"Minnesota Men in Child Care," Jim Elicker and Dan Greenberg, U. of M. Feb. 20, 1986.

News and Views from the Minnesota Council on Children, Youth and Families. Dept. of Human Services, State of Minnesota. Vol. 1, #4 (March, 1986).

Parts 9545.0510 to 9545.0670 Extracted from Minnesota Rules 1983 as in effect July 31, 1983. Dept. of Human Services: Group Day Care of Preschool and School-Age Children.

"Prospectus for a Consortium on Children, Youth and Families" Office of the Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs, U. of M. Draft, March 5, 1986.

"Recommendations to the Vice Presidents," University Task Force on Child Care. May, 1973.

"The Fall 1985 Student Fee Survey," Ron Matross, Research Bulletin, Office for Student Affairs, U. of M. Vol. 25, No. 1, Jan. 10, 1986.

"Uncle Sam's Minding the Baby," Working Mother, Jan., 1986.

CAMPUS CHILD CARE SURVEY

	<u>Number of Centers</u>	<u>FTE Children</u>	<u>Total Enrolled</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Ages Served</u>
<u>Public</u>					
Ohio State University	1	192	224	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities	3	162	216	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch, Some School
University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee	1	154	264	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
University of Texas- Houston	1	110	110	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
Georgia State University	1	105	240	Day+Eve	Inf, Tod, Presch, School Age
University of Michigan- Ann Arbor	2	104	226	Day	
University of Maryland-* College Park	1	100	?	?	Tod, Presch
Michigan State University	1	96	130	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
University of Mass.- Boston	2	90	105	Day	Tod, Presch
University of Connecticut	1	84	84	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
University of Sthrn. Calif.	1	64	85	Day	Tod, Presch
University of N. Dakota- Grand Forks	1	48	100	Day	Presch
University of Illinois- Urbana	1	40	80	1/2 Day	Tod, Presch
Indiana University- Bloomington	1	40	42	Day	Presch
Northern Illinois Univ.	1	38	73	Day	Tod, Presch
<u>Private</u>					
Stanford University	5	450	650	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch, School Age
Harvard/Radcliffe Univ.	7	350	375	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
Carnegie-Mellon Univ.	2	130	130	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch
Lehigh University	1	100	120	Day	Inf, Tod, Presch

*Planned, not yet constructed.

CAMPUS CHILD CARE SURVEY

	Sponsoring Department	Located	Free Space	---Sources of Cash Income, %---					
				Parent Fees	Univ Gen.	Acad. Dept.	Stud. Fees	Govt.	Other
<u>Public</u>									
Ohio State Univ.	Personnel	Off Campus	No	55	20	0	0	25	0
Univ. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	Child Devt. & Parent Bds.	On & Off Campus	Yes/ No	71	0	16	4	6	4
Univ. of Wisconsin- Milwaukee	School of Education	On Campus	Yes	75	0	0	24	1	0
Univ. of Texas- Houston	Student Services	Univ. Housing	Yes	100	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia State Univ.	College of Education	On Campus	Yes	42	0	0	10	48	0
Univ. of Michigan- Ann Arbor	Academic Affairs	On Campus	Yes	79	13	7	0	1	0
Univ. of Maryland- College Park *	Private Non-profit	On Campus	No	Not Available					
Michigan State Univ.	Student Services	Student Housing	Yes	95	0	0	0	0	5
Univ. of Mass. Boston	Student Affairs	On Campus	Yes	16	17	0	17	49	0
Univ. of Connecticut	Family Studies	On Campus	Yes	80	15	0	0	5	0
Univ. of So. Calif.	Human Resources	Near Campus	Yes	60	39	0	0	1	0
Univ. of N. Dakota- Grand Forks	Education	On Campus	Yes	82	0	10	0	8	0
Univ. of Illinois- Urbana	Inst. for Child Beh.	On Campus	Yes	80	0	20	0	0	0
Indiana Univ. Bloomington		On Campus	Yes	100	0	0	0	0	0
No. Illinois Univ.	Student Affairs	On Campus	Yes	39	15	0	17	29	0
<u>Private</u>									
Stanford Univ.	Indepen.	On Campus	Yes	90	0	0	0	0	10
Harvard/Radclif. Univ.	Various	U. Property	Yes	100	0	0	0	0	0
Carnegie-Mellon Univ.	Auxilliary Services	On & Near Campus	No	78	12	5	0	5	0
Lehigh Univ.	Private Nonprofit	Near Campus	No	Not Available					

"Corporate Financial Assistance for Child Care" Research Bulletin
No. 177, The Conference Board, New York, 1985, pp. 35-36.

Sample Dependent Care Assistance Plan ¹

This is a sample plan. Employers should consult their own tax attorneys or advisors with respect to adoption and implementation of any Dependent Care Assistance Program. If dependent care is to be offered as part of a flexible benefits program, then the requirements of Code section 125 must also be satisfied. The provisions of this sample 129 plan can be incorporated into a 125 plan which should be submitted to the Department of Labor.

ABC CORPORATION DEPENDENT CARE ASSISTANCE PLAN*

1. *Purpose* The company wishes to assist its employees in the care of their qualified dependents and therefore has adopted the ABC Corporation Dependent Care Assistance Plan (the "plan") set out herein for the exclusive benefit of those employees who are eligible to participate in the plan. The plan is intended to qualify as a dependent care assistance program under section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended and shall be construed to comply with Code section 129.

2. *Definitions* The following terms are defined for purposes of the plan and are indicated by capitalized initial letters wherever they appear in the plan:

a. "Dependent" shall mean (i) any child of an employee who is under age 15 or who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself or herself and with respect to whom the employee is entitled to claim an exemption for federal income tax purposes or who is in the custody of the employee for at least six months during the calendar year, and (ii) a spouse of the employee who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself or herself.

b. "Employee" shall mean any person employed by the company any portion of whose income is subject to withholding of income tax and/or for whom social-security contributions are made by the company, as well as any other person qualifying as a common law employee of the company.

c. "Dependent Care Expenses" shall mean amounts paid for the care of a dependent in the employee's home or at a dependent care facility which meets all applicable requirements of state or local law or is exempt from such requirements under the state or local law in question and amounts paid for related household services, except that the following items shall not be considered dependent care expenses:

(i) Amounts paid to a person with respect to whom the employee or his or her spouse is entitled to claim an exemption for Federal income tax purposes;

(ii) Amounts paid to a child of the employee who is 18 years of age or younger, and

(iii) Amounts paid for or reimbursed under another plan of the company or to which the company contributed on behalf of the employee, under any Federal, state or local program of dependent care assistance, or by an employer of the spouse or by an educational institution where the spouse is an enrolled student.

3. *Effective Date* The plan shall be effective on _____.

4. *Eligible Employees* All employees of the company shall be eligible to participate in the plan.

5. *Reimbursement of Expenses for Dependent Care*

a. Upon application of the employee, accompanied by a bill, receipt, cancelled check, or other written evidence of payment or of the obligation to pay dependent care expenses, the company will reimburse the employee for dependent care expenses incurred in order to enable the employee to be employed by the company, subject to the limits of paragraph b. The company reserves the right to verify all claimed expenses prior to reimbursement.

b. *Limitation on Benefits* The maximum amount of dependent care expenses which will be reimbursed under this plan shall be the lowest of:

(i) \$ _____ per calendar year; or

(ii) If the employee is single or is married and earns less than his or her spouse in a calendar year, the compensation paid to the employee by the company as reflected on his or her Form W-2 for the year; or

¹ Prepared by Barbara B. Creed, Partner, Pillsbury, Madison and Sutro, San Francisco, CA and Deene Goodlaw Solomon, Counsel, Pillsbury, Madison and Sutro. Reprinted with permission from the Child Care Law Center, San Francisco, CA.

* Additional plan provisions will apply and other considerations will pertain if the plan is an "employee welfare benefit plan" as defined in section 3 (3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended

APPENDIX D - Flexible Employee Benefits

(m) If the employee is married and the earned income of his or her spouse is less than the compensation paid to the employee by the company in a calendar year, the earned income of the spouse. If the spouse is a student or is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself or herself, the spouse will be deemed to have earned income (for each month that the spouse is a student or incapacitated) of \$200 per month if the employee has one dependent for whom care is provided and of \$400 per month if the employee has two or more dependents for whom care is provided

The company may require that the employee and/or his or her spouse certify to the company the amount of such spouse's expected earned income for the calendar year in question and may require that the employee provide documentary evidence of the amount certified in the form of an employment contract, paycheck stub, medical records (if the spouse is incapacitated) or a school enrollment form (if the spouse is a student)

c. *Direct Payment in Lieu of Reimbursement* The company may, in its discretion, pay any expenses for dependent-care directly to the dependent-care provider in lieu of reimbursing the employee in satisfaction of its obligations under the plan.

d. *Limitation of Benefits Paid to Prohibited Group* No more than 25% of the benefits paid under the plan in any one calendar year shall be provided for the class of individuals (or their spouses or dependents) each of whom owns more than 5% of the stock of the company, determined in accordance with Code sections 1563(d) and (e) without regard to Code section 1563(e) (3) (C), on any one day of that calendar year. If the benefits payable under the plan to such class exceeds the limits of this paragraph, the benefits paid to each individual member of the class shall be reduced proportionately.

