



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 MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

May 2, 1985
Regents' Room, Morrill Hall
12:45 - 3:00

AGENDA

Approx. time

- 12:45 1. Minutes of April 18 (enclosed).
2. Reports:
A. SSCC Chair
B. SCC Chair
C. Senate Finance Committee
D. Self-Study Committee.
- 12:55 3. Proposed bylaws amendment re ex officio Senate membership for MSA president (enclosed to members who did not receive it April 18).
- 1:05 4. Shope motion referred to SCC by the Senate, and on which SCC needs to respond to Senate on May 16 which would include random sampling of students in the vote on possible change to a semester system (text enclosed).
- 1:15 5. Governance: next steps on proposals for improvement.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

- 1:30 6. "A Commitment to Focus:" next steps.
7. The president's other items.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MINUTES

APPROVED 5/16/85

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

May 2, 1985
1:50 - 3:00

Regents' Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Bruce Williams.

Guests: John Aune, Lisa Carlson, Richard Goldstein, Sandra Flake, Associate Dean Evelyn Hansen, Dean Jeanne Lupton, Vice President V. Rama Murthy, Tim Pratt.

1. The minutes of April 18 were approved as distributed.

2. Reports.

A. Student SCC Chair.

Mr. Melby announced that the SCC had met the previous week-end at Waseca. He reported that the Student Senate has operated under budget. He then introduced members-elect Linda Hanson and Tim Pratt.

B. SCC Chair.

Professor Merwin introduced member-elect Richard Goldstein. He announced that the Faculty Consultative Committee had elected Professor Deon Stuthman and Professor Irwin Rubenstein to be chair and vice chair, respectively, of the FCC and SCC for 1985-86.

In preparation for Professor Howard Bowen's May 22 meeting with the SCC, copies of reprints provided by the Graduate School were distributed to the SCC. Professor Clark noted that the subject of Professor Bowen's Guy Stanton Ford memorial address will be "The Outlook for the Academic Profession," including the demographics of the professoriat. SCC agreed to send notices to the Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, Finance, and Planning Committee chairpersons, calling attention to Professor Bowen's visit and inviting them to join the SCC in conversation with him on the 22nd.

SCC members are asked to prepare questions and discussion topics for the time with Professor Bowen. Two were raised in the meeting: the relative values of semester and quarter calendars, and what makes accreditation reviews more or less worthwhile -- how can we make the University's most valuable to us?

P/A participation in the Senate. Professor Merwin read a letter from a P/A senator inquiring about the lack of parallelism among the P/A, faculty, and student components of the Senate. SCC agreed with Professor Clark's suggestion to ask one or both of its governance subcommittees to take his concerns into account.

The Facilitative Committee will meet in the latter half of May. Agenda will include wrap-up reports of the year's business and discussion on how to assist incoming chairpersons in getting off to a strong start. Mr. Melby asked that chairs be urged to inform and involve student members.

C. Senate Finance Committee.

Professor Stuthman announced the Finance Committee meeting would follow today's SCC meeting. Vice President Murthy will discuss the budget principles with SFC.

D. Pre-Accreditation Self-Study Committee.

Professor Rubenstein announced the committee will schedule another focus group during spring quarter. Mr. Darwin Hendel will write the committee's report. The preliminary document is expected by early fall, and the theme for the report is "A University at the Crossroads."

3. Motion to make the Twin Cities student body president an ex officio member of the University Senate.

Ms. Emanuelson will discuss her motion further with the Business and Rules Committee and report back to SCC at a later date. She would find it acceptable to have the Senate vote on this or a similar motion next fall rather than this spring.

4. Motion to survey students as well as faculty on the semester vs. quarter question.

Mr. Shope explained that he had wanted the text of his motion to parallel that which ultimately passed the Faculty Assembly. He sees the question as more appropriate to the University Senate than to the Faculty Senate.

