



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 4, 1984
Regents' Room
12:45 - 3:00

AGENDA

- 12:45 1. Approval of SCC minutes of 9/20/84. (Minutes enclosed.)
2. Report of the Student Chair.
3. Report of the Chair.
- 1:00 4. Evaluation of Teaching Quality. Guests: Dr. John Wallace, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Professor F. Gerald Kline, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
- (Enclosure to SCC: SCEP report on evaluation of teaching quality, 6/22/84.)

DISCUSSION WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

- 2:00 5. Policy proposals regarding physical plant and space allocation. Guests: Vice President Keller, Professor Robert Sloan, chairman, Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation, and a representative from Vice President Lilly's office.
- (Enclosure to SCC: Policy proposals from PPSA Committee.)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/18/84

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
October 4, 1984
Regents Room
12:50 - 3:00

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Doug Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin, Chair; Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Dave Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman.

Guests for all or part of meeting: Doug Iverson, Jacque Jodl, Vice President Keller, F. Gerald Kline, Robert Sloan, Maureen Smith, Ass't. Vice Pres. Wallace.

1. The minutes of the September 20 meeting were approved as distributed.
2. Report of the Student Chair. Mr. Melby.

Mr. Melby introduced Sue Grueness, Waseca's new SCC representative.

Student Senate development: SSCC has approved the executive committee and the rules. SSCC hopes budget can be covered through a per-student assessment per campus rather than largely from MSA.

On October 24 Ms. Jodl, MSA president, will give her State of the Campus address. All are welcome.

3. Report of the Chair. Professor Merwin.

a. Presidential search advisory committee. Upon becoming Associate Vice President, Dr. Murthy asked to be relieved of the chairmanship. Regent Krenik honored that request but asked Dr. Murthy to remain on the committee. He then asked Professor Howe to chair the committee and asked the FCC to name an additional faculty member; that member is Professor Mario Bognanno.*

b. Professor Merwin is meeting individually with several Senate committee chairs and will convene the Facilitative Committee later in October. He invites suggestions for that agenda.

c. Professor Merwin has accepted Business and Rules' offer to try to resolve the remaining questions regarding the Review Board on Advertising, Sponsorships, and Promotions. (See September 20 minutes.)

* Regents subsequently declined to add a faculty member, so Professor Bognanno did not serve.

4. Evaluation of instructional quality. Guests: John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education, and Jerry Kline, chairman of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP).

Material: June 22, 1984 memorandum from SCEP to SCC and Vice President Wallace re "Recommendations Concerning the Evaluation of Teaching Quality."

The heart of SCEP's response to the 1982 charge from the Consultative Committee makes three points: "...a) that evaluation should more often be designed for course improvement, b) that the University should make the advancement of the evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement part of the planning theme of improving the undergraduate experience and c) responsibility for advancing the evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement should be a central responsibility of the Office of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education." The report goes on to report eight findings of fact and seven recommendations.

Dr. Wallace told SCC that the objective of evaluation is the improvement of teaching in courses. He believes colleges and departments should be made responsible for producing a plan and reporting it back to his office.

Dr. Wallace said he was generally sympathetic toward moving in the direction recommended in the SCEP report, but believes it needs a little more discussion. Administrative time is scarce. He does not want to instruct the deans on this exercise until it is clear. He meets regularly with the deans and they are looking at the recommendations. He thinks the deans should initiate the proposals for evaluation design if they are to do something substantially different and more than at present. Those proposals presumably would be brought to the Educational Policy Committee.

Professor Kline emphasized the need to distinguish between evaluation for course instruction improvement and evaluation for promotion and tenure and/or for merit raises. He also questioned who would pay evaluation costs.

Professor Sorauf countered that personnel decisions are a unit's major source of leverage in getting improved performance. Professor Kline responded that we want evaluation to make a contribution to education, but we don't submit to evaluation when we expect it to be used against us. Faculty choose their one best course of the year for evaluation.

Dr. Wallace remarked that the striking differences in attention to teaching are between departments, not between colleges. A weakness in the existing system, he said, is that it has not addressed the departmental situation at all. Professor Kline said deans could take attention to teaching into account in distributing discretionary funds. He spoke of the need to nurture the culture of the department because it is in that culture that we care about teaching.