6. *Funding Method.* The benefits provided under the plan are funded entirely out of the general assets of the company

7. *Notification of Terms of Plan.* A copy of the plan shall be given to all employees

8. *Statement of Benefits* On or before January 31 of each year, the company shall furnish each employee who received benefits under the plan a written statement showing the amounts paid or the expenses incurred by the employer in providing dependent-care assistance under the plan for the prior calendar year.

9. *Amendment or Termination.* The company may amend or terminate the plan at any time; provided, however, that any such amendment or termination shall not affect any right to benefits arising prior to such amendment or termination or shall cause benefits paid hereunder not to qualify as dependent-care assistance under Code section 129.

10. *Governing Law.* This plan and the rights of all persons under the plan shall be construed in accordance with and under applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, ERISA and the laws of the State of California

[Note: The following provisions should be added if the plan is an "employee benefit plan"]

11. *Fiduciary Responsibility and Plan Administration*

a. *Plan Sponsor and Plan Administrator.* The "plan sponsor" and the "administrator" of the plan, within the meaning of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), is the company.

b. *Named Fiduciary.* The company is the named fiduciary responsible for the operation and administration of the plan

c. *Assignment of Duties.* The duties of the company hereunder shall be carried out in its name by its executive committee, officers and employees. The company may designate any person to carry out fiduciary responsibilities under the plan pursuant to a written instrument which specifies the fiduciary responsibilities assigned to each such person. Any person may serve in more than one fiduciary capacity with respect to the plan.

d. *Employment of Advisors.* The company or a fiduciary designated by the company, may employ one or more persons to render advice with regard to its fiduciary responsibilities under the plan.

12. *General Plan Information.*

a. *Employer Identification Number.* The Employer Identification Number assigned to the company by the IRS is:

b. *Plan Number.* The Plan Number assigned to the plan by the company is: _____

c. *Plan's Fiscal Year.* The date of the end of the year for purposes of maintaining the plan's fiscal records is:

d. *Agent for Service of Legal Process.* The agent for service of process with respect to the plan is: _____

TO RECORD THE ADOPTION OF THE PLAN, the company has caused this document to be executed by its duly authorized officer this _____ day of _____.

ABC CORPORATION

By _____
Its

"Corporate Financial Assistance for Child Care," Research Bulletin No. 177, The Conference Board, New York, N.Y., 1985, pp. 37-39.

Selecting a Tax Treatment Plan for Dependent Care: A Comparison Between Salary Reduction and the Dependent Care Credit*

by Sally F. Goldfarb, National Women's Law Center**

As more and more firms opt for flexible benefit plans, an increasing number of employees will face the choice between salary reduction and the dependent care credit as a means of gaining federal income tax savings for dependent care expenses. A taxpayer can use only one of these two tax treatment methods for any given dollar of dependent care expenses.

Although tax laws are continuously subject to change, it is useful to compare the current advantages of these two tax treatments for employees at various income levels.

The Rough Test

As a general rule, if an employee's marginal tax rate is lower than the percentage of dependent care costs that can be subtracted from the employee's tax liability by using the dependent care credit, then the employee will receive greater federal income tax savings by using the credit method.¹ (This comparison does not take into account Social Security tax savings available through salary reduction, because it could be

misleading to do so without considering future Social Security benefits, which are subject to numerous variables beyond the scope of this article.) Of course, this rough test assumes that the employee's dependent care payments are equally eligible for the dependent care credit and for the employer's salary reduction plan. It also assumes that if dependent care benefits available under the salary reduction plan are not used, the employee will receive an equivalent amount of cash.

In order to apply this rough test, it is necessary to know the employee's adjusted gross income (which will determine what percentage of care expenses will be available as a credit) and the employee's taxable income (which will determine the marginal tax rate).²

To perform this comparison, the taxpayer should first locate the appropriate adjusted gross income on the Dependent Care Tax Credit chart (see page 8) to determine the percentage of care expenses that will be available through the credit. Then, the taxable income should be located on the applicable tax rate schedule in order to determine the marginal tax rate.³

* "Marginal tax rate" refers to the rate (that is, the percentage) of tax levied on the last dollar of an employee's taxable income.

** © 1985 by Sally F. Goldfarb. All rights reserved. For permission to reproduce any part of this article, contact the National Women's Law Center, 1751 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

** Attorney Sally F. Goldfarb prepared this article while a Women's Law and Public Policy Fellow at the National Women's Law Center. The author wishes to thank Nancy Duff Campbell, managing attorney of the National Women's Law Center, for her invaluable assistance. This article was made possible in part by funds granted by the Muskwinni Foundation and the Charles H. Revson Foundation. However, the statements made and views expressed are solely those of the author.

¹ *Adjusted gross income* is total income minus moving expenses, employee business expenses, IRA and Keogh deductions, penalties on early savings withdrawals, alimony paid, and the deduction for a married couple when both work. *Taxable income* is adjusted gross income minus itemized deductions, personal exemptions, and a partial deduction for charitable contributions if one does not itemize deductions.

² The annual tax rate schedules are provided by the Internal Revenue Service. Although the tax rate schedules are not actually used by all taxpayers for calculating tax liability (for instance, most taxpayers with taxable income under \$50,000 must use the tax tables rather than the tax rate schedules), the tax rate schedules are nevertheless ideal for determining marginal tax rates because the percentage at which each dollar is taxed is stated explicitly. All tax rate figures in this article are for the 1984 tax year.

statutory ceiling for expenses which may be counted toward the dependent care credit is \$2,400 for one dependent and \$4,800 for two or more dependents. Also, neither salary reduction for dependent care, nor expenses claimed for the dependent care credit, may exceed a taxpayer's or taxpayer's spouse's earnings, whichever is less.

If employees' dependent care expenses exceed the ceiling for their salary reduction plan or the credit—but not both—they should determine which of the two is more advantageous and then allocate their expenses to that option up to the maximum limit (unless they first reach a "tipping point," as discussed above). They should then allocate the remainder of their expenses to the other tax treatment. Of course, if employees' dependent care expenses equal or exceed the *sum* of the ceiling amount for the credit *and* the ceiling amount for their salary reduction plan, then they need not even determine which of the two is preferable; they should simply use each up to its applicable limit. Thus, for example, a taxpayer with \$8,000 in dependent care costs who is eligible to claim \$2,400 in expenses toward the dependent care credit

and \$5,000 in expenses through a salary reduction plan should use both of these methods fully—and will still have expenses "left over."

Necessary Information

As the above discussion indicates, employers or individual taxpayers wishing to use this refined test as effectively as possible need to have certain basic information available: yearly adjusted gross income, yearly taxable income, annual dependent care expenses, and the applicable ceilings on the dependent care credit and the salary reduction plan. They also must have access to the appropriate tax rate schedules and the dependent care tax credit chart. Ideally, all of this information should be obtained prior to the decision to elect dependent care benefits under a salary reduction plan for a given year. In fact, however, most taxpayers will have to make approximate projections of income and expenses and apply the refined test to these estimated figures.

One Method of Individual Tax Planning

While tax treatment decisions are subject to continuous changes in the law, and must be fully evaluated by accredited professionals for each individual case, the author of this article believes that the following method of tax planning ensures optimal use of the dependent care credit and salary reduction for dependent care expenses.

This method involves eight principal steps. (All income figures are for 1984.)

1. For the year in question, first determine the amount of dependent care expenses that qualify for the dependent care tax credit and salary reduction. Then determine the ceiling on eligible expenses under the dependent care tax credit and under the salary reduction plan.
2. If dependent care expenses equal or exceed the sum of both ceilings, go no further. Use both tax treatments to the permitted maximum.
3. For the year in question, determine the adjusted gross income and taxable income.
4. If the adjusted gross income is less than or equal to \$26,000 for married couples filing jointly, or \$22,000 for heads of households, or \$19,200 for single taxpayers, then proceed directly to step 7.
5. If taxable income is greater than or equal to \$24,202 for married couples filing jointly, or \$21,002 for heads of households, or \$18,202 for single taxpayers, then proceed to step 8.
6. Determine the credit percentage by locating the adjusted

gross income on the dependent care tax credit percentage chart. Find the marginal tax rate by locating the taxable income on the applicable tax rate schedules. Compare these two amounts. If the credit percentage is greater than or equal to the marginal tax rate, proceed to step 7. If the marginal tax rate is greater than the credit percentage rate, proceed to step 8.

7. Use the dependent care tax credit up to the applicable ceiling. Allocate remaining expenses to salary reduction. (It may be advisable to underestimate expenses for salary reduction in order to avoid the risk of forfeiting unused amounts at the end of the plan year.)

8. Determine whether there is a "tipping point." This is a level at which some portion of dependent care expenses, when subtracted from income through a salary reduction plan, reduces the taxpayer's taxable income to a point where the marginal tax rate is lower than the credit percentage available at the newly reduced adjusted gross income. If such a "tipping point" exists, allocate expenses to the salary reduction plan up to that point. Then allocate the remainder to the dependent care credit up to the applicable ceiling. If expenses still remain, allocate the remainder once again to the salary reduction plan. If there is not a "tipping point", allocate expenses to salary reduction up to the permitted ceiling and then allocate the remainder to the dependent care credit. (As noted in step 7 above, it may be advisable to underestimate expenses for salary reduction.)

