



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
614 Social Sciences  
267 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

February 16, 1984  
626 Campus Club  
12:30 - 3:00

AGENDA

1. Minutes of January 19 and February 2 (enclosed).
2. Report of Student Co-Chair.
3. Report of Chair.
4. Report of Finance Committee.
5. Reports from Regents meetings.
6. Report of the Task Force on the International Character of the University: discussion.

Among other things, we should consider what our response to the Report should be and whether we should coordinate somehow with SCEP. Recall that the President asked for our response within a month or so.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
614 Social Sciences  
267 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 3/1/83

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

February 16, 1984

626 Coffman Memorial Union

12:50 - 2:50

Members present: Charles Farrell, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Van Hayden, John Howe (Chr.), Susan Hunstiger, Julie Iverson, Marvin Mattson, Lisa McDonell, Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Scott Singer, W. Donald Spring, Deon Stuthman, Colleen Traxler, John Turner.

Guests: Alice Edwards, Gary Engstrand, Professor Norman Kerr, Pamela LaVigne (University Relations).

1. Addition to the Agenda: 2:00 Discussion with Professor Kerr regarding the Committee on Student Academic Support Services, which he chairs.

2. The minutes of January 19 and February 2 were approved as distributed.

3. Report of Student Co-Chair. Scott Singer.

a. Student pay plan presented to Board of Regents February 9: The top student leaders from all five campuses collectively wrote a position paper in opposition to the current form of the proposal and submitted it to the Board. In response to an SCC question, Mr. Singer said MSA had gotten a draft of the proposal a week to a week-and-a-half before the Regents meeting.

b. SSSC members continue to acquaint themselves with all campuses. Several will travel to Waseca following this afternoon's Senate meeting.

c. SSSC is examining its co-chairperson concept.

d. SSSC, along with other MSA students, was represented at the national student conference on voter registration at Harvard last week-end.

e. Student Senate task force will soon present to SCC its draft revisions for rules and bylaws.

f. SSSC is interested in the issue of priority registration for athletes.

On behalf of the students, Mr. Singer asked when two reports are expected-- that of Dean Holt's task force on the Quality of Graduate Education and Research, and that of the Andersen Commission on the Future of Post-Secondary Education in Minnesota. Answers: the Holt report is in the writing stage and the Andersen Commission report is expected March 1.

4. Report of the Chair. John Howe.

The Senate Research Committee seeks an addition to today's University Senate agenda. A University faculty member is due to receive a grant to conduct research under a contract which is at odds with Senate/Regential policy prohibiting secrecy in research. Professor G. Edward Schuh's grant to do a study for Panama comes through the United Nations Development Program which requires written permission prior to publishing results. University Senate policy requires the Research Committee to report its recommendation to the Senate on any case which falls outside the policy, and the Senate to then make a recommendation to the President. Professor Howe will move that the rules be suspended to add this item to today's Senate agenda, and he expects the SRC to ask Senate approval of the exception.

5. Report of the Finance Committee. Irwin Rubenstein.

At its February 13 meeting Vice President Keller passed out to SFC members the document on retrenchment, and retrieved it at the end of the meeting because the list was still tentative since consultation with the deans had not been completed. Consultation was due to be completed by February 17.

The assessments against units are only about one-third to one-half what was anticipated. Units will be assessed differentially. Some retrenched funds will go to central reserves for reallocation and some will be returned to the retrenched unit, which will be required to reallocate them pursuant to the unit's planning documents. Units which have not yet been forthcoming will be forced to be so this time, Professor Rubenstein reported. By mutual agreement, a number of colleges are moving towards their targets over longer time periods than originally conceived.

The SFC elicited central administration's reasons for certain proposals. In two weeks the SFC expects to see further development of these retrenchment/reallocation documents, which are to go to the Regents in March.

Professor Howe asked if SFC has any sense whether someone is still tracking the planning decisions and whether they actually are being implemented over time. Professor Rubenstein said Vice President Keller is keeping close track of them, as well as of circumstances where a particular tax was tried on a unit and didn't yield the intended results.

On March 1 SFC will talk with Dean Holt. Part of that discussion will be about the "equilibrium state" we are to be approaching.

6. Reports from Regents' meetings.

a. Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee. M. Poppele.

- Controversy over the kind of student pay plan proposal brought forward by Vice President Wilderson; item continued to March meeting;
- Regential interest in rates of retaining and of losing valued faculty;
- Acceptance of proposed student service fees for SS84;
- Regential interest in keeping in touch with the process and reasoning by which the proposed new tenure code is being amended, and in any major points of difference between central administration and the emerging faculty consensus. Vice President Keller said (1) central

administration was uneasy at putting terms and conditions of tenure into the code, saying we need some flexibility in that, and (2) rather than giving the Judicial Committee the compelling authority that it can determine a maximum sanction, central administration would prefer a requirement that any contrary decision the President reaches be published in the Senate docket.

Regents McGuiggan and Schertler and Vice President Vanselow advocated making service essentially co-equal with teaching and research as a criterion for promotion and tenure; Vice President Keller said reward should be based on all three but tenure granted on the basis of teaching and research.

b. Budget and Legislative Coordinating Committee. John Howe reported for SFC member Tom Scott who monitored the meeting for SCC.