Professor Stuthman outlined the system used in Agronomy and Plant Genetics, which is the one department recognized in SCEP's report for constructive evaluation. The department separates evaluation from direct personnel decisions. It is assumed everybody will evaluate every course. Two items are mandatory on each evaluation -- the assessment of the instructor and of the course. All other items address improvement of instruction. He said faculty tend not to experiment in teaching if what doesn't work out is going to count against them

in evaluation. In Agronomy the connection to personnel decisions is delayed and is related to the faculty member's response to suggestions for improvement.

Professor Stuthman then suggested Vice President Wallace be in touch with the Graduate School as well as with deans of undergraduate units regarding improving instruction. Workshops of the sort being promoted for TA's can be useful, he said, when the right kind of resources are brought in.

Professor Sorauf remarked that recognizing exceptional teaching (emphasized in the SCEP report) is fine in itself but does not have the effect of improving the performance of poor teachers. Good teaching is primarily a matter of priority, of time and attention, he said.

Professor Clark inquired about the current and anticipated funding abilities of the Small Grants Fund and the Bush Sabbatical Fund and others cited in SCEP's report as valuable in strengthening teaching. Vice President Wallace said the Small Grants Fund can award \$50,000 a year and the Bush Sabbatical Fund \$300,000 a year. Support for that sabbatical program is now shifting, as originally intended, from the Bush Foundation to the University. Funds from the Northwest Area Foundation are running out.

Professor Kline urged the students to take the Student Course Information Project (SCIP) fully into their own hands. Students are free, he emphasized, to collect information and to use it. SCIP clearly aids students in course selection. But because the students sought funds and legitimacy from the Senate, faculty and administration got into the position of helping students define their questionnaire.

Professor Merwin recognized Ms. Jodl, MSA president, who reported that a committee of MSA will be looking at ways to resurrect SCIP. MSA believes a student course guide should contain considerable course information including some course evaluation. Students would like an opportunity to discuss with faculty any faculty anxiety that student evaluations will affect personnel decisions.

Professor Rubenstein added that students have the biggest incentive to see evaluation happening and shouldn't wait for the faculty. Mr. Melby agreed the students must try to transcend the problems on expertise and funding of the past. He hopes for some central mandate on evaluation of instruction, but departmental autonomy on just what the method will be.

Professor Sorauf commented that the grapevine can be adequate for upper-class students while freshmen and sophomores need something more. Hence the job for SCIP could be narrowed down to the relatively small number of introductory courses.

Dr. Wallace asked what approach people want to see taken: whether to collect all the good examples of exercises for the improvement of instruction and require them University-wide, or whether to encourage each unit to work out its own system? Professor Kline said as a minimum Dr. Wallace must get the support of the deans and their agreement that it is up to them to do something.

Professor Latterell said faculty have to get over our hesitation and use promotion and tenure evaluation data more for positive feedback. Professor

Stuthman then wrapped up the discussion with the remark that we should consider that our most important product is our students.

The Committee thanked Dr. Wallace and Professor Kline for their participation.

5. Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation: policy proposals.
Guests: Vice President Keller and Robert Sloan, chairman of PPSA.

(Note: Schedule conflicts prohibited representation from the Office of Finance and Operations. However, Associate Vice President Hewitt had given Vice President Keller a memorandum reflecting on the proposal.)

Background. In 1983-84 the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee discussed a number of policy proposals and officially adopted some of them. The Committee was moved by the persistence of the problems. Committee discussed with Mr. Hewitt reports of a number of specific problems, but he largely discounted them. The PPSA Committee wanted to present the whole draft to the Senate for its consideration. SCC members had copies of the proposals and last year's SCC had discussed them once with Professor Sloan on May 31.

Discussion.

A. Recognition of problems. No one questioned that problems persist in both broad areas: (1) maintenance, repair, and remodeling (which is in the sphere of Finance and Operations) and (2) space allocation and space use (which is in the sphere of Academic Affairs).