Case Example

For a more specific example of how to apply the rough test, consider the following case. Assume that a head of household has an adjusted gross income of \$25,000. The taxable income, computed by subtracting various deductions and personal exemptions, is \$20,000. The appropriate charts indicate that the taxpayer is entitled to a tax credit of 22% of dependent care expenses and that the marginal tax rate at this level of taxable income is 24%. Based on this rough test, the taxpayer would conclude that the salary reduction method is more beneficial than the tax credit.

Employers can provide helpful guidance to their employees by pinpointing the precise income levels at which the dependent care tax credit is generally preferable to salary reduction and vice versa. Such determinations are crucial to the effective use of flexible benefit plans.

In order to make these determinations, certain basic relationships must be kept in mind. It is important to remember that the percentage of the dependent care credit declines (or stays the same) as income increases. By contrast, marginal tax rates rise (or remain stable) with increasing income. Also, a personal exemption is available for taxpayers and their spouses. Thus, married couples gain at least \$2,000 in personal exemptions, and single taxpayers and heads of households gain at least \$1,000. These exemptions are, of course, subtracted from adjusted gross income when computing taxable income.

Using these basic relationships, it is possible to calculate, first, the adjusted gross income levels at and below which salary reduction for dependent care expenses is never preferable to the dependent care credit method. Consider a married couple filing jointly with an adjusted gross income of \$26,000. With two personal exemptions, the adjusted gross income is reduced to a taxable income of *at most* \$24,000. (The actual taxable income may be lower because of deductions or additional exemptions.)

At an adjusted gross income of \$26,000, the dependent care credit is worth 22% of the care expenses incurred. This percentage will *increase* as the adjusted gross income decreases. At the same time, at a taxable income of \$24,000, married couples with joint returns have a marginal tax rate of 22%, and that marginal tax rate will *decrease* as taxable income decreases. Therefore, at an adjusted gross income of \$26,000 or less, married couples filing jointly will find the dependent care credit equally or more advantageous than a salary reduction scheme.

In the same fashion, heads of households will find the dependent care credit at least as advantageous as salary reduction at adjusted gross income levels of \$22,000 or less. Similarly, single taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of \$19,200 or less will find the dependent care credit to be the more advantageous tax treatment method.

The adjusted gross income cutoff points identified above do *not* mark the points at which salary reduction necessarily becomes more advantageous than the dependent care credit. For instance, a married couple with an adjusted gross income

of \$26,001 may or may not have a marginal tax rate that is higher than their 21% dependent care credit, depending on their number of deductions and personal exemptions.

The above cutoff points have all been based on adjusted gross income. However, taxable income, not adjusted gross income, is the key to determining the points at which *salary reduction* becomes the more advantageous tax treatment.

The taxable income levels at and above which salary reduction is always initially preferable to the dependent care credit are as follows: for married couples filing jointly, \$24,002 in taxable income; for single taxpayers, \$18,202 in taxable income; and for heads of households, \$21,002 in taxable income.

Refining the Test

Employers and employees should add two important refinements to the rough test previously described, in order to be sure that their conclusions are accurate for individual cases.

The first refinement involves the total amount of dependent care expenses incurred for the year in question. As an example, assume that for the tax year 1984, a single taxpayer with one child and two personal exemptions, but no deductions, has an adjusted gross income of \$21,000. Deducting the two \$1,000 personal exemptions, this taxpayer has a taxable income of \$19,000. Using the rough test previously cited, the taxpayer would note that the 26% marginal tax rate for taxable income of \$19,000 is higher than the 24% dependent care credit available for an adjusted gross income of \$21,000. Thus, the taxpayer would conclude that using the employer's salary reduction plan for dependent care expenses was the better method. But there could be a hitch. Suppose that the taxpayer's dependent care expenses were more than \$800 for the year. In that case, the taxpayer would be better off allocating the amount exceeding \$800 to the dependent care credit. This is because once the taxpayer reduces his or her income by \$800 through salary reduction, the taxable income level falls to \$18,200 (at that level, a 23% marginal tax rate applies). The adjusted gross income becomes \$20,200 (entitling the taxpayer to a 24% dependent care credit). At that point, the relative advantages of the two tax treatments have become reversed. (Such a "tipping point" does not occur, however, in instances in which the rough test shows that the dependent care credit is more advantageous than salary reduction and the credit is accordingly used first. This is because the credit is subtracted from tax liability and does not alter either the taxable income or the adjusted gross income.)

The second refinement to the rough test requires knowing the maximum permitted dollar amount of dependent care expenses under the salary reduction plan, and the maximum permitted dollar amount of expenses that may be claimed for the dependent care credit. These maximum permitted amounts may be established in several ways. Employers may set a fixed maximum for salary reduction generally, or for salary reduction, dependent care benefits specifically. The

APPENDIX E

Legislation

Among the relevant legislation are the following:

1. Dependent Care Assistance Plan (DCAP): "A written plan required by Section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code as stipulated in the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act. The plan makes employer contributions to the care of children, elderly parents and disabled dependents non-taxable to the employee and tax deductible to the employer." "Corporate Financial Assistance for Child Care," Research Bulletin, The Conference Board, No. 177 (1985), p. 2.

The Conference Board, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

2. Minnesota State Legislation (pending)

SF 1196 (Spear): Concerning grants for "resource and referral program" within Minnesota Statutes 1984, Section 245.83, all of which authorizes the county board "to provide child care services, to make grants. . .for. . .child care services," etc.

HF 1068 (Clark): Same as SF 1196.

3. Federal Legislation

HR 2111 - Passed December, 1985 as part of HR 3700 with titles "Special Child Care Services for Disadvantaged College Students"; "Child Care Personnel Work-Experience Program".

These are sections 1204 and 1205 of S 809 (Kennedy), pending, which is an amendment to The Higher Education Act of 1965, Sec. 2. The Kennedy bill would provide, in addition to the titles in HR 3700: "Grants for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation of Facilities" (Sec. 1203) - \$75,000,000 total each year, 1986 - October, 1990.

4. Other legislative interest: Rep. Bruce Vento (St. Paul) conducted a public hearing on child care January 18, 1986. Regulating insurance costs and providing user vouchers on a basis of need seemed to be his focus on federal assistance.

APPENDIX F

Both the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association (GMDCA) and the St. Paul Resources for Child Caring (RCC) serve corporate clients such as General Mills, Pillsbury, Cargill, and 3M. Almost all major corporations in the Twin Cities, in fact, offer these information services to their employees free of charge. They supply parents with lists of child care providers in designated geographical areas, with information on the number of children served by each provider. Quality cannot be guaranteed, and it is the responsibility of the parents to keep watch on this aspect.

The fee-for-service charge at each agency is based on a sliding scale from \$0 to \$25. This amount may increase as more services come to be offered. Clients are allowed, besides an initial intake interview, unlimited calls in each year.

Despite the free service to corporate employees, University students, faculty and staff made the most calls of any single group to the two agencies last year. University-affiliated callers accounted for about 6 percent, or 600 of the approximately 10,000 calls. With some publicity, this number could increase to about 800 or 8 percent. As such a large client, the University might well negotiate a reduced fee per person, for example \$5, especially if the University were to do the initial interview to determine the parents' needs. To provide this free service would then cost the University about \$4,000 per year.

These agencies also customarily make quarterly reports on the needs of their corporate clients, and hold periodic meetings on child care issues for parents.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Child Care Center
1818 4th Street South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55454
(612) 376-5265

April 16, 1986

To: Margery Durham, Chair
Special Committee on Child Care Policy

From: Patty Finstad, Director *PF.*
University Child Care Center

Thank you for inviting my comments to your Committee's report. Needless to say, such very short notice requires brevity of both review and response. But since I represent a child care constituency on this campus which has waited over a decade for an opportunity to have their professional perspectives heard in an official capacity, I wish to advise the Committee on specific policy areas of the report.

First, although I commend the Committee's effort and agree with the majority of its findings, I must call attention to a serious and conspicuous omission in the list of recommendations, namely a clear statement advocating University resources to support not only the continuation of the three types of campus child care programs that already exist, but their improvement as well. These centers currently face financial difficulties which threaten their future survival, yet your report fails to recognize or recommend appropriate actions that would assist them. Does it make sense to promote precise ideas and urge increased expenditures for new programs while the proven incumbents are forced to compromise their quality or even close their doors because they lack the financial resources to remain viable? I think not. Nor do I think this was the intention of your dedicated Committee members. Therefore, I sincerely hope there is both time and willingness to amend the report, adding these policy action statements:

1. Recognition of the two parent cooperative child care programs in the Como and Commonwealth Student Housing communities; providing free space, utilities and building maintenance for their continued operations. (RATIONALE: Most college campuses support child care in this way.)
2. Financial commitments necessary to support decent wages to University affiliated child care program personnel. (RATIONALE: The recent Civil Service Pay Equity Survey reveals that University Child Care Center staff are "undervalued" by between 22-65%. The Center needs additional funds to maintain the level of quality it has modeled over the past twelve years.)

3. Funds to replace the proposed discontinuation of Student Services Fees for the Intra Campus Child Care Consortium. This revenue (about \$28,000) subsidizes the cost of child care for low income students in the three University Centers. (RATIONALE: The Consortium has struggled long and hard to secure this small amount of subsidy. The student body has consistently supported the fees for this activity. But your report seems to suggest that in the future, the Office of Student Affairs should get and spend this money in a very different way, for space, maintenance and utilities for new student activities.)