- Most of the meeting time was spent on the capital request, including the question of whether the University has access to the surplus resulting from capital bids coming in considerably under the appropriation. Professor Spring recalled that it had been members of the governor's staff who reviewed the original Music Building proposal and insisted the University omit plans for the performance hall. He called reinstating the performance hall a major concern and noted that the Music Department last year generated 2000 performance events.
- There is taken to be little likelihood of the supplementary budget request being opened, except for those items the governor has initiated. If one is broached, would that open up the whole list of state specials?
- The governor met February 6 with the CEO's of the state's higher education systems and asked if they had tough planning systems in place. The University looks good on this score. Reciprocity and inter-system relations were also on the agenda.
- There is University unease over what will be the real ownership of the supercomputer. Several FCC members requested future meeting time on this issue.
- There was reference to the legislative bills submitted relating to the "spinning off" of Duluth. Professor Mattson volunteered that the UMD initiatives play a sad song for the existence of the other University campuses distant from the Twin Cities.

c. Educational Policy and Long Range Planning. Professor Mark Brenner, Planning Committee Chair, monitored this meeting; SCC does not yet have his report.

7. Report of the Task Force on the International Character of the University.

Professor Howe told the committee SCC must decide just what it wants to do in terms of officially commenting on the report.

Professor Turner said the report is short on conceptualization and that the whole thrust requires better justification. He reemphasized many of his points from the February 2 discussion.

- We need to set our priorities before making changes.
- There is no inventory of what University is already doing along each line.
- Some of the dollar amounts have to be justified.
- Address the advisability of elevating the directorship of OIP into a vice presidency or assistant vice presidency.
- Need for standards. We have a lot of agencies of support services for foreign students and for arranging exchanges. If we are going to internationalize, we need a good academic base to do it. Admissions and exchanges should be arranged on that basis, by departments. U.S. students' interaction can be with good foreign students. The academic costs of having unqualified students are high and no staff time budget is built into the recommendations.
- Be alert to the possible problem of becoming a community college for the world.
- Regarding faculty rewards: In juxtaposing a new dimension are we going to differentiate in any way among the international, national, and local aspects of teaching, research, and service?
- Given the University's present resource situation, it would be well to proceed carefully, to anticipate possible problems, and do all we can to preclude them. We need to think about it much more seriously and avoid as many of the costs as possible.

Mr. Hayden spoke of the great benefits of an international atmosphere for American students, in personal relationships and in building awareness of the impact of events elsewhere in the world.

Professor Merwin reported that he became aware during his four-year tenure on the board of the Midwest Universities Consortium on International Affairs that University of Minnesota faculty, especially junior faculty, were reluctant to work abroad. They feared they would be penalized for taking a year for such work because their faculty would not recognize it as academically valuable. Professor Turner agreed that work overseas should not negatively affect a faculty member's status.

Professor Stuthman asked people to keep in mind that achievement, not effort, is what is normally compensated.

SCC members sense that central administration seeks some decisions on the recommendations in the report so the future of the position of OIP's director can be resolved. But they see the issues as too complicated to get all resolved within a short time.

Professor Howe remarked that, however, what is most needed now is to identify one person to organize the future discussion.

Ms. Iverson said she had several questions about projected student benefits and requested more student input into the discussion.

Professor Howe said he would contact Professor Michael Root, Chair of SCEP, and inform the President, recapitulating today's SCC discussion, and would also contact the International Education Committee. SCC members are to inform Professor Howe if they want the item on the agenda again.

8. Senate and Assembly Committees on Student Academic Support Services.

Professor Howe introduced Professor Norman Kerr, who chairs the committee, and explained that Professor Kerr had called him to describe the committee's difficulty over the past two years in carrying out its charge.

Professor Kerr distributed copies of a letter of resignation he had drafted but had not yet sent to the President.

He said the committee had had little to do in 1982-83, and that it now has become clear to him that people are prohibited from asking the advice of the committee without the permission of the student affairs vice president. He learned the most recent instance of a relevant policy change from the Daily's reporting of the change ordered in registration queues to favor certain categories of students.

Professor Kerr referred to the rules of the Student Employment Committee (an administratively appointed committee) which appear to have been bypassed in the recent policy proposal made to the Regents regarding a student pay plan.

The Financial Aid staff has been splendid in its cooperation, he said; however, they have not been allowed to bring the committee any materials the vice president has not approved.

Professor Kerr told SCC his objective is to change the system such that faculty and students may participate in decisions affecting them before the decisions are final. He noted that committee attendance, particularly of student members, has been poor.

Ms. Iverson asked whether members of the Task Force on the Student Experience had talked with the committee, as the student SCC members had suggested to Dr. Wallace; Professor Kerr said the committee had seen nothing about that task force.

Structure: Professor Spring pointed out that the Senate constitution revision of 1981 had revamped the former Academic Standing Committee into the Student Academic Support Services Committee because the old committee was no longer being asked to do anything relating to its charge but was being called upon to do other things; these were put into the charge to the new committee. SASSC is an operations committee, which means it is attached directly to an administrative office which it is to report to and advise. The responsibility is upon the office to see that the committee functions effectively. Professor Rubenstein pointed out that the committees are not privy to what is going on, so the related administrative office has the obligation to call issues to the attention of the committee.

In response to a question, Professor Kerr said that his committee's concerns had not yet be addressed in any forum with Vice President Wilderson.

Participants in the meeting variously suggested that Professor Kerr submit his letter of resignation because a dramatic gesture seemed needed, and that he stay on and continue his valuable efforts to vitalize the committee.

The SCC consensus was to advise Professor Kerr not to resign, but to write a strong letter of protest about the committee's being handicapped in performing its charge. Professor Kerr said he would follow that advice and would send SCC a copy of his letter.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele,  
Executive Assistant