



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 PRESIDENT KELLER

December 6, 1984
12:45 - 3:00
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

12:45
sharp

1. Minutes of November 15 (enclosed).
2. Reports:
 - A. Presidential Search Advisory Committee
 - B. Student Chair
 - C. SCC Chair
 - D. Finance Committee
 - E. Accreditation Self-Study Committee.

1:00

3. Governance: continuing discussion. Guest: Professor Pat Swan.

DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

1:45

4. Anticipated process for University decision-making on whether to convert to a semester calendar.
5. Governance: Practical steps to maximize the benefits of coordinating faculty and student governance with University administration.
6. President's agenda items.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

APPROVED 1/17/85

December 6, 1984
12:45 - 3:15
Regents Room

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Irwin Rubenstein, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, W. B. Sundquist, and Maria Sikaffy, substitute representative from the Crookston campus.

Guests: Jacque Jodl, Carol Pazandak, Mary Jane Plunkett, Maureen Smith, Patricia Swan, John Turner.

1. Minutes of November 15. The minutes were approved after being corrected by striking the sentence which followed "The motion carried with one negative vote," at the bottom of page 4, because it had been negated by subsequent discussion in the meeting.

2. Reports.

A. Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Professor Sundquist.

Professor Sundquist summarized the work of the advisory committee to date. There is a flow of information between the committee and the regents via Regent Lebedoff, Mr. Sherburne, and Professor Howe. Committee and Regents will meet jointly on December 13 or 14, at which time committee will transmit a list of about 75 candidates it believes should remain under consideration. Reduced list is long because nominees have not been approached as to their willingness to be candidates and because committee's information on many is still sketchy.

Professor Sundquist excused himself to attend the advisory committee meeting.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

(NOTE: The agenda was reduced and rearranged because a commitment at the state capitol permitted Dr. Keller to join the SCC for only one-half hour.)

3. Anticipated process for decision-making on whether University will convert to a semester calendar.

President Keller termed the College of Agriculture's protest statement "misguided," because, he said, it is mistaken to say the Regents have been told there should be a change to a semester system. Dr. Keller reiterated what he noted he had stated in various other forums, that he would share the informational report of the administrative^{comm.} with the Regents for information and without a recommendation, and would then share it with the governance system.

Dr. Keller remarked that it did not seem useful to gather opinions again because previous surveys have resulted in rather indeterminate splits. Instead, the choice was made to acquire information and develop a plan for how to make the change and then, on the basis of that plan, and following consultation, to decide whether to make the change. He acknowledged that there would be costs associated with the change as well as savings following the change.

Several faculty members observed that the perception nonetheless exists that faculty and student consultation into the decision is missing. Professor Sorauf asked whether it would be better to deal with reactions after a proposal is more or less hardened, or for the committee to get input as it develops the proposal. President Keller said he would prefer to get an operational plan on how to accomplish a change, and then get response to that plan; but, he said, consultation that adds to the committee's being able to meet its charge of gathering information is relevant to the question.

The Consultative Committee had never seen President Magrath's written charge to the administrative committee. During the course of the meeting, copies were obtained and distributed to SCC.

Professor Freier suggested scholarly papers be published on the merits of a semester system and of a quarter system, followed by either a referendum or a vote in the Senate. President Keller said he would have reservations because a referendum does not measure informed opinion.

In reply to the comment that the advisory committee appears to be attending to cost considerations and not to academic considerations, the president said he knows the committee is most interested in the academic questions and is now addressing or will presently address them. "The academic value is the most important aspect of the question," he told FCC. Mr. Shope said the only issue should be whether the academic program will be better under the semester system than under the quarter system.

Professor Freier remarked that the faculty's concern is that the committee make-up does not reflect faculty perspective which the committee needs to get.

SCC agreed that the Educational Policy, Planning, and Faculty Affairs committees are the most appropriate ones for the advisory committee to hear from. SCC and President Keller agreed Professor Merwin would write the president recommending the committee consult with these Senate committees. Professor Rubenstein said it will be the Consultative Committee's responsibility to decide whether the matter should go before the full Senate.

