



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

ALL UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, May 6, 1982
1:00 - 3:00 p.m.
Room 608 Campus Club

AGENDA

1. Fix agenda
2. Minutes of April 29 (to be sent in advance if possible)
3. Report of the Chair
4. Report of the Student Chair
5. Committee reports
6. Old business
 - a. Committee on Committees will bring their Senate motions
 - b. Subcommittee on financial emergency
7. New business
 - 2:30 a. Discussion with Vice President Keller on how undergraduate education, particularly the liberal education "floor" requirements for undergraduate degrees, will be overseen if the Committee on Liberal Education is disestablished.
8. Adjourn



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

ALL-UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE MEETING

May 6, 1982
1:00 p.m.

The meeting of the All-University Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Chairman Douglas Pratt in Room 608, Coffman Union. Other members present: Robert Brasted, Nancy Brecht, Marcia Eaton, Dawn Fleming, John Howe, Dennis Kronebusch, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marvin Mattson, Paul Quie, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan, Kit Wiseman. Visitors included Vice President Keller, Pam Coyle (Daily), and Maureen Smith.

1. Fix agenda-

The agenda was fixed as written.

2. Minutes of April 29-

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the Chair-

Distributed- Report from the Budget Executive on the Library School with cover letter from Vice President Keller to Professor Pratt

Draft of the SCC Annual Report to the Senate

The results of the unit consultation survey were sent out 2 or 3 weeks ago. The responses of unit heads will be distributed. Responses from Management, Pharmacy, and Library have already been received.

The proposed policy revisions from the Committee on Human Subjects in Research has been forwarded to the Research Committee. The SCC will examine any changes recommended by the Research Committee, before it is brought before the Senate.

Robert Holt has expressed his continuing concern over the divestment policy submitted to the Finance Vice President and thence to the Regents by the Social Concerns Committee. He may make a motion on the floor of the Senate that the policy resolution currently under consideration by the Regents, which in fact differs from the resolution from Social Concerns, be submitted to the Committee on Faculty Affairs, since the investments covered by the policy may eventually include faculty retirement investments. The SCC may want to consider its own position on this subject.

4. Report of the Student Chair-

The Students' Annual Report has been submitted to Marilee Ward's office.

Kit Wiseman has written a letter to President Magrath protesting the absence of a student representative in the interviews of the final candidates for Vice President of Health Sciences.

Election of Twin Cities Campus Consultative Committee members is taking place today. Next week there will be a reception with the President.

5. Committee Reports-

a. Finance- (Swan) The Finance Committee's annual report will be submitted fall quarter. Professor Swan intends to propose that the Finance Committee submit a third interim report to the Senate. This report will first be directed to the SCC. The following are some items included in that report:

1. A summary of the oral report given at the last Senate meeting.
2. A summary of the '82-'83 budget plan which includes the total figures of the O & M budget and increases caused by the two salary increase plans implemented between this year's official budget and next year's official budget.
3. Work left to do- Complete an analysis of the relationships between college reductions and program priority statements and note any trends.
4. Report to the Senate that there are now four task forces created as a result of inter-college issues (on programs in composition, social work, special counseling for students, and information science).

6. Old Business-

a. Committee on Committee's motion to the Senate regarding the Committee on Liberal Education- Mr. Benson's amendments have been incorporated into the present form of the recommendation. The Committee asked for an indication from the SCC as to whether or not the SCC would endorse the motion.

Professor Howe recommended endorsement of the motion on the basis that it represented a constructive reallocation of tasks. Dave Lenander said he would rather not have the SCC take a position until a broader discussion of undergraduate education at the University of Minnesota could take place on the Senate floor. Professor Eaton said that though she could support the motion, she had questions about the comments which accompanied the motion. Professor Howe responded that approval would be only of the motion, not the comments. Professor Spring indicated his endorsement of the motion, explaining that the SCC originally gave this task of studying the future of CLE to the Committee on Committees and SCEP after having already agreed upon the ideas now specified in the amendment. Professor Swan suggested putting on record: 1. that the SCC will initiate conversation with the Vice President on the direction and development of Liberal Arts Education and 2. the SCC will request that the SCEP highlight aspects of liberal arts and undergraduate education in its annual report to the Senate. Dave Lenander suggested that when the motion is presented, Professor Pratt express some of the SCC's concerns about the subject. Professor Howe suggested as a friendly amendment that the SCC call upon SCEP to 1. remain sensitive to its mandate concerning undergraduate liberal arts issues and to its role as policy maker and 2. report to the Senate on policy issues.