These recommendations are obviously pertinent to the issue of continued support for current campus programs which I believe must be a prerequisite to future expansion plans. New coordination is likewise an essential administrative function and I am pleased with the priority given it by your Committee.

Some further comments and questions I have regarding the report are:

1. The position of University Coordinator of Child Care will likely require secretarial assistance. (Recently I met with the Coordinators of Child Care at Stanford University and they described their model as a 2/3 professional position at about \$18 per hour plus a 1/4 time secretary.)
2. The full day summer program for 100 kindergarten and school-age children will be a costly investment. Did your Committee intend this activity to be a contractual arrangement with Community Public Schools and personnel or would it be on-campus and designed to continue throughout the year perhaps as a demonstration all day Kindergarten program?
3. The problem of "quality" control is a very important matter, I think, for both policy and financial support. The Standing Committee on Child Care might be charged with defining the standards which University Child Care programs must meet. State licensing law currently excludes campus operations from their inspection systems, but ample criteria for high quality child care is available and could be easily used by the Committee and the Coordinator for quality assurances to both parents and funders alike.
4. There is indeed a great demand for good quality infant care, but research as well as my waiting list indicates that care arrangements for toddler age children is equally urgent. Therefore I recommend adding "INFANT-TODDLER" programs under your special needs category.

5. The University Child Care Center administered a Satellite Family Day Care program for six years until last summer, when funding problems forced its abandonment. This model, however, is very sensible since it is cost-effective, community-based and offers wider options for parents. A 75% staff position is all that is needed to resume this type of University sponsored activity.
6. Research in all facets of comprehensive child care programming is a crucial matter. The National Coalition on Campus Child Care is currently developing recommendations for important research activities.

In closing, let me reiterate that I respect and support the thrust of your report. There are many features that will assist parents to locate and to afford appropriate child care to meet their family needs, and that, after all, is the fundamental purpose of a campus child care network. Thank you for your commitment to improving services to young children and their families. If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

PF/mb




UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of English
Lind Hall
207 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2595

April 21, 1986

To: Deon Stuthman

From: Margery Durham 

Re: Child Care

Thank you, Deon, for inviting me and members of the Child Care Committee to speak to the SCC last Thursday. The questions asked there pointed out to me two areas in which I would like to supply more information, and another topic occurred to me later.

Enclosed is a list of the research projects, with the hours spent on each, at the West Bank Child Care Center from 1977 through 1985. We received this information very early in our study, and it convinced us that we need make no plans for encouraging research; the research seems to generate itself. This is all the more remarkable considering the inconvenient facilities for observation, for storing project materials, for everything except the children at the Center. I'd encourage members of your Committee to walk over there and see for themselves how much is needed to facilitate research.

Concerning rent-free facilities on and off campus: the off-campus facilities that must pay rent are the Como and Commonwealth cooperatives. They are sagging under this financial burden and, I am told, will need help to stay in operation. If the University could provide rent, maintenance, and utilities, this would be a help to them.

My third and later consideration is the University's graduation rate. This might be helped if adequate child care becomes available.

Thanks again for your continued interest and your encouragement.

copies to: Child Care Committee
Ken Keller
Frank Sorauf

University of Minnesota Child Care Center--Educational Participation:

1977-Spring 1985

I. <u>College Community Involvement/Teacher Assistance</u>	<u>1977-Spring 1985</u>
A. Other University Participation	Number of Hours
1. St. Mary's School of Nursing	2660
2. University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire	180
3. University of Wisconsin - Stout State	30
4. Iowa State	170
5. College of St. Catherine	82
6. University of Minnesota - Crookston	60
7. Mankato State University	30
8. University of Minnesota - Duluth	57
9. University of Minnesota - Waseca	8
10. University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	12
11. University of Michigan - Ann Arbor	20
12. South Dakota State University	15
13. University of North Dakota	12
14. Ohio State University	3
15. Washington University	10
16. Augsburg College	16
17. Minneapolis Community College	12
18. University of Minnesota Hospital Child Care Task Force	50
19. University of Minnesota: Institute of Child Development Bag Lunch Colloquim on Family Day Care	4
20. University of Minnesota - Guest lectures	64
21. University of Minnesota: Home Economics Parenting Education Advisory Board	16
22. National Coalition of Campus Child Care	20
23. Psychoanalytic Foundation of Minnesota	35
24. Minneapolis Crisis Nursery Program	4
25. North Central Bible College	4
26. U of M Child Care Task Force (82-83/84-85)	320
27. University of Indiana	4
28. Twin Cities International Program	500
29. H.E.L.P. Center	10
TOTAL	4408

B. Other Community Child Participation and Training Activities	Number of Hours
1. American Guidance Services: Infant-Toddler Curriculum Review	35
2. N.E.T. State Advisory Board	350
3. Eastside Child Care Committee	300
4. Minnesota Children's Lobby	105
5. Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children	61
MNAEYC Workshops and Conferences	
-Microcomputer in a Preschool Classroom	6
-Advocating for Kids	15
-Childcare and Comparable Worth	30
-Child Abuse and Neglect (for Parents/for Providers)	25
-Week of the Young Child Campus Activities	5
-"Child Care Works"	30
-Infant Care	10
-Multi-age Curriculum Planning in Family Day Care	6
6. Childhood Sexuality Training Session	12
7. Conferences of Fathering (School of Social Work and M.E.L.D.)	19
8. Midwest AEYC Conference on Family Day Care	4
9. Media Coverage/Special Topics (WCCO and KSTP Television; Star and Tribune Articles; Report; Matrix; Twin Cities Magazine	71
a. "Computers and Kids" - KSTP	
b. "Being With Kids" - Videotape presentation of Minnesota Psychoanalytical Association	
10. Visitors from other child care programs, resource centers and coordinating councils, etc.	2921
11. Hennepin County Family Day Care - Training	10
12. Children's Defense Fund: Child Watch Project	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	4023

C. Visitors from Abroad

1. Great Britian	5. West Germany	9. Malaysia
2. Japan	6. China	10. Italy
3. Korea	7. France	11. Canada
4. New Zealand	8. Taiwan	

University of Minnesota Child Care Center Educational Participation

II. Student Interaction and Observation1977-Spring 1985

A. Project Description	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Number of Hours</u>
1. Early Childhood Education Program of Community Programs	47	826
2. Nursery School Certification Program-- Student Teaching*	34	5350
3. Head Start Training	21	315
4. Child Psychiatry--Medical School	39	396
5. Child Development--CPsy 3330, 1301, and 3331	121	1395
6. U of M Nursing	101	931
7. Educational Administration	11	120
8. Home Economics Education	148	1079
9. School of Public Health--Child and Maternal Nutrition	13	155
10. School of Public Health	11	116
11. College of Education - Social, Psychological, and Philosophical Foundations of Education	25	521
12. Continuing Education and Extension	7	249
13. Child Development - Right to Care Project	4	120
14. Women's Studies	10	166
15. Honors Program	14	59
16. AVTI	4	12
17. Journalism	7	19
18. Speech 5452	6	12
19. Architecture/Interior Design	6	114
20. Linguistics	6	15
21. Court Referred Volunteer and Training Program (for U of M students)	4	150
22. H.I.R.E.D. (Refugee Program)	1	400
23. Outward Bound	10	20
24. Hennepin County Medical Center	14	28
25. High School Placement	1	150
26. Psychology - Ph.D. Candidate (Independent Study)	<u>1</u>	<u>180</u>
TOTAL	666	12,898

*The Center has approximately six student teachers per year, including international students from such countries as Japan, Nigeria, Israel, and Malaysia.

University of Minnesota Child Care Center Educational Participation:

1977--Spring 1985

III. Student and Faculty Research

Number of Hours

A. Department

1. School of Public Health	218
2. School of Nursing	86
3. Educational Administration	140
4. Women's Studies	115
5. Child Development	1360
6. Psycho-Educational Studies	125
7. Public Health Nutrition	40
8. Preschool Computer Project (I.C.D.)	190
9. Linguistics (Longitudinal-1981 to present)	NA
10. Journalism and Mass Communication	40

TOTAL 2314

University of Minnesota Child Care Educational Participation:

1977--Spring 1985

IV. Additional Contributions to the University Community

A. Information and Referral:

1. Community involvement also entails acting as a First Call Child Care Resource, Information and Referral service for parents at the University of Minnesota. Typically, the Center talks with and refers approximately five parents per day as to the options, availability and quality of care for their children. (1200 contacts)

- B. Employment of University students; approximately 40 each year (or 28% of staff salaries).

C. Formation of an "Intra-Campus Child Care Consortium"

1. Early Childhood Training Project: Northwest Area Foundation
2. Increased Networking and funding with the Student Housing Child Care parent cooperatives.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Child Care Center
1818 4th Street South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55454
(612) 376-5265

rec'd at SCC mtg
4-17-86

April 16, 1986

To: Margery Durham, Chair
Special Committee on Child Care Policy

From: Patty Finstad, Director *PF.*
University Child Care Center

Thank you for inviting my comments to your Committee's report. Needless to say, such very short notice requires brevity of both review and response. But since I represent a child care constituency on this campus which has waited over a decade for an opportunity to have their professional perspectives heard in an official capacity, I wish to advise the Committee on specific policy areas of the report.