President Keller told the SCC he hopes consideration by Senate committees and by the Senate, if it is so decided, could be completed no later than next fall.

4. Cycle III Planning: Relation of unit planning to central administration's analysis of, and recommendations pertaining to, the planning task force reports.

Dr. Keller said the units are to take account of the task forces' proposals primarily in terms of President Magrath's report of summer, 1984. Dr. Keller's own responses to each of the several hundred recommendations will be out shortly. He suggested that timing (unit plans being due before his responses are available) is not a major problem because the larger goals were articulated last summer.

At 1:25 the president departed for a meeting with the Commissioner of Finance. The SCC returned to its earlier agenda.

2. Reports (continued).

B. Student SCC. Mr. Melby.

Mr. Melby introduced Maria Sikaffy, substituting from UMC for Eric Stroschein. He noted that six of the nine student members had managed to attend today despite some scheduling conflicts with final exams.

SSCC held a retreat at UMD on November 29 and 30 which included, among other business:

- learning about UMD campus issues;
- setting up a further meeting to address the selection process for student representatives to the Board of Regents, including a fair grievance system;
- assessing SSCC strengths and weaknesses;
- creating a student equivalent of the Senate Budget Subcommittee.

The SSCC suggests SCC schedule a lunch or other informal social gathering for faculty and student members to become better acquainted.

C. Report of the Chair. Professor Merwin.

(1) Physical Plant issues. Following SCC's November 1 discussion with Vice Presidents Lilly and Hewitt, Professor Merwin wrote Mr. Lilly for the SCC formalizing the oral understanding that Vice President Lilly would see that SCC got written responses to the problems articulated in the policy proposals from the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation. Mr. Hewitt has now responded to that request (report included in circulating file). Professor Merwin is forwarding the response to the PPSA Committee for its consideration and follow-up.

(2) Today's meeting conflict with final exams. The conflict was real, but because it appeared SCC would take no definitive action on this date on governance questions, and because of the limited time before the February Senate meeting, SCC needed to discuss governance today.

D. Report of the Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman.

SFC meets today and will discuss with Dr. Keller (1) the anticipated effect on tuition of the O&M supplement, should it be appropriated, and (2) the status of the Senate and SCFA's retirement fund rollover request and any alternative

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226
November 30, 1984

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

When the Senate Consultative Committee meets with you on December 6, from 1:45 to 3:00, there are two topics we would like to raise.

First, we would appreciate it if you could clarify for us the process you envision by which the University will arrive at its decision on whether or not to convert to a semester calendar.

Second, we would like to talk governance with you. You are well aware of the current Senate and committee discussions about the effectiveness of faculty and student governance within the Senate system. The SCC is moving in its talks toward a rather global consideration of governance. We would appreciate it if you would be willing to share your thinking on governance generally and how it best interacts with central administration and unit administrations for the betterment of the University as a whole. As we are both aware, Senate-approved policies are sometimes neglected even though the ex officio memberships on Senate committees are intended to promote good communication and coordination.

As department head, chair of SCC, Academic Affairs Vice President and now Interim President, you have had a unique opportunity to see this matter from many angles. We'd appreciate your insights on how to make the efforts of the governance system and the central and collegiate administrations complementary and mutually supportive in the best interest of our University.

As always, we invite you to add items to the agenda. If there is time, have Marsha call me to report these.

Cordially,

Jack
Jack Merwin, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp

c: Vice President Vanselow
SCC members



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Student Senate
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 373-2414

for Dec. 6 SCC discussion

December 3, 1984

TO: The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC)

FROM: Paul Schulte, Member *PKS*

RE: The Swan Motion & Faculty-Student Governance: 'Where to Go From Here

As I should be somewhere over Wisconsin at the time our next SCC meeting commences on Dec. 6, on my way to the Big 10 Rec Sports Directors Conference in Chicago, I am penning these thoughts for your esteemed and careful consideration when we, out of urgent necessity, take up this whole matter again.