B. Specifying the problems and addressing them.

(1) Maintenance, repair, remodeling. Faculty have a pervasive sense there is no accountability in this realm. The eternal complaints continue of overcharges and unsatisfactory work. Vice President Keller said he recognizes the problems but sees signs of improvement and efforts to make the system more responsive. For example, 60% of remodeling is now done by outside contractors. (But faculty alleged that threats are still being made to units contracting outside.) In addition, there is now an ombudsman through whom the administration hopes to centralize communications regarding physical plant problems. (However, the faculty members present were quick to point out that faculty know nothing of the ombudsman. That office, they emphasized, must be publicized through such means as the SCC newsletter and a listed hot-line phone number.)

(2) Space use and allocation. The University must make good use of its space and, said Vice President Keller, that requires an incentive system. We must introduce positive stimuli to the faculty to give up space no longer well-used. Administrators spent considerable time with PPSA last year on suggestions about space rental and space reallocation which the administration hoped would give units incentives to surrender underused or unused space, and had hoped PPSA would produce some proposal from those suggested options. But the PPSA report dismisses that approach.

Professor Sloan explained that PPSA had spent a great deal of time discussing the numerous alternatives offered on the concept of space rental, retrenchment, and reallocation, and concluded that carrying them out would cost far too much faculty time in the frequent reassessment of their own space needs. Dr. Keller said that while of course such assessment could be done administratively, he

thought faculty would like to have a voice in it. On the other hand, he said, perhaps the range of options the administration brought forward were not practical and better ones can be found. He encourages PPSA to help search creatively for a workable incentive system. He has also asked one of the deans' councils to try to come up with a proposal on space reallocation.

C. Assessing PPSA's proposals. Vice President Keller questioned whether the faculty/the Senate want to approach the problems along the lines proposed by the PPSA Committee. He raised several criticisms of the policy proposal:

(1) It separates space allocation questions from academic questions, perpetuating a problem the University is trying to overcome. Academic Affairs is not mentioned in the proposal. The University should not be separating in the Senate structure what we are trying -- with good reason -- to integrate in the administrative structure.

(2) Some policy statements are completely unworkable, e.g., "In principle the user department should be asked to pay only after work is satisfactorily completed." Courts have ruled that withholding all payment on work in progress is not permissible.

(3) PPSA errs in appropriating certain authority, e.g., making the committee the final authority on space allocation, defining what University officer can make certain decisions.

Vice President Keller said it is appropriate for PPSA to discuss the execution of physical space plans with Finance and Operations and to hold them to the plans. However, the master plan for space use and its integration with the academic plan should be left to the bodies dealing with the academic plan. The Senate Finance Committee, on which PPSA has representation, should do much of the overseeing. Professor Stuthman noted that from the point of view of the Finance Committee it appears some progress has been made toward linking the capital request to University planning.

D. Senate structure. Vice President Keller said the Senate reorganization (1979-81) went a long way toward making parallels between the Senate and the administrative structures. That doesn't seem to have happened, however, in the creation of PPSA. He raised the question of whether PPSA has the right mission.

E. Space audit. In answer to a question, Vice President Keller told SCC that the Vice President for Finance and Operations is conducting a space audit. He said people beyond the department immediately concerned need to take part in the decisions for several reasons, including the facts that at some time in the future another unit may occupy the space in question, and that common space is often the first thing a department is willing to give up when its plans exceed available resources. Professor Rubenstein surmised that the purpose of the audit must be in part for Academic Affairs' decisions regarding using space appropriately. But, he noted, faculty want some input into such decisions.

F. Some other PPSA agenda items for 1984-85. Professor Sloan said the committee will look into classroom adequacy and improvement. Vice President Keller reported central administration has approved the use of \$300,000 for

classroom improvement this year. He hoped PPSA would discuss this undertaking with Assistant Vice President Wallace. Professor Sloan reported the committee would be talking with Dr. Wallace. PPSA wants to promote several other practical recommendations from the Task Force on the Student Experience, such as maps and a good sign system on campus.

Committee will challenge the office size model the University is using, which PPSA finds absurd for contemporary needs.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226
September 27, 1984

Vice President Kenneth Keller
Office of Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Re: October 4 Senate Consultative Committee meeting

Dear Ken:

The SCC looks forward to the opportunity to discuss with you on October 4 topics of mutual interest. We have reserved 2:00-3:00 for that talk but I will also alert you to our earlier agenda (see #2 below).