First, although I commend the Committee's effort and agree with the majority of its findings, I must call attention to a serious and conspicuous omission in the list of recommendations, namely a clear statement advocating University resources to support not only the continuation of the three types of campus child care programs that already exist, but their improvement as well. These centers currently face financial difficulties which threaten their future survival, yet your report fails to recognize or recommend appropriate actions that would assist them. Does it make sense to promote precise ideas and urge increased expenditures for new programs while the proven incumbents are forced to compromise their quality or even close their doors because they lack the financial resources to remain viable? I think not. Nor do I think this was the intention of your dedicated Committee members. Therefore, I sincerely hope there is both time and willingness to amend the report, adding these policy action statements:

1. Recognition of the two parent cooperative child care programs in the Como and Commonwealth Student Housing communities; providing free space, utilities and building maintenance for their continued operations. (RATIONALE: Most college campuses support child care in this way.)
2. Financial commitments necessary to support decent wages to University affiliated child care program personnel. (RATIONALE: The recent Civil Service Pay Equity Survey reveals that University Child Care Center staff are "undervalued" by between 22-65%. The Center needs additional funds to maintain the level of quality it has modeled over the past twelve years.)

3. Funds to replace the proposed discontinuation of Student Services Fees for the Intra Campus Child Care Consortium. This revenue (about \$28,000) subsidizes the cost of child care for low income students in the three University Centers. (RATIONALE: The Consortium has struggled long and hard to secure this small amount of subsidy. The student body has consistently supported the fees for this activity. But your report seems to suggest that in the future, the Office of Student Affairs should get and spend this money in a very different way, for space, maintenance and utilities for new student activities.)

These recommendations are obviously pertinent to the issue of continued support for current campus programs which I believe must be a prerequisite to future expansion plans. New coordination is likewise an essential administrative function and I am pleased with the priority given it by your Committee.

Some further comments and questions I have regarding the report are:

1. The position of University Coordinator of Child Care will likely require secretarial assistance. (Recently I met with the Coordinators of Child Care at Stanford University and they described their model as a 2/3 professional position at about \$18 per hour plus a 1/4 time secretary.)
2. The full day summer program for 100 kindergarten and school-age children will be a costly investment. Did your Committee intend this activity to be a contractual arrangement with Community Public Schools and personnel or would it be on-campus and designed to continue throughout the year perhaps as a demonstration all day Kindergarten program?
3. The problem of "quality" control is a very important matter, I think, for both policy and financial support. The Standing Committee on Child Care might be charged with defining the standards which University Child Care programs must meet. State licensing law currently excludes campus operations from their inspection systems, but ample criteria for high quality child care is available and could be easily used by the Committee and the Coordinator for quality assurances to both parents and funders alike.
4. There is indeed a great demand for good quality infant care, but research as well as my waiting list indicates that care arrangements for toddler age children is equally urgent. Therefore I recommend adding "INFANT-TODDLER" programs under your special needs category.

5. The University Child Care Center administered a Satellite Family Day Care program for six years until last summer, when funding problems forced its abandonment. This model, however, is very sensible since it is cost-effective, community-based and offers wider options for parents. A 75% staff position is all that is needed to resume this type of University sponsored activity.
6. Research in all facets of comprehensive child care programming is a crucial matter. The National Coalition or Campus Child Care is currently developing recommendations for important research activities.

In closing, let me reiterate that I respect and support the thrust of your report. There are many features that will assist parents to locate and to afford appropriate child care to meet their family needs, and that, after all, is the fundamental purpose of a campus child care network. Thank you for your commitment to improving services to young children and their families. If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

PF/mb

JUL 11 1986



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

July 8, 1986

TO: The Honorable Wendell R. Anderson
The Honorable Charles H. Casey
The Honorable Willis K. Drake
The Honorable Erwin L. Goldfine
The Honorable Wally Hilke
The Honorable David M. Lebedoff
The Honorable Verne E. Long
The Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan
The Honorable Wenda W. Moore
The Honorable David K. Roe
The Honorable Stanley D. Sahlstrom
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

The purpose of this letter is to bring together the elements of our discussion during the past few months of increased preparation standards so that we can ensure that we have addressed all of your concerns as you prepare to take action on the matter at this month's meeting. Because of my European trip, I could not get this letter to you with the docket materials, for which I apologize.

Our discussion has focused on four areas:

- 1) the date for implementing these requirements
- 2) the availability of required high school courses in general
- 3) the requirements for a second language in particular
- 4) the availability of financial aid.

Let us consider each of them.

Date For Implementing The Requirements

The proposal presented at the June Board meeting (and in the attached resolution) calls for an implementation of these preparation standards as requirements for Fall, 1991. This is an extension of the original Committee recommendation which had called for implementation in Fall, 1990. If we enact a Fall, 1991 date, the students entering eighth grade this Fall (class of 1991) will be the first graduating

class affected by the requirements. This should provide ample lead time for students to plan their high school programs. Moreover, the HECB Futures brochure, which we distributed at the May Board meeting, has already been sent to this Fall's ninth grade class (class of 1990). Although not designed to reflect specifically these new University of Minnesota requirements, the brochure urges students who are interested in college to take a set of courses that is nearly identical to those the University would require. We are told by HECB that this brochure has been well received by the school systems.

The Committee report recommends that all students completing high school "before 1987" should be "grandparented" into the current requirements. The attached resolution is more specific and more accommodating in that it recommends that we extend this to students who graduate from high school prior to September 1, 1987. Thus students in the class of 1987 would be grandfathered into the requirements, as would all preceding classes, regardless of when they enter the University.

Availability Of Required High School Courses

In developing these requirements we have consulted with the State Department of Education. They have assured us that a move by the University to increase preparation requirements would reinforce the higher standards that they are mandating by policy. Not only would young people seeking to attend the University benefit, but many more high school students would be made aware of these changes and would be guided to enrich their school experience.

Since the June Regents' meeting, the Board of Education has again assured us that virtually all districts will offer the required courses by this Fall. Two special circumstances are worth noting. There are a very small number of schools that may not offer a second year of a foreign language. In virtually all cases there is a neighboring high school that does. We were also advised that in reviewing high school curricula, we must look across a four-year interval to understand the full range of offerings. Not all required courses are offered each year, but over a four-year period students do have each of them available.

As we have noted before, there will always be cases where a student, for one or another reason, is missing some of the required courses. Since the requirements are upper division entrance requirements, these students will still have access to the University either through provisional admittance to degree-granting colleges or through General College. Financial aid would be available for making up these courses under our existing guidelines. By ensuring both access to the

University and financial aid for this work, we feel that the student who is lacking one or two courses will not be unduly penalized. Moreover, all students, including those required to make up courses, will benefit from the higher quality University of Minnesota baccalaureate degree that will result from those new requirements.

Requirement For A Second Language

This specific recommendation was one of those most carefully considered by the Committee. Repeatedly, this University has gone on record asserting its role as an international university. Members of the Board, as well as many others, have noted the growing "internationalization" of the world. I believe that we all agree that the understanding of a foreign culture will be increasingly important in the years ahead. As the Committee worked with the school systems, members were told that the second language courses are the most reliable high school offerings for introducing an international perspective. In addition, the discipline of learning a second language helps to develop the mind in broader ways and increases one's ability to use one's primary language, an area in which the shortcomings of modern higher education have been frequently noted. I might add that since CLA has implemented its language requirements, school systems have reported significant increases in enrollment for foreign language courses in both 1984-85 and 1985-86.

With the assurance of availability of high school courses and in view of the importance of the language experience, I would urge that the Board retain the second language provision as an integral component of the preparation requirements.

Availability Of Financial Aid

Current University financial aid guidelines, which are consistent with both state and federal policy, permit students to receive aid for up to 216 credits attempted. It is our intention to offer all developmental courses for credit, including those in response to "missed" high school courses which are required by the University. Since baccalaureate degrees require about 185 credits, students could take approximately 30 credits or two full quarters of additional work within the guidelines of existing financial aid policy. If practice shows that the University is attracting a large number of students requiring more than 216 credits to earn a baccalaureate degree, the HECB has indicated its willingness to explore new financial aid policy alternatives and, if it is necessary, we could set aside funds specifically aimed at this group. It would be premature to do so at this time since it appears to me that action by HECB would be a better first step if and when that is necessary.

Board of Regents
July 8, 1986
Page 4

The proposed resolution has been changed to include a more definite statement on meeting the financial need of students.

In closing, I would only repeat my comment at an earlier meeting that Professor Collins and his committee conducted a model process in working with school systems and their administrations to develop the report on which the resolution is based. Feedback through a survey distributed to all school districts indicates strong support for these requirements. I look forward to our discussion on Friday morning.

Sincerely,



Kenneth H. Keller
President

KHK:kb

Enclosure: Resolution on Increased Preparation Requirements

c: University Vice Presidents and Chancellors
Ellen Berscheid, Professor, Department of Psychology
W. Andrew Collins, Professor, Institute of Child Development
Barbara J. Muesing, Secretary of the Board of Regents
David A. Longanecker, Executive Director, Minnesota Higher
Education Coordinating Board
Ruth Randall, Commissioner, Department of Education
Student Representatives to the Board of Regents

INCREASED PREPARATION REQUIREMENTS

- PROPOSED RESOLUTION -

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has reviewed the report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements for the University of Minnesota.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

. the Board of Regents endorses the recommendations presented in the report, with the understanding that required or recommended course work may be completed during the first two years in addition to the lower division course work required for a baccalaureate degree; and in implementing these changes,

. the University will continue to review the individual applications for admissions in those special cases where students do not meet all the preparation requirements;

. colleges will continue to provide appropriate skill development courses for students who are inadequately prepared;

. as per its current policies, the University will continue to offer the full range of financial aid options to full-time students up to 216 credits attempted, thereby providing aid to those students with demonstrated need who must take developmental courses;

. the University will implement its communications plan for informing school systems, other systems of higher education, potential applicants, parents, and other interested parties of these changes;

. there will be phased implementation of these preparation requirements so that they take full effect in September, 1991;

. these preparation requirements will not be a consideration in the admissions decision for any applicants graduating in the high school class of 1987 or earlier, regardless of when they seek admission to the University.