I am sure that all of you have by now figured out that SCC will hold a grand total of 3 other meetings before the Feb. Senate meeting, according to our schedule. The last of those 3 meetings falls on the Senate meeting date, Feb. 14. The meeting prior to that one, Jan. 31, will be the docket deadline. That leaves one meeting at which to decide what SCC would like to recommend to the Senate. Not a lot of time. It would seem sensible to either schedule extra meetings, for this agenda item primarily, or to appoint some form of subcommittee, whether extended or not. Which option we follow is up to us. However, if SCC chose the former, it requires more commitment on the part on all of us than the latter route. I will dwell more on the latter route later in this memo.

Before SCC can decide which route to follow, SCC will need to decide how much further inquiry this agenda item deserves. If we choose the latter route, SCC as a whole will be re-faced with this agenda item at a probably less specific future time. Then it could again quite easily consume enormous amounts of SCC's time. With these preliminary, structural constraints noted, let me build a case for a modified second route (subcommittee).

As Prof. Sorauf stated at the last SCC discussion of the subject (which by the way was all devoted to the immediate procedural aspects of the Swan motion and not to the substance of the matter), he was not quite sure of all of the problems perceived by either Profs. Turner and Swan, or other faculty, with the existing governance structure. Prof. Sorauf went on to say that he was not quite sure what were the problems with the existing structure. He did not deny that there were problems, but he expressed the desire to discover what the real problems were. This is a desire I heartily share. The problems outlined in the original motion of Prof. Turner's last Spring cannot be the only perceived problems. SCC barely even got started discussing that set of problems when this deadline was thrust upon us. My basic proposition for the direction SCC should follow relies upon time-

tested methods of information gathering and time allowance. I would propose that SCC first plan one additional meeting to discuss primarily this whole matter. Then SCC should appoint, perhaps initially only SCC-based, a subcommittee to give this issue the time and study it requires. This subcommittee, or an extended successor, should sponsor a series of open fora for all of the University community. A series of targeted open fora could also be held with diverse groups, including perhaps past Facilitative Committee members, past and current faculty Senators, and other such more involved groups. (Each SCC member can quite easily add additional groups to this start.) This subcommittee would be charged with gathering as much information as possible on what problems exist or are perceived to exist. Then the subcommittee would be charged with reporting back to the full SCC its findings, allowing for an SCC discussion that hopefully could produce a set of common problems that the SCC recognized as existing. Then the SCC could set out to work on solving these common problems. (I do not propose to foresee what common problems will be aged upon.) The SCC would have fulfilled the desires of many for change, in its typical, thoughtful fashion. More importantly, haste would have been avoided in reacting to Prof. Swan's motion. Delay in radically altering the Senate's Constitution usually serves the institution better.

This still leaves SCC with the question of an immediate response to Prof. Swam's motion. SCC should discuss this at its special meeting, but not hastily draft alternatives without the requisite forethought. The Student members of SCC are aware of, and I am sure most Faculty members are as well, a substitute motion available at the door of the Senate meeting authored by yours truly. I saw no reason to offer said motion at the time. Its prime purpose was to point out the possibilities one could encounter when one started radical redrafting basic operational documents. I firmly believe that adopting either motion out of haste would be a gross mistake. I do advocate careful, thoughtful consideration of the matter. At our special meeting, the SCC could discuss, and then vote upon the Swan motion on its merits. This up or down recommendation to the Senate could easily be accompanied by a report on other SCC action, such as the route I advocate above. In that way, SCC could fulfill its traditional role as a thoughtful, consultative body and allow the Senate to vote on Prof. Swan's motion. Also, all SCC members would be allowed to express their opinions on this motion, while progressing towards a more viable, healthy solution that could strengthen faculty, student, and faculty-student governance structures without causing needless damage. Otherwise, I fear that we could waste precious SCC time, and do nothing about the problems which do exist.