1. Physical Plant and Space Allocation policy matters. SCC has on the agenda for 2:00 the policy proposals developed by the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation. Bob Sloan, chairman of PPSA, will attend, and we expect that Vice President Lilly, who must be out of town on that date, will send an officer. Professor Sloan presented the proposed policies to the SCC late last spring for a preliminary discussion. The PPSA Committee hopes to put them before the Senate on November 15 and has attached them to its annual report to the Senate.

2. Evaluation of Instruction. John Wallace and Jerry Kline will be on hand for the SCC's first discussion of SCEP's June 24 report and recommendations concerning the evaluation of teaching quality. It is SCEP's response, after extensive work, to a charge given it by SCC late in 1982. We cordially invite you to join the meeting for this topic as well.

Finally, of course, if you have additional items you wish to bring to the meeting, we would welcome them. If possible, please let me know ahead of time of any other items.

Cordially,

Jack Merwin, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp

cc: President Magrath
Vice President Vanselow
Vice President Lilly
Assistant Vice President Wallace
Professor Sloan
SCC members

Enc.: SCEP 6/22/84 memorandum to Howe and Wallace.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Philosophy
355 Ford Hall
224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 22, 1984

TO: Professor John Howe, Chairperson
Senate Consultative Committee (SCC)
Professor John Wallace, Assistant Vice President
for Undergraduate Education

FROM: Professor Michael Root, Chairperson
Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP)
Gloria M. Williams, Chairperson
Subcommittee on the Quality of Instruction

SUBJECT: Recommendations Concerning the Evaluation of Teaching Quality

In response to a September 1982 letter of request from Professor Patricia Swan, then Chairperson-Elect of SCC, a subcommittee of SCEP was formed to begin an examination of the issues addressed in the Brasted Task Force Report on Developing and Encouraging Excellence in Teaching accepted by the University Senate in 1978. Attached to Professor Swan's letter were two other documents.

The first of these was a letter (June 9, 1982) from President C. Peter Magrath requesting that SCC review the University's efforts to evaluate and improve the quality of undergraduate instruction. Several issues/questions which he thought should be addressed included (1) how to maintain the quality of our teaching programs, (2) what are the problems and opportunities associated with the use of teaching assistants, (3) are there better ways to consolidate and use our teaching and evaluation system, and (4) how can the quality of teaching be taken into account in the processes by which promotion and tenure and merit pay decisions are made?

The second attachment (August 1982) was a series of follow-up questions to the 1978 Brasted Task Force Report which focused on the following issues/questions: (1) how course/instruction evaluation takes place and who is involved, (2) what is the role of the University community in the improvement of instruction, (3) in what ways is teaching quality recognized at all levels of personnel decision making within the University, and (4) how is instructional evaluation integrated with activities such as advising to assist student

choices? Further correspondence with Dr. Patricia Swan directed the SCEP subcommittee to examine the question, "What is the status of evaluation of teaching (over the past five years) since the 1978 Brasted report?".

Gloria Williams is the Chair of the SCEP Subcommittee that has examined these questions. This subcommittee met many times during 1982-83 and Professor Williams carried the work of the subcommittee forward through this academic year. This spring Professor Williams presented her sub-committee's report to SCEP, SCEP discussed the report and following that discussion agreed to the following response to Professor Swan's letter.

The Committee's response does not offer an answer to each of the questions raised by either President Magrath or Professor Swan. The Committee decided that it would be better to focus on a few topics than to discuss many. The Committee decided to focus on the evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement. While a good deal of attention and effort has been given to the evaluation and rating of instructors for the purpose of personnel decisions, it is the Committee's view, that students are likely to gain more when evaluation is centrally focused on the improvement of a course than when it is centrally focused on a rating of the course instructor. The central point of the Committee's response to Professor Swan's letter is a) that evaluation should more often be designed for course improvement, b) that the University should make the advancement of the evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement part of the planning theme of improving the undergraduate experience and c) responsibility for advancing the evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement should be a central responsibility of the Office of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education.