. the University will evaluate annually the impact that these changes are having on access to baccalaureate programs.

7/8/86

~~Student Senate Consultative Committee are is granted the right to close a portion or all of a given meeting, after approval by a two-thirds majority of their its respective members present. The chair of each committee shall keep a listing of all topics discussed in its closed meetings, make making it the list available upon request, and include including the this list each year in the annual report to the Senate, along with an evaluation of the role these meetings have played in consultation with the president. The right of the Faculty Consultative Committee to close meeting shall not be extended beyond the end of the academic year 1985-86 unless there is a vote of the University Senate to do so. Meetings shall normally be listed in the Minnesota Daily and/or in the Daily Bulletin.~~

Note: One effect of revising this section is to grant the privilege for an indefinite duration.

COMMENT:

During the three-year experiment with closed meetings the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has closed three meetings under authorization of this Senate bylaw. Two meetings were closed to encourage complete candor in discussions on rewording sections of the tenure code to respond to regental concerns. A third meeting was closed when President Keller invited FCC to join him in a discussion of the proposals he was developing for restructuring central administration. (In those years FCC also voted to close portions of five other meetings, but those instances involved the discussion of specific personnel and were thus authorized by another bylaw permitting closed meetings to protect the rights of the individuals being discussed.)

Its experience during this trial period has convinced the Consultative Committee of the desirability, even the necessity, of continuing its ability to close all or a part of a meeting. This ability enables FCC to begin discussions within itself and with the President on emerging or "likely" issues or problems. It permits the members to be briefed in exploratory ways that bring faculty influence to bear upon the administration at the earliest stages of planning and decision-making. It also permits all parties in the consultations to achieve a degree of candor and openness that would in some instances be difficult to sustain in a public setting. For these reasons we think that the right to close meetings, sparingly and judiciously used, is essential for maintaining the full effectiveness of the FCC's consultative role.

The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) operate in parallel, meeting separately and also meeting jointly as the Senate Consultative Committee. The SCC also consults regularly with the President, and the SSCC consults indirectly with the President through its Chair, who joins the other student body leaders in regular meetings with the President. The arguments in the preceding paragraph on behalf of the FCC's authority also apply to SCC's and SSCC's need for occasional closed meetings in carrying out their consultative responsibilities. The authority to close meetings should therefore logically be extended to them.

DEON STUTHMAN
Chair

Approved, 125 to 13

VII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

PREPARATION STANDARDS, COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

Action (30 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate endorse establishment of unified preparation requirements for students entering Twin Cities, Morris, and Duluth colleges of the University of Minnesota to pursue baccalaureate degrees. These requirements would be met by evidence of competence commensurate with four years of study in English, with emphasis on writing and including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appre-

ciation; two years in social studies, including American history; three years in mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra; three years in science, including one biological and one physical science; and two years in a second language. In addition, one year of instruction in the arts (music, drama, or the visual arts) is strongly recommended as valuable preparation for study at the University; and familiarity with microcomputers and common types of software is recognized as an important skill for university work.

These preparation requirements should become effective for students entering in Fall, 1990, in order to allow for extensive communication of requirements to school districts and high school students in Minnesota and major feeder schools in other states. The Senate Consultative Committee should report annually to the Senate (a) in advance of these dates on the status of preparations for implementing these requirements; and (b) following implementation on the impact of the requirements.

In implementing these preparation standards, the University should adhere to all recommendations in the final report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Standards.

COMMENT:

The Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements believes that increasing and unifying preparation requirements in core areas of study can help to create the potential for improving the quality of teaching and learning at the University, thus improving access to a quality education for all students. Such preparation requirements would apply to all students, but would not affect decisions regarding applications for admission to the University. Such decisions would continue to be made on the basis of an applicant's high school class rank and on PSAT or ACT scores. Students who enter without having met preparation requirements would be required to do so by the time they have completed 39 degree credits (roughly the equivalent of one year's work for a full-time student).

The Special Committee's report includes implementation recommendations that reflect the Special Committee's extensive review of the potential impact of increased preparation requirements on access to the University and on academic and student services programs. A key recommendation is that a transition period of five years be allowed before the proposed preparation requirements take effect. During that time, the University should undertake an extensive public relations and communication program to inform school districts and the people of the state of the new requirements and to provide consulting and technical assistance where needed to help schools make the necessary curricular and academic advising changes to prepare students to meet the requirements. In addition, during this period the University faculty should review and revise the University curriculum to meet the needs of students with more advanced preparation in core areas.

The significant changes in the motion from the draft motion presented at the February 20 Forum are these:

- (1) the requirement of one year of instruction in the arts becomes recommended, rather than required, preparation);
- (2) the requirement in social studies has been reduced from three years to two.

Other significant changes in the final report from the draft report are these:

- (1) Recommendation 4 addresses in greater detail the need to develop explicit competency expectations and adequate assessment procedures;
- (2) The availability of high-school coursework and current patterns of student preparation are discussed (pages 8-9);
- (3) Recommendations 19 and 20 have been added to address issues of accountability in implementation of the report.

Copies of the final report are available from Terri Anderson (373-4911) in 313 Morrill Hall.

INFORMATION:

The Senate Consultative Committee respectfully forwards to the Senate the above motion and comments all of which were developed, after wide consultation, by the Special

Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements. SCC expresses its appreciation to the members of the Special Committee for their thoughtful, thorough, and diligent work over the past seven months, which culminated in the final report upon which the motion is based. SCC owes a debt of gratitude to Professor W. Andrew Collins, chair of the Special Committee, for his superb leadership.

DEON D. STUTHMAN
Chair

Above is the final, approved version. A motion to add "annually" following "The Senate Consultative Committee should report" in the last sentence of the second paragraph was accepted as a friendly amendment. The addition of the last paragraph was approved (69 to 67) over "Implementation of these preparation standards should be guided by the full set of recommendations in the final report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements." A motion to amend the second sentence to add after "...three years in science, including one biological and one physical science" the words, "and may include one applied science" was defeated. A motion to amend the second sentence to add after "...and two years of a second language" the words, "or equivalent number of units in world history and/or international relations" was defeated. A motion to add a final statement, "If it is determined that the unified preparation requirements are deleterious to the maintenance of a critical mass of students in a collegiate unit, the unit may submit an alternative set of preparation requirements" was defeated. The original motion as amended was approved.

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

(5 minutes)

See abstract of the discussion.

IX. FINANCE COMMITTEE

(5 minutes)

See abstract of the discussion.

X. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

none

XI. OLD BUSINESS

none

XII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

none

XIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

LEONARD D. BART

1932-1986

Leonard D. Bart, associate professor of speech-communication, died at his home in St. Paul on March 31 after a long illness. Bart, who completed his Ph.D. degree in 1964 at Minnesota, joined the faculty as an instructor in the fall of 1962. He was promoted to associate professor in 1969.

Even before completing his degree under the direction of E. W. Ziebarth, Bart was actively engaged in helping to build a curriculum in television production at Minnesota. His students are now working at all levels of the broadcasting industry throughout the country. His simultaneous grasp of practical problems and dedication to the ideals of a liberal education will be sorely missed by his colleagues and students.

Leonard Bart's outstanding work as a teacher, both formally in the classroom and informally as an adviser and colleague, was recognized in 1977 when the Alumni Society of the College of Liberal Arts and University College named him as one of the recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award.

HENRY J. GRIFFITHS

1910-1986

Henry J. Griffiths, professor emeritus in the College of Veterinary Medicine, died in Roseville, Minnesota, on January 28, 1986. He was 75 years of age.

Henry Griffiths was born July 4, 1910, in Cambridge, England. He received M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in parasitology at McGill University, under Professor T.W.M. Cameron and later received his D.V.M. in 1943 at Iowa State University. He served as a captain in the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps from 1943 to 1946. From 1946 to 1948 he was a member of the faculty of Ontario Veterinary College and then Washington State University. Dr. Griffiths joined the University of Minnesota faculty as associate professor in 1948, was promoted to professor in 1953, and retired in 1979. During his service he served as chairman of the Department of Veterinary Pathology and as an assistant dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine. He was an active member of numerous professional and honor societies including the Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Veterinary Parasitologists, the University of Minnesota Biological Club and Sigma Xi.

Henry Griffiths was a very popular and highly respected classroom teacher. In recognition of his teaching talents, he received the first Norden Distinguished Teacher Award at the University of Minnesota in 1963. He was named Outstanding Educator of America in 1973 and received a second Norden Distinguished Teacher Award in 1976. He is listed in *Who's Who in America* and *American Men of Science*.