I hope my musings help you get through your discussion on Dec. 6. I shall be thinking of you all in the Windy City. Merry Christmas, Happy Chanukah, and all the rest.

cc. Jacqueline Jodl Prof. Don Spring Prof. John Turner
Mary Jane Plunkett Prof. Pat Swan Meredith Poppele

MOTION

In order to achieve the following objectives:

1. To encourage students to focus their efforts on those parts of the University's governance structure in which their contributions can be most fruitful -- on committees, at all levels of the system, in the campus assemblies, and in their own student government institutions.
2. To change the composition of the University Senate to eliminate the student representatives, except for the student body presidents of the five campuses; to abolish the Faculty Senate, whose functions will be taken over by the University Senate; and, through these reforms, to provide a governance structure (the University Senate) in which the voice of the faculty can be heard more clearly.

Therefore, be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Constitution of the University Senate:

GENERAL CHANGES

Delete references to the "Faculty Senate," substituting, where appropriate, the designation "University Senate."

Substitute "Faculty Consultative Committee" for "Senate Consultative Committee."

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE (Page 1)

Section 1. Membership

line 5: Delete "and student"

lines 8-10: Delete "Medicine. The elected faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate; the elected students representatives shall serve as the Student Senate." Substitute: "Medicine; and (d) the student body presidents of the five campuses."

Section 3. Allocation of Functions and Powers

a. lines 3-4: Delete "to the Faculty Senate or"

b. lines 3-4: Delete "either the Faculty Senate or"

d. Delete: "In general, functions allocated to the Faculty Senate shall include but not be limited to accreditation,

designation and granting of University honors, policies concerning faculty appointment and tenure, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Affairs and Judicial Committees. " (Entire section.)

e. Delete: "In case of disagreement by the Faculty Consultative Committee or the Student Consultative Committee with a decision of the Senate Consultative Committee concerning the allocation of functions, either committee may refer the matter to the University Senate for resolution. (Entire Section)"

Section 4. Election of University Senate Members

c. (Page 2) Delete: entire section.

e. line 3: Delete: "or student"

f. lines 12-15: Delete: "All student representatives shall be elected for one-year terms and may be re-elected. No student representative may serve more than three consecutive terms."

lines 17-19: "To continue to serve, a student representative must continue to meet the requirements for election identified under 'c' hereof."

g. Line 1: Delete: "and student"

lines 4-5: Delete: "and the students"

line 14: Delete: "the student board or"

line 21: Delete: "Faculty Senate, or Student Senate"

Section 5. Removal for Neglect of Meetings

b. line 3: Delete: "A member of the Student Senate shall forfeit membership by neglecting two consecutive meetings of the University Senate."

d. lines 2-3: Delete: "or a campus student assembly by virtue of holding membership in the University Senate,"

Section 7. University Senate Agenda and Minutes

lines 4-5: Delete: "the students and"

Section 8. University Senate Meetings -- Call -- Quorum (Pages 2-3)

lines 4-5: Delete: "and meetings of the Faculty or Student Senate"

line 6: Delete "appropriate" and add "Faculty"

line 9: Delete: "any" and add "the"

line 11: Delete: "and any student"

lines 17-27: Delete the rest of the paragraph, beginning with "All members of the faculty...."

Be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Bylaws:

ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS (Page 5)

Section 1.

line 3: Delete: "and students"

line 4: Delete: "or students"

Section 3.

Delete entire section.

Section 4.

lines 7-9: Delete: "Student vacancies in the Senate shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the constituencies of the relevant voting unit."

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES (Page 6)

Section 1. Committees Reporting to the University Senate

A. CONSULTATIVE

Rewrite as follows:

"The Faculty Consultative Committee shall be composed of 11 elected members of the faculty and the vice chair of the University Senate. It shall serve as a consultative body to the president, as the executive committee of the University Senate, and as the steering committee of the Senate."

Membership

(1) lines 1-2: Delete: "and the Student Consultative Committee"

b. Student Consultative Committee: Delete entire section.

(2) lines 6-9: Delete: "Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses for the balance of any unexpired term until the next regular election."

(3) Rewrite as follows:

"The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall be elected by its members from among their number for a one-year term of office. He/she shall be eligible for re-election to that position."