1. Generally speaking, each faculty member and department engages in some form of evaluation of instructional quality. The quality of instruction is assessed in different ways throughout the University, but interviews with faculty members and administrators in CLA, IT, the Schools of Architecture, Law and Journalism indicate that units are in compliance with the 1974 Senate Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching (May 30, 1974) that every faculty member evaluate in some way or another at least one course per year.
2. Few Colleges or departments in the University have followed the other recommendations of the 1974 Senate Policy. In particular, the Policy recommended that Collegiate and departmental units a) develop a plan for compulsory evaluation of all undergraduate courses beginning 1975-76 and b) develop faculty performance agreements that clearly state the criteria upon which faculty will be judged at the end of the stated term of agreement. These plans and agreements have not been developed, and the members of this Committee do not here propose to endorse such performance agreements. However, the fact that little or no effort

has been made to implement these Senate recommendations points to a general problem that faces University Senate resolutions: no one has a responsibility to acknowledge let alone follow the recommendations moved by the Senate. The Committee discovered that few Deans or Central Administrative Officers were even aware of the 1974 Senate Policy and 1978 Senate Report and learned that the Senate has no procedures for advancing its recommendations or for seeing that its policies are understood, taken seriously or implemented by Vice-Presidents, Deans or Department Heads.

3. There are three main purposes which evaluation of teaching quality serves within the University. They are (1) the purpose of making personnel decisions and, in particular, for making promotion and tenure or salary/merit decisions, (2) the purpose of improving courses or improving the performance of instructors and (3) the purpose of aiding students in courses and in teacher selection. Different procedures are used by different academic units to accomplish one or more of these purposes, but evaluation of teaching quality is generally directed toward personnel decisions. Central Administration is primarily interested in evaluation of instruction at the time of tenure and promotion reviews. Here there are University guidelines for how teaching is to be evaluated and the role that evaluation of the quality of person's teaching is to play in departmental, Collegiate and University decisions.
4. Less attention has been given to the evaluation of instruction for salary/merit increases. In a letter of April 17, 1984 to Provosts, Deans, Department Heads, Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow explained that salary and merit decisions should be based on judgments of teaching quality and exceptional or unusual teaching accomplishments should be a basis for merit increases. However, there do not appear to be any standards or procedures like those offered by the Koffler-Ibele memorandum to describe how this should be done, and no formal reviews to assure that Colleges and departments base salary/merit increases on teaching quality.
5. Evaluation of courses/teaching to aid students in decision-making was the purpose of the Student Course Information Project (SCIP). Though the project was approved by the Senate on March 29, 1979, there has been no student survey since 1981.
6. Some departments have developed programs for evaluating teaching for the purpose of course improvement. Impressive among these is a program developed by the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics. Evaluation of teaching in

this unit includes all courses and includes self-evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation. The aim is not to rate the instructors but to discover ways to improve the instructor's course or some feature of his instruction. Salary and merit increases are based on effort and success at making these improvements.

7. The history of the University's support for instructional improvement is uneven. An interesting program supported by F.I.P.S.E. and directed by Clyde Parker of the College of Education languished after the F.I.P.S.E. money ran out. Russell Burris's consulting group received mixed review from the faculty who have worked with the group. The Educational Development Program and Small Grants Program have supported many efforts to develop or improve undergraduate or graduate course. This support seems to have greatly encouraged and aided faculty in developing new and innovative courses, and in strengthening older and established courses. However, both of these programs appear to be underfunded and neither of the programs provide faculty with summer salary for educational development as the Graduate School provides faculty with summer salary for research. The Northwest Area Program on Active Learning also seems to have been a great success. The aims of the program are most important ones: to help students learn how to learn, to help them to be more active in the classroom and to encourage them to work collaboratively on projects that draw on a number of their skills. The Bush Sabbatical Program has given another boost to interest in teaching. Projects supported by the Bush Sabbatical Program must promise to improve undergraduate education and not merely to advance a faculty member's research interests. This provision of the Program appears to be taken very seriously by those who administer the Program. John Wallace is to be commended for his work on behalf of both the Bush Program and the Northwest Area Program.
8. Important in supporting quality instruction are symbols and awards. A number of University faculty have won teaching awards from their professional societies for outstanding contributions to graduate or undergraduate education, but as important if not more important, is the University's interest in teaching awards. Faculty should receive as much recognition and reward from the University for professional recognition or awards for teaching as they do for professional recognition for research. Very important are the University's own awards for teaching excellence. Some Colleges offer such awards, others do not. Every College should offer teaching awards. At the all-University level, contribution to quality instruction is rewarded and recognized by the Morse-Amoco Program. This program is very well