Professor Sorauf suggested that a directive by the Business and Rules Committee might be called for because the issue of what body is to be responsible for voicing the community will has become so tangled. (The Ney resolution called "for the Senate Consultative Committee to discuss the matter thoroughly and for the Senate to debate the issue." The Faculty Assembly later voted "That the question of a change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of all regular faculty on the Twin Cities campus of the University." The same Faculty Assembly meeting agreed the coordinate campuses should have the option of conducting a poll.) (n.b. See also FCC minutes of 5/2/85.)

It was Professor Sorauf's opinion that many people expect there will be a vote of the representative body of the University constituency: the Senate. He further noted that neither the Assembly nor the Senate has forfeited its right to discuss, and if they choose, to vote on the question later.

In view of the fact that the students have already paid for and successfully conducted a survey of University students on the question, and in view of the

assessment by student SCC members that a second survey would yield very similar results, several SCC members spoke against a second student survey. Instead, suggested Professor Sorauf, the SCC could (1) propose to involve students in the question in the Senate, (2) recommend that any final community action on the question be taken in the Senate, and (3) recommend that each campus's vote on the question be recorded separately.

Professor Rubenstein questioned the wisdom of allowing the Senate, a subgroup of the whole faculty, to vote once a referendum has been conducted.

Mr. Shope requested that there still be a poll of students on the coordinate campuses.

Professor Latterell asked that the committee consider how the community would want to bring its report, and what kind of report it should be, to the Regents. Someone will have to formulate a text with supporting data.

Professor Merwin suggested that SCC consider this course: recommend to the Senate that, following the outcome of polls already done and those planned, the SCC would prepare a report to the Regents which would first go before the University Senate for approval.

SCC DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

5. President Keller told the committee he would like to leave for SCC's further discussion the question of whether a model for the Senate which would provide for more participation on the part of the president could be constructive. There are points in the meetings at which the president may be able to contribute, he noted, and in a University that looks to the president for leadership, a purely symbolic role in the Senate does not seem appropriate.

6. Altering the student fees model.

The president reported that central administration has discussed, and will propose to the Regents, a somewhat altered plan for student fees. He called attention to the current situation and outlook of ever rising fees with no change in services because of the declining number of students to pay the fees. The question is whether compulsory fees in areas which are quasi-educational should be included as part of tuition. One advantage to students would be that their payment would be based upon the number of their credits. A possible additional advantage would be that if the legislature accepted the University's definition of the services as educational expenses, it might pay two-thirds.

The question will have its second Regental discussion in June, at the same meeting at which the fees schedule will be proposed. The president described the proposal as the only way the administration sees to get some relief for certain kinds of fees. In response to an inquiry as to what the change would gain people, the president said there would be some monetary gain to students, and the University would allow some items to be voluntary.

Mr. Shope reported that the items Vice President Wilderson had discussed with students regarding a change in payment system were the fees for the Boynton Health Service, for Music (the marching band), and Debate. At many institutions,

Music and Debate support are included in tuition. The Regents require students to subscribe to the Health Service.

Mr. Shope pointed out that the increase in fees over the last 12 years has been far less than the same period's tuition increase. He noted that the Student Services Fees Committee has had to rely on the assessment of the director of the Health Service and has not been able itself to analyze that budget. He said he did not view the transfer of funds between campuses as a real problem. But, he said, the decision process does need attention. He hoped heavy student input regarding the Health Service would continue even if the funding system were changed.

Professor Stuthman cautioned that if the University pursues this change, it must be very careful about what it defines and does not define as quasi-educational. The president indicated that he agreed and said the administration is not trying to move too quickly on the question. The state fully funds what are defined as necessary expenses, he said.

He said he hoped all students were aware of the proposal, and asked SSCC members each to take it to their campuses for consideration.

Mr. Shope offered the proposal that overhead of the buildings which house the student unions be included in the tuition package.

7. Commitment to Focus.

Guests from the General College who joined the meeting for a portion of this discussion were Dean Jeanne Lupton, Associate Dean Evelyn Hansen, and Professor Sandra Flake.