After further discussion the original motion was combined with the friendly amendment to read: The SCC endorses the amendment to the Senate Constitution as proposed by the Committee on Committees and requests that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy report to the Senate during the coming year concerning ways in which it is incorporating into its domain issues regarding liberal arts and phases of undergraduate education which were formerly addressed by the Committee on Liberal Education. The motion carried without dissent.

b. Civil Service representation on Senate committees- will not be dealt with at the next Senate meeting because of complications arising from the fact that some civil service employees belong to collective bargaining units. The item has been withdrawn from the May 20 agenda.

c. Subcommittee on financial emergency- (Eaton) The subcommittee has decided to take its "imperfect" document to the Senate as a working document. Further work is needed to ensure that the language of the document is legally unambiguous.

7. New Business-

a. Annual Report to the Senate- (Pratt) Professor Pratt asked for any additions or changes to the annual report. After some discussion a motion was made to submit the report for information at the May 20 Senate meeting. The motion was carried without dissent.

b. Discussion with Vice President Keller about CLE- Professor Pratt outlined the nature of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Committees, reported SCC's endorsement of the amendment, and invited Vice President Keller to comment. Vice President Keller said that he agreed in principle to the SCC's endorsement of the Committee on Committee's motion. His only hesitation was in regard to the separation of the functions of policy making and implementation, which carried an inherent danger of one body forming policies which the other found to be unworkable. This danger, however, will be mitigated by the formation of a new position in the Vice President's office- an additional Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. This person will direct the Center for Educational Development, working in close touch with the Vice President for Student Affairs and the University College. Using both organizations (CED and University College) the Assistant Vice President will be able to both review the current curriculum and oversee experimentation with new curriculum. Professor Pratt asked what the relationship would be between the new Assistant Vice President and SCEP. Vice President Keller replied that the Asst. Vice President would confer with SCEP over policy issues. Professor Swan asked if that relationship with SCEP is made explicit in the Assistant Vice President's job description. Keller said he was not certain that it was, but agreed it would be good to have it explicitly stated. Professor Brasted asked who would be responsible for feeding information and recommendations to the Assistant Vice President. Keller suggested that a working subcommittee from SCEP could be assigned that function but welcomed other suggestions.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Helmstetter

MAY 6 1982



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Minnesota Student Association
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2414

May 5, 1982

Dr. C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. C. Peter Magrath;

When we heard last Thursday, April 29, 1982, that two of the three final interviews for the position of Vice President of the Health Sciences had already taken place without student representation, my fellow members of the Student Consultative Committee and I were, to say the least, very disappointed. In the two most recent Vice Presidential vacancies at the University of Minnesota the members of the Student Consultative Committee actively participated at the final interviews and made a recommendation. It is unfortunate that the candidate for the Health Sciences position did not have an opportunity to meet the student leaders at this institution.

I realize that all of the final interviews are now completed and that students' recommendations will not be forthcoming. I do hope, however, that whoever is selected will have an opportunity to meet with students at the earliest possible moment. It is also important that some sort of formalized mechanism is established for students to meet with the final candidates for such visible and important positions. I look forward to a recommendation on a formalized process including student representatives.

In closing, the student members of the Senate Consultative Committee strongly resent being left out of such an important decision.

Respectfully,

Kit Wiseman
Student Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

cc: Dr. D. Pratt
Bruce Thorpe
Student S.C.C.

May 5, 1982

To: University Senate Members

From: Marilee Ward, Clerk of the Senate

M.

In compliance with the University Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules the following amendment to the Bylaws is being sent to you 10 days before the May 20 Senate meeting, when it will be presented.

MOTION:

To amend the present University Senate Bylaws, Article IV, by eliminating Section 2C, which provides for a Standing committee on Liberal Education reporting to the University Senate through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. (Also to re-number the succeeding sections of Article IV, i.e., 2D as 2C, etc.)

COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees has been discussing throughout the year the need for the Committee on Liberal Education. Meetings have been held with members of the Liberal Education Committee and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and several memos regarding the Committee's activities have been examined. Further, the Committee on Committees has reviewed the original purpose of the predecessor of the Committee on Liberal Education in light of the needs of liberal education at this University today. It is the consensus of the Committee on Committees that the Committee on Liberal Education is no longer the best mechanism for furthering the cause of liberal education at this University and that its functions should be reassigned to various other units as described below.

We believe that the Committee on Liberal Education was extremely important in furthering the aims of liberal education when it was established in 1963. However, circumstances have changed since then and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy should now provide appropriate attention to undergraduate education. Because the Senate Committee on Educational Policy is representative of all parts of the University, we do not feel that the special representational structure of the Committee on Liberal Education is needed. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy can also provide the necessary links to the academic vice president, the office which has the broadest mandate for the educational policy. We outline below a division of labor which we believe rationalizes the governing structure and furthers the goal of preserving and enhancing the study of liberal arts by undergraduates in a large university.

Our basic organizational principle is that the policy-making functions should be centralized in the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and the administrative functions should be handled by the academic vice president's office. We think that the present structure of the Committee on Liberal Education blurs these functions and attempts to do by committee what must be done by a single administrator. The activities which have been carried out and sponsored by the Committee on Liberal Education include policy-making; monitoring; teaching awards; small grants program; and serving as a forum for the exchange of views on liberal education. We suggest that the first activity, that of policy-making, should be handled by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Certainly, if the Senate Committee on Educational Policy desires, it could establish a subcommittee on undergraduate education reporting to the full committee. The second activity, that of monitoring the liberal arts floors, should be assigned to the office of the academic vice president. This is essentially a technical function best done by one person designated by the academic vice president. Any issues which arise regarding

OVER

the monitoring would be referred to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy for action.

The third activity, the awarding of prizes for contributions to undergraduate education, should also be administered by the academic vice president's office. That vice president might appoint an ad hoc committee each year for the purpose of selection or might appoint a committee of past winners of the award. Once again, the Senate Committee on Educational ^{POLICY} would set up the criteria for the awards, and the vice president's office would handle the actual administration of the awards (perhaps through the Center for Educational Development, as is the current process). The fourth activity, that of the small grants program, should also be directed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy at the policy level. While the Committee on Committees notes that the purposes of the educational development and small grants programs are quite distinct, it recommends that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Educational Development Committee consider the streamlining of the selection process and also the collegiate and all-University rounds of the granting process. The amount of faculty time spent in reviewing grant proposals seems excessive, given the reduction in the overall amount of educational development funds. Once the granting process is simplified, again the academic vice president could establish, at his or her discretion, a mechanism for awarding the funds. The fifth activity concerning the interchange of view on liberal education is also one that could be handled through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy with the cooperation of the academic vice president.

The Committee on Committees proposes the above division of labor between the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the academic vice president and the abolition of the Committee on Liberal Education. We believe that this assignment of functions preserves many of the significant achievements of the Committee on Liberal Education and is sensitive to the arguments put forth by its members in support of the liberal arts mission. At the same time, the Committee on Committees believes that a more straightforward and streamlined committee structure will allow these vital functions to be performed more effectively.

MARY CORCORAN
VIRGINIA GRAY
Co-chairs
Committee on Committees



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

ALL UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, May 20, 1982
12:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

1. Fix agenda.
2. Minutes of May 6 (enclosed).
3. Report of the chair.
4. Report of the student chair.
5. Report on the student year at UMD (Bea Anderson).
6. Committee reports.
 - a. Senate Finance
 - b. SCC Subcommittee on Legislative Relations
 - c. Subcommittee on Financial Emergency.
7. Old business: Social Concerns and the Subcommittee on Social Responsibility in Investments - continue discussion. (enclosed--two background documents)
8. New business: Steering.
Preliminary draft of University policy recommendation, coming from President's Religious Affairs Advisory Group, re resolution of conflict between scheduled exams and religious holidays and sabbath observances.
9. Conversation with President Magrath (1:00).
(Enclosure: Prof. Pratt letter to President)