(4) line 1: Delete: "Senate Consultative Committee, the"

lines 2-3: Delete: "and the Student Consultative Committee"

Duties and Responsibilities

(1) Senate Consultative Committee

b. Steering (Page 7)

Second Responsibility listed -- lines 6-7: Delete:
"to refer the proposal to the Faculty Senate"

c. Executive

Seventh Responsibility listed -- line 3: Substitute
"chair" for "chairs"

line 4: Delete: "and Student Consultative"

line 5: Delete: "and one student"

(3) Student Consultative Committee

Delete entire section.

ARTICLE IV. STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Committees Reporting to the University Senate through the Consultative Committee

A. BUSINESS AND RULES

Membership (Page 8)

line 2: Delete: "2 students"

Be it further resolved that:

1. These changes go into effect on July 1, 1985.
2. The necessary editorial changes and renumbering of clauses be made in the Constitution and the Bylaws in order to bring these documents into conformity with the requirements of this motion.

Patricia B. Swan
Senator, College of Agriculture

Until 1969, the main governance structures at the University were the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee. In 1969, two additional structures were grafted on -- the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee -- so that students would be represented. At that time, too, a special effort was made to give the students representation on the campus assemblies, on task forces, and on most committees at all levels of governance.

Student participation in governance may be justified on two grounds: (1) to provide them with experience in leadership, and (2) to enable them to make useful contributions in those areas in which they have had experience and have developed some competence. In an effective system of governance, students should be encouraged to focus on activities that help them to develop leadership qualities and enable them to inject their viewpoints on those subjects in which they are most qualified and hence can make the most significant contributions. This can best be done in those forums that deal with such matters as curriculum development, student fees, the calendar, and similar issues. The appropriate forums for such discussions are departmental and college committees, some Senate committees, campus assemblies and committees, task forces, and the institutions of student governance. For the students to perform adequately in these areas requires a great many people who are expected to spend considerable time on this work. (Last year there were more the 180 student committee positions on Senate and Assembly committees alone.) The students have usually encountered difficulty in recruiting people to serve in positions where their contributions can be the most fruitful; they should be encouraged to concentrate their efforts in these forums, where their performance is greatly needed and

deserves improvement. At a time when we are emphasizing the improvement of quality at the University, we ought also to shape up the operation of our governance structures.

It should be noted that this motion does not deprive the students of the representation they presently have on the campus assemblies, on task forces, or on various committees (except for the "Senate Consultative Committee"). Nor does it say anything about the students' right of access to the Regents which they currently enjoy -- rights that are denied to the faculty.

One of the purposes of this motion is to abolish the Senate Consultative Committee (the body composed of both faculty and students), leaving only the Faculty Consultative Committee. Under the existing arrangement, the faculty meet as the Faculty Consultative Committee, and then subsequently the faculty meet with the students as the Senate Consultative Committee. Administrators attend both meetings. Having to hold the two meetings consumes the time of both faculty and administrators. Most, if not all, members of the Faculty Consultative Committee during the past two years would agree that the FCC meetings are much more valuable to the University than are the meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee. The work of the latter tends to be "added on" or duplicative. Furthermore, one of the former chairs of the Committee recently appraised the students' contributions to the SCC discussions as "at best modest." This was a generous appraisal.

For a good number of years, faculty members have been criticizing the present format for student representation in the Senate. Lacking the background needed to deal with issues that appear on its agenda, the students do not participate very much in the debates: they offer very few "inputs" and gain little leadership experience. They encounter great difficulty in filling their seat allotments, their attendance record is poor, and they tend to vote as a bloc. When the Senate acts, we are not entitled to say that it is the voice of the faculty because more than one-third of the seats are given to students. This motion, however, permits the student body presidents of the five campuses to be members of the Senate and to participate and

vote even on matters that were hitherto reserved for the Faculty Senate. This is an effort to improve student governance by upgrading the position of student body president.