administered and more and more prominence has been given to these awards within the University Community each year. Professor F. Thomas Benson, Acting Director of the Center for Educational Development, is to be complimented for his efforts on behalf of the Morse-Amoco Program as well as his efforts on behalf of the Small Grants Program and the Educational Development Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Senate Consultative Committee should develop a policy to support the actions and recommendations taken by University Senate. The aim of this policy would be to promote an administrative response to these recommendations and to promote administrative support for them. The policy should provide for periodic reviews of progress in implementing the recommendations and, in some cases at least, it should provide for reports to the Senate of this progress.
2. Each College and department should actively promote and support the use of evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement and curriculum development.
3. Such evaluation should concentrate on a) the aims and the organization of a course, b) the course materials and c) the tasks asked of the students, at least as much as on the lectures or on the qualities of the instructor. The evaluation of these features of the course should include peer evaluation, though the peer evaluation the Committee has in mind would not include classroom visits, for it appears to SCEP that peer evaluation is most desirable in the evaluation of course design or course content and least desirable in the evaluation of classroom performance.
4. At present, there is no office in the University and no academic officer responsible for supporting and encouraging efforts to evaluate and improve the quality of instruction. This should be a central responsibility of the Office for Undergraduate Education in Academic Affairs. The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education should receive each year from the Dean of each College an accounting of efforts within the College to evaluate and improve instruction and efforts within the College to recognize and reward instructional excellence. The Assistant Vice President should summarize and evaluate these efforts in an annual report to SCEP.
5. The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education should make special effort to encourage and support the

evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement. He should provide financial and professional support to departments and faculty to assist them in this evaluation.

6. The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education should purchase the time of faculty or graduate students in the University who are experts on instructional improvement and who are willing to consult with instructors as part of a department's or individual faculty member's plan to improve the quality of instruction. The Office of the Assistant Vice President should act as a referral office and should publicize these opportunities for advice and support as widely as possible.
7. The University should introduce a program of competitive grants (similar to those provided through summer research fellowships) to faculty who wish to spend some part of the summer improving their ability to plan and present the highest quality courses. This program, each year, could decide to emphasize one side of good teaching. Some years, for example, the program could give priority to proposals to help faculty plan and present courses that emphasize student writing; in other years, priority could be given to proposals to help to plan and present courses that emphasize collaborative learning, or that emphasize the methods of inquiry of the discipline or the way that the discipline resolves disagreements between experts. This program would be part of an overall planning theme to insure adequate support, recognition and rewards for excellence in classroom teaching.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Com
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

*Copy sent
8/6/85 to
Harry Hoekamp*

January 9, 1985

Professor Robert Sloan, Chairman
Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation
Department of Geology and Geophysics
106 Pillsbury Hall

Dear Bob:

Following the SCC meetings of October 4 with you and President Keller, and of November 1 with Vice President Lilly and Associate Vice President Hewitt, Mr. Hewitt sent to you and to me a copy of his review of the proposed policies on maintenance and remodeling procedures developed last spring by the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation. The Consultative Committee now returns the matter to your committee for whatever further follow-up PPSAC considers appropriate.

One response which might make sense at this point would be to monitor for a year or so the effects of the new directions and new efforts being undertaken by the Physical Plant units, including the designation of Charles Self as the officer to assist clients in any project-related problems they cannot resolve with the job foreman. After some trial period has passed, the Committee presumably would want to consider whether it saw a need to try again to negotiate some policy adjustments.

We hope your committee will find the year a productive one also in terms of the several other items on your agenda as you, SCC, and President Keller discussed on October 4.

Cordially,

Jack Merwin, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp

cc: Vice President David M. Lilly
Associate Vice President Clinton N. Hewitt
President Kenneth H. Keller