President Keller told the meeting there had been complaints regarding how he had spoken in public forums on the Commitment to Focus about General College, and questions as to whether he had been accurate. He told the meeting he has learned that it is not accurate to describe the early General College as having been entirely a transitional experience enabling students in an experimental way to move into degree-granting programs. For some, the two years of General College were, in themselves, just what they wanted.

Baccalaureate degrees have been given in GC for the last 13 years, and not the 15 to 30 as he has been reporting. However, the figures he has used of approximately 25% of General College students getting some degree from GC, including about 20% getting four-year degrees, seem to be consistent with the recent record of GC degrees granted and GC transfers to CLA who earn degrees. When he has said that 20% receiving degrees was not a record of success, he told the group, he has meant that the University does not have a record of success in this area. It has never been his belief or intended message that General College has a record of failure.

He said he thinks General College is best suited to helping people with a lower expectation of success to achieve success and to get a four-year degree. He thinks the University's goal should be to see that they get degrees. He told the meeting he has nothing but admiration for the work General College does with its students.

Dean Lupton said she appreciated the president's remarks. The General College staff, she said, is continuing to think about the implications of the

Commitment to Focus. She said General College has never changed its response to its founding philosophy which is to meet the student where the student is and not where one expects the student should be. This philosophy appears to be at least somewhat at odds with the president's speaking out against a "value added" definition of what the University's education will provide.

Professor Stuthman asked whether General College believed that awarding a four-year degree should be its primary aim. Professor Flake said the College values it highly but respects the students' varying expectations.

Dean Lupton said that accurate graduation rate comparisons with IT and CLA cannot be made because there has been no careful tracing of each student from freshman entry on. She said those students who transfer from GC after completing two years have a very high success rate; the college discourages earlier transfers and early transfers have a much lower success rate. Because of the developmental work they require, and because they hold jobs, General College students won't complete their work in two years and in four years. The University community needs to understand the General College philosophy, she told the meeting.

Professor Freier, noting that she was aware from her own Physics teaching of General College's assistance to students for whom English is a second language, inquired how many GC students are in that category. Professor Flake said that each year approximately 100 of General College's 3300 students are enrolled in TC's Commanding English program. Most are Southeast Asians. The president commented at this point that General College plays an important part in the whole University.

Dean Hansen reiterated the point that GC students enter with a different readiness. Consequently, when they enter they are, on the whole, not ready to go the entire distance. Many spend one year in school, then stay out for a while working, starting families, and later return. Some GC students, she said, take 20 years to earn the four-year degree. She emphasized that the state needs to serve these less-well-prepared students.

Professor Sorauf remarked that he had not heard anyone challenge the entry mission of General College: to serve the first two years of post-secondary education. He said he understood the deans' remarks as implying that for a four-year degree General College has a different mission and perhaps even different standards from the rest of the University.

Dean Lupton pointed out two curricular aspects different from other colleges: lots of interdisciplinary coursework, and relating curricular requirements to parts of each student's experience and goals. GC pays attention to a student's background and supports it in terms of putting together a good curriculum for each student. The degrees are individually designed, and not discipline-based. There is neither a language nor a science requirement unless it is part of the student's plan.

Professor Sorauf related that description to the question of focus and of how varied the University's mission should be. Dean Lupton said GC could not continue open admission under the Commitment to Focus because not all students who enter GC will be able to go on into other four-year programs at the University. Some will not choose to, and some will be unable to because they will not take the language and/or the math/science requirement. The question of access, she said, must be addressed because the University should not encourage entry for those students for whom it does not have a place where they can finish.

Next steps regarding Commitment to Focus.

The president noted that the Board of Regents has agreed to capping IT enrollments. At the May Regents' meeting the Board will discuss the proposed linking of the Crookston and Waseca campuses to the Institute for Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. At the June meeting General College representatives will talk with the Regents.