It is important for us to get the modified and strengthened governance structure in place before the new president of the University takes office.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2025

AUG 24 1984

August 21, 1984

TO: Betty W. Robinett, Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
Cherie Perlmutter, Associate Vice President, Health Sciences
Sam Lewis, Director, Student Support Services
William Weiler, Associate Director, Management Information Division
Russell Hobbie, Assistant Dean, Institute of Technology
Craig Swan, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Keith Wharton, Associate Dean, Academic and Student Affairs
John Imholte, Provost, University of Minnesota-Morris

Dear Colleagues:

As all of you know, the question of whether or not the University of Minnesota, and particularly the Twin Cities campus, should move to an early start-early finish calendar with a Semester system, has been under consideration for some time here. This is primarily a Twin Cities issue, but not exclusively so. You should keep in mind that the School of Law and the School of Medicine already have different calendars on the Twin Cities campus, that the two agricultural and technical colleges have their own special circumstances, and that the University of Minnesota-Duluth already operates under an early start-early finish system (but still tied to a quarter system calendar).

It is also crystal clear that the University community in the sense of the University Senate and the various faculty and student participants in this process will never agree as to whether or not the quarter system should be continued or changed in favor of a semester system. It is my impression on the basis of the various materials I have seen over the years that students in general, or at least those who have thought about these questions, favor an early start calendar and a semester system, and that the faculty is divided on this matter -- though it appears that perhaps the faculty division may be about 50-50, and that the trend line may be toward acceptance of the desirability of both an early start calendar and a pure semester system.

I personally am convinced for all kinds of reasons, some of which appeared in the comments in John Wallace's Student Experience Task Force as well as in other studies, that a semester system would save money eventually for the University in a very decided way, and that it would be advantageous to students and the University community generally if we could start classes in late August or very early September and have the "regular" academic year end in early May. I am absolutely convinced that this would be advantageous to University of Minnesota students, and it would enhance University recruitment efforts.

Accordingly, I would like you to serve on a special working committee on a semester system to develop specific plans and a timetable for a transition from a quarter system to a semester system on the Twin Cities campus, leaving open the possibility that the coordinate campuses may also wish to join in some changes in their current calendar arrangements. It is for this reason

August 21, 1984

Page Two

that I have invited Provost Jack Imholte of Morris to serve on the working committee both to represent Morris views and, explicitly, to serve as a liaison with the Provosts of the other three coordinate campuses. The working committee will be chaired by Assistant Vice President Betty Robinett, and she and the rest of you should feel comfortable in establishing ad hoc special committees to examine the various issues, including subsidiary sub-committees that might be drawn from the coordinate campuses in terms of their involvement with the projected change.

I am assuming that all of you can serve on this committee, and I propose to announce it and emphasize the commitment of the Central Administration to work for an implementation of a semester plan as early as possible at our September Regents' meeting. Obviously there will be some controversy and discussion with regard to this matter, and I believe the working committee should consult closely with the All University Senate Consultative Committee, but I explicitly reject the idea that we will, at this point, open up for discussion the question of whether we should or should not move to a semester system.

Once a plan, with budgetary estimates (for it will cost money to make the transition) has been developed, it should be presented before the Regents with ample opportunity for those who disagree or have other suggestions to state their case so that the Regents can make a full and complete evaluation. Increasingly, major American universities, not to mention colleges, who have been on the quarter system are moving to a semester system, and I believe this has recently occurred with the University of Iowa and the University of California-Berkeley. In any event, I believe it is time for the University of Minnesota to move from education at three-quarter time.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:pln

cc: University Vice Presidents
Provosts
Mr. Duane Wilson
Associate Vice President George Robb

cc: Sec 1/17



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

December 9, 1984

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

You will recall that in the Consultative Committee's December 6 discussion with you about the process for deciding upon any change from a quarter system to a semester system, the SCC urged that consultation with Senate committees begin immediately. You requested that SCC identify the committees that should be involved. We request that you charge the administrative task force to invite the participation of the Senate Committees on Educational Policy, Planning, and Faculty Affairs as soon as possible, and preceding the drafting of its interim report.

By copy of this letter I will alert the chairs of those three committees that their contributions are likely to be sought soon, and I will enclose for their information a copy of President Magrath's August 21 letter charging Dr. Robinett's task force.

Cordially,

JM
Jack Merwin, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp

c with enclosure:

Professor Jerry Kline
Professor Mark Brenner
Professor Tom Clayton