As a person, Henry Griffiths will be remembered as a quiet, modest man with a dry, sparkling sense of humor. He had an uncanny memory of the names, faces, and personal accomplishments of his many students.

Henry J. Griffiths is survived by his wife, Ann, of Falcon Heights, Minnesota.

GLADSTONE B. HEISIG

1893-1986

On January 17, 1986, Professor G.B. Heisig lost a long bout with Alzheimer at the age of 93. The Department of Chemistry in turn lost a valued and dedicated member. G.B. retired in 1959, the same year as that of another fine and respected member of our faculty, Professor Norville Pervier.

Those of us who had the privilege of "overlapping" with G.B. have memories of a man with high skills as a teacher, a competent research scholar, and one with imagination in producing not only stimulating lectures, but texts and manuals that set a standard for analysis and separation procedures in his time. Few ever knew him as other than G.B.; a very much smaller number knew he was Gladstone B.; and an almost infinitesimally small fraction knew him as Gladstone Baring Heisig.

Committee, since this committee had decided that the new ratio would be in line with that of other committees and would not consider the Krupp proposal a friendly amendment. The parliamentarian ruled that the Krupp motion could not be voted on because it had not been submitted in advance as required. Ms. Krupp decided not to ask for a suspension of the rules, and the Clark motion was approved with one dissenting vote.

Committee on Committees amendment. Ms. Clark introduced an amendment to permit membership on the Committee on Committees of those who had served in the Senate within the last five years of the election, rather than limiting it to those currently serving. She said it would expand the pool of those eligible and reminded the Senate that there were many committees that required Senate membership, limiting even more the number eligible. Coordinate campuses were particularly hard hit by the requirement. Again, the Consultative Committee supported the Committee on Committees, and the amendment was approved almost unanimously.

Social Concerns Committee amendment. In presenting a motion to add an ex officio finance vice president representative to the Social Concerns Committee, Ms. Clark explained that that person is important to committee discussions on investment policies. The Consultative Committee supported the motion, and the amendment was approved by all but two senators.

Open Meeting Rule amendment. Mr. Stuthman said the Consultative Committee had concluded successfully a three-year experiment with closed meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee as provided for in Senate bylaws, and proposed extending it to the Senate Consultative and Student Consultative Committees indefinitely. He said that advice early, rather than consent later, is the role his committee should assume, and the amendment would facilitate that goal. Asked whether the Student Consultative Committee had met with the president this year, Mr. St. Laurent said it had not, but had met with his representative, the academic affairs vice president. The amendment was then approved with some opposition.

Preparation Standards, Commitment to Focus. On behalf of the Senate, Mr. Stuthman prefaced his remarks with thanks to Andrew Collins, professor of child development, and his Special Committee on Preparations Standards that had first presented its report at the forum in April. Mr. Stuthman said the Faculty Consultative Committee had voted unanimously in favor of the motion regarding preparation standards, and the full committee had shown a strong majority favoring it. His committee had identified as a friendly amendment a proposal by Vernon Cardwell, professor of agronomy and plant genetics, to require that the Consultative Committee progress report should be made *annually*. Mr. Hanson supported it as a friendly amendment, too. Another amendment accepted as friendly by both committees was proposed by Mr. Collins, i.e., to include one year of arts instruction as being strongly recommended and recognition that microcomputer and software familiarity is desirable.

William Hanson, professor of philosophy and chair of the Educational Policy Committee, proposed a closing sentence to the effect that the University *should adhere* to all of the report's recommendations, whereas the Special Committee suggested that implementation *should be guided* by the recommendations. Mr. Hanson defended his version as being stronger; Mr. Collins said that recommendation 20 in the report provided sufficient review and oversight for the process so the stronger language was not needed. The Hanson amendment was then approved by two votes.

Steve Florman, student, expressed concern that the impact on students receiving financial aid be carefully considered and asked what specific measures were being proposed to ensure assistance for those who would need more than five years to complete work toward degrees. Mr. Collins said his committee had considered it one of the most serious implementation issues and recommended an extensive information campaign and extension of guidelines for some sources of aid.

Mr. Cardwell proposed an option to have an applied science in the science requirement, which he said would be useful for those who decide late that they want to go to college, noting that less than 50 percent of ninth graders know whether they want to pursue a higher education. He said some students do not have the incentive to go further, and there are not, in many cases, sufficient high school advisors to counsel them. He called the proposal an opportunity to introduce flexibility into the plan. Mr. Collins said his committee had tried to

reduce the number of requirements, but did not have time to review the courses to be included in each category. However, many appeared, such as this one, too broad to stay within the intent of the program. Asked what would be included in applied sciences courses, Mr. Cardwell identified natural resources, physical geography, horticulture, and agricultural education. Mr. Stuthman said the Consultative Committee favored the Special Committee position, and the amendment was defeated.

Mr. Cardwell's next proposed amendment called for an alternative of world history and/or international relations for the language requirement. He said there were multiple avenues for achieving the international perspective and that his proposal would permit greater flexibility for high schools that would not have sufficient language staff. Mr. Collins said the committee had considered the idea but most members agreed that such courses were taught from the United States perspective and would not achieve a sufficient international cultural perspective. Mr. Hanson and Mr. Stuthman reported little or no support from their committees. Lisa Steidl, student, maintained that high school teachers, especially in small, rural schools, often must require teachers to instruct more than one course and should be provided as many options as possible. James Tracy, professor of history, said that the College of Liberal Arts had found that there was a great deal of movement toward improving language offerings in the secondary schools. Tim Pratt, student, urged that the University actively support increased funding for high schools if the preparations standards proposals are implemented. Mark Ollenburger, student, declared that he came from a rural area of North Dakota where he had been able to take German in the eighth grade, and spoke enthusiastically of reading Goethe in German as compared with reading a translation in English, and he contended that language ranks with mathematics in importance in preparing for college. With this, the proposal failed on a voice vote.

Mr. Cardwell's final motion was for inclusion of a statement to the effect that an alternative set of requirements could be submitted by a unit in which a "critical mass" of students was adversely affected by the new standards. He said the intent was to provide a safety net as a protection in addition to the advisory committee called for in the report. He was concerned about collegiate autonomy and access to those courses that are part of the land-grant mission of the University. As an example, he indicated that many students decide to enroll in smaller institutions, especially near the Minnesota-Wisconsin border, where there is tuition reciprocity and that this trend would accelerate particularly in rural high schools where the college decision may not be made in the early years. He termed the standards *de facto* admission requirements with significant implications for agriculture. Mr. Collins said his committee had found there had not been declines in enrollment applications where similar preparation standards had been adopted, and that the College of Agriculture problem seemed to be an isolated one. Central administration, he said, had been made aware of this special situation. Mr. Hanson said the Educational Policy Committee sympathized with the College of Agriculture, but still supported the original recommended policies. Mr. Stuthman, identifying himself as an Agriculture faculty member, said the Consultative Committee found the proposal at odds with what was intended. Steve Florman, student, calling himself a "critical mass" person, though he was not sure what the term meant, indicated the Cardwell proposal would defeat the purpose of the report, and with that the motion was voted down.

Returning to the original motion as amended, the chair recognized Richard Purple, professor of physiology, who asked whether there was any provision for students with special disabilities. Mr. Collins replied that the matter had not been considered, but it was hoped that the University would provide some alternatives including skilled training and special services. There being no further amendments, the motion as amended was approved and, following Mr. Stuthman's commendation of the work of the committee and particularly of its chair, Mr. Collins and the members were accorded a warm round of applause.

Consultative Committee report. Mr. Stuthman outlined briefly concerns of his committee. He urged that comments on any of the committee reports arising from the *Commitment to Focus* be directed to his committee. He reported that the accreditation site visit of the North Central Association had been completed and acknowledged the efforts of the internal review committee chaired by Consultative Committee member Irwin Rubenstein, professor of genetics and cell biology, who received Senate applause for his work. Mr. Stuthman reported that his committee is reviewing the recent report of the Child Care Committee, and

UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING AGENDA, Thursday, Apr. 17, 1986

Please add the following proposed amendment to Item VII. Preparation Standards motion:

MOTION:

To amend the Consultative Committee motion by adding as a final sentence, "In implementing these preparation standards, the University should adhere to all recommendations in the final report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Standards."

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy supports the motion of the Consultative Committee when amended as above.

WILLIAM HANSON, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Please add the following proposed amendments to Item VII. Preparation Standards motion:

MOTION: To amend the second sentence to add the underlined phrase. . . "three years in science, including one biological and one physical science and may include one applied science; . . ."

MOTION: To amend the second sentence to add the underlined phrase . . . "and two years of a second language or equivalent number of units in world history and/or international relations."

MOTION: To amend the last sentence of the original motion by adding the underlined word . . . "The Senate Consultative Committee should report annually to the Senate . . ."

MOTION: To amend the original motion by adding a final statement, "If it is determined that the unified preparation requirements are deleterious to the maintenance of a critical mass of students in a collegiate unit, the unit may submit an alternative set of preparation requirements."

V. B. CARDWELL
Senator

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

(30 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate endorse establishment of unified preparation requirements for students entering Twin Cities, Morris, and Duluth colleges of the University of Minnesota to pursue baccalaureate degrees. These requirements would be met by evidence of competence commensurate with four years of study in English, with emphasis on writing and including instruction in reading and speaking skills and in literary understanding and appreciation; two years in social studies, including American history; three years in mathematics, including geometry and intermediate algebra; three years in science, including one biological and one physical science; and two years in a second language.