Lower Division Education. Assistant Vice President John Wallace is charged with this part of the plan; Academic Affairs is also asked to consider certain elements of it.

Each part of the Commitment to Focus plan, said the president, will go at some point to the Regents, first for a go-ahead signal and later, in some cases, for approval of specific action. There are questions of whether, and if so to what extent, the University would be closing any doors under the plan. The University is attending to the opportunities available at other institutions.

Professor Rubenstein inquired how, as the administration and the Regents examine the various areas of the plan, they take into account the costs to the University. The president replied that most of the cost question depends upon the response at the legislature because the success of the plan requires maintaining constant dollars for a declining number of students. The legislature has not confronted the cost issue. And the University doesn't know what institutions the state's students will choose to attend.

Professor Rubenstein asked at what point the administration decides to act on some part of the plan. The president gave as an example of action already underway the decision to cap IT enrollments. That decided, the University must work on getting the building and the faculty to carry out the program. Professor Stuthman asked about the relation of this need to the constant budget goal. The president replied that in places such as IT where the University has a backlog of needs for additions and where enrollments will not decline, at least not in the near future, money must be added.

Professor Freier asked if the legislature does not see the proposal as a zero-sum game. The president said it is zero sum in all those units except the ones how seriously underfunded, which will get more.

Professor Freier cautioned that if and when enrollments decrease dramatically, there would surely be funding shifts. The president said what he is aiming for on the funding side is an appropriately-funded base per student. Because for the whole state there will be fewer students in higher education, the state will be able to afford to support those fewer students at a higher level.

The president inquired of SCC about appropriate consulting for different parts of the plan. Are there aspects that call for an all-faculty or all-University process, he asked? He pointed out that some recommendations specifically call for a task force.

Professor Merwin asked that the Senate Consultative Committee be involved in composing committees or task forces regarding various aspects of the plan. Vice President Murthy said he could work with the SCC in formulating those task forces.

The president reported that the staffs from the several state systems

continue to meet on occasion. The University, he said, has sought the help of the state universities to create an alternative four-year opportunity in the Twin Cities.

Professor Rubenstein asked if it's possible the University's undergraduate student body size will be determined by the number of graduate students. President Keller listed four interrelated factors: the size of the faculty of good quality; the physical facilities, the number of high ability graduate students, and the number of undergraduate students. He termed the number of undergraduate students one can adequately handle as the dependent variable. He said there is no ideal ratio of undergraduate to graduate students.

Mr. Melby asked if it would follow that, as the proportion of graduate students increases, TA's will replace professors in teaching undergraduates. President Keller said that, on the contrary, the ratio of undergraduates to faculty will improve. There will be more TA help for faculty who teach undergraduates, but they will help as assistants, in recitation sections and in labs.

Professor Merwin asked that the president in his monthly meetings with the SCC keep it informed of the progress of the plan.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

General College
106 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-4104

May 1, 1985

Professor Jack C. Merwin
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
210e Burton Hall

Dear Professor Merwin:

I understand that the Senate Consultative Committee will be meeting with President Keller on May 2. I am writing to request the inclusion of an issue for discussion on your agenda, an issue of concern to me and the faculty of the General College.

In recent public appearances before various audiences, President Keller has repeatedly given inaccurate information about this College, and has impugned its record of success in the accomplishment of its mission. I am concerned about the perceptions such characterizations create, and worse, about the defamation that can result.

I appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeanne T. Lupton".

Jeanne T. Lupton
Dean

JTL:kss

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

April 24, 1985

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

The Senate Consultative Committee will meet with you on May 2, in what is probably our penultimate discussion for this year. We would like to leave as much time as possible for your new items. But we do also hope to spend further time with you on "A Commitment to Focus," as you had intended for April 18; that discussion, as we vividly remember, was aborted by the day's legislative storm signals.

Cordially,



Jack C. Merwin, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

JCM:mbp

Enc: agenda

cc: Vice President Murthy
Vice President Vanselow