These preparation requirements should become effective for students entering in Fall, 1990, in order to allow for extensive communication of requirements to school districts and high-school students in Minnesota and major feeder schools in other states. The Senate Consultative Committee should report to the Senate (a) in advance of these dates on the status of preparations for implementing these requirements; and (b) following implementation on the impact of the requirements.

COMMENT:

The Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements believes that increasing and unifying preparation requirements in core areas of study can help to create the potential for improving the quality of teaching and

learning at the University, thus improving access to a quality education for all students. Such preparation requirements would apply to all students, but would not affect decisions regarding applications for admission to the University. Such decisions would continue to be made on the basis of an applicant's high school class rank and on PSAT or ACT scores. Students who enter without having met preparation requirements would be required to do so by the time they have completed 39 college credits (roughly the equivalent of one year's work for a full-time student).

The Special Committee's report includes implementation recommendations that reflect the Special Committee's extensive review of the potential impact of increased preparation requirements on access to the University and on academic and student-services programs. A key recommendation is that a transition period of five years be allowed before the proposed preparation requirements take effect. During that time, the University should undertake an extensive public relations and communication program to inform school districts and the people of the state of the new requirements and to provide consulting and technical assistance where needed to help schools make the necessary curricular and academic-advising changes to prepare students to meet the requirements. In addition, during this period the University faculty should review and revise the University curriculum to meet the needs of students with more advanced preparation in core areas.

The significant changes in the motion from the draft motion
presented at the February 20 Forum are these:

- (1) the requirement of one year of instruction in the arts has been deleted (and becomes recommended preparation);

draft

- (2) the requirement in social studies has been reduced from three years to two.

Other significant changes in the final report from the draft report are these:

- (1) Recommendation 4 addresses in greater detail the need to develop explicit competency expectations and adequate assessment procedures;
- (2) The availability of high-school coursework and current patterns of student preparation are discussed (pages 8-9);
- (3) Recommendations 19 and 20 have been added to address issues of accountability in implementation of the report.

Copies of the final report are available from Terri Anderson (373-4911) in 313 Morrill Hall.

INFORMATION:

The Senate Consultative Committee respectfully forwards to the Senate the above motion and comments all of which were developed, after wide consultation, by the Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements. SCC expresses its appreciation to the members of the Special Committee for their thoughtful, thorough, and diligent work over the past seven months, which culminated in the final report upon which the motion is based. SCC owes a debt of gratitude to Professor W. Andrew Collins, chair of the Special Committee, for his superb leadership.

Deon D. Stuthman,
Chair

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Regarding the Report of the

Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus
For Information

The Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus believes that the University of Minnesota, being a large, urban, land-grant, research institution, needs to reaffirm in actions its commitment to quality lower division education and, more generally, to quality undergraduate education on its Twin Cities campus. We believe that the size and complexity of the Twin Cities campus can be used to advantage in providing a rich variety of quality educational opportunities for undergraduates. We recognize the value of an educational environment that emphasizes the importance of communication, computation, and study skills, fosters student engagement with a wide variety of subject matters, encourages student involvement in the academic life of the institution, honors the importance of student achievement throughout the educational process, and respects the diverse needs of students. In order to help ensure the realization of these goals, the Special Committee recommends that the Twin Cities Assembly adopt the following resolution:

In order to improve the quality of undergraduate education--especially lower division education--on the Twin Cities campus the following steps should be taken:

1. There should be established on the Twin Cities campus an Undergraduate Center, responsible to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, for the purposes of: a) providing a single office to serve as a point of first contact with the University for undergraduates and prospective undergraduates; b) serving as a visitor center in a highly visible and accessible location on the Minneapolis campus; c) helping people new to the Twin Cities campus--students and visitors alike--find their way to appropriate services and offices; d) providing advising referral and certain important advising and assessment services that are not currently provided; e) simplifying the processes of approaching, entering and moving through the University.

2. The Undergraduate Center and Student Support Services should be linked under Academic Affairs in such a way as to facilitate and encourage cooperative work in recruiting, prospective-student relations, admissions and records, financial aid, and other important student services. The Center should also be linked under Academic Affairs with the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs and with the Office for Students with Disabilities in such a way as to facilitate and encourage cooperative work and to ensure that the needs of these students are adequately met.

3. Major administrative responsibility for protecting and enhancing the quality of undergraduate education should be focussed on a senior officer in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. That officer should be given sufficient authority to carry out his or her charge. In particular, the officer should: a) be

responsible for the Undergraduate Center mentioned in 1, and for its linkage with Student Support Services, the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs, and the Office for Students with Disabilities mentioned in 2; b) coordinate and support, in concert with their respective deans, the lower-division academic-support services offices in the several colleges in such a way as to encourage a higher quality of services, easier student access to services, greater efficiency, and protection of those offices' budgets in times of retrenchment; c) be responsible for carrying out the recommendations for improving undergraduate education contained in the report of the Committee on Quality Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (Page report) and the report of the Task Force on the Student Experience (Wallace report); d) take steps to ensure that the All-University Liberal Education requirements are met by students in every college; e) take steps to ensure that barriers between colleges--both those that inhibit transferring from one college to another and those that inhibit students in one college from taking courses in another--are kept at a minimum; f) initiate and support ongoing review of teaching and advising, curriculum overlap, and student involvement.

4. The faculty should seek to provide in all undergraduate classes, but especially in large classes, structured experiences that promote active learning and work to lessen the anonymity that students too often encounter. Such experiences are especially important during the freshman year when students new to the University feel most isolated.

5. Faculty and administrators should seriously consider establishing on the Twin Cities campus a coordinated research program in higher education. Such a program would draw on the expertise of the University's faculty, including specialists from the General College, the College of Education, and other colleges, to seek ways of improving the undergraduate experience.

William H. Hanson, Chair
Special Committee on Coordinating
Lower Division Education on
the Twin Cities Campus



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Institute of Child Development
51 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-0345

April 16, 1986

TO Deon Stuthman, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

FROM Andrew Collins *Andy*
Special Committee on Preparation Requirements

RE Proposed amendments to the motion now before the Senate

Here are the two modifications suggested by the Special Committee at its meeting today:

1. With regard to the proposed amendment from SCEP, the Special Committee has suggested the following re-wording:

"Implementation of these preparation standards should be guided by the full set of recommendations in the final report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Requirements."

I spoke with Bill Hanson following the meeting and found that, after consultation with SCEP members, he continues to find the new language unacceptable. Consequently, the amendment from SCEP must be dealt with in its original form.

2. With regard to the Special Committee's discussion of the need for greater visibility for the arts recommendation in the Senate motion, I propose the following language, to be inserted immediately following the sentence in the motion in which the proposed requirements are stated:

"In addition, one year of instruction in the arts (music, drama, or the visual arts) is strongly recommended as valuable preparation for study at the University; and familiarity with microcomputers and common types of software is recognized as an important skill for university work."



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

March 20, 1986

To: Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

From: Professor Shirley Clark, Chair
Committee on Committees

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Shirley".

I have enclosed for the Senate Consultative Committee's review three motions that Committee on Committees recently approved. One recommends the addition of an ex officio member to the Social Concerns Committee; the second expands the pool of faculty eligible to serve on Committee on Committees; and the third revises the description, membership, duties and responsibilities of the Senate Planning Committee.

If you would like to discuss the rationale of any of these recommendations, please feel free to call either me or Martha Kvanbeck in the Senate Office. We would be happy to provide further information about these requests.

Thank you.

enclosures

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the present Senate Rules, Article III.2., to add as an ex officio member of the Social Concerns Committee a representative from the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations.

COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees agrees with the request of the Social Concerns Committee that a representative from the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations be added as an ex officio member of the Social Concerns Committee because many of the issues discussed by the Social Concerns Committee relate to the University's investment portfolio.

SHIRLEY CLARK
Chair

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article IV. 1. B. regarding membership requirements for the Committee on Committees by changing "Faculty/academic professional members shall be senators during the year of their election" to "Faculty/academic professional members must have served as senators within the last five years".

COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees feels that the pool of faculty/academic professional candidates knowledgeable about and experienced in University governance is unduly restricted by the present requirement that all nominees must be senators in the year of their election.

SHIRLEY CLARK
Chair

(A parallel change will be made in the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws.)

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the present Senate Bylaws, Article IV. 1. E. to revise the description, membership, duties and responsibilities of the Planning Committee as follows (additions are underlined and deletions have lines through them):

The Planning Committee represents faculty, academic professional, and student interests in the development of principles, policies, and criteria in University planning. It also serves as a consulting body to the central administrative officers responsible for planning.

Membership

The Planning Committee shall be composed of at least ~~4~~ 6 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Members shall be appointed by the Senate Consultative Committee with the approval of the Senate.

Duties and Responsibilities

- ~~to advise the Consultative Committee on those issues and concerns of relevance to Senate governance~~
- to recommend to the Senate policies with respect to planning.
- to serve as a consulting body to the central administrative officers responsible for planning.
- to submit an annual report to the Senate through the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT :

The Committee on Committees agrees with the Senate Planning Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee that the description, membership, duties and responsibilities of the Senate Planning Committee should be revised to recognize the role this committee plays in the consulting relationship on University planning policies that exist between the Senate and the University administration.

SHIRLEY CLARK
Chair