



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
5-257 Millard Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

Approved 10/18/79

Minutes of the Senate Consultative Committee

September 27, 1979

The All-University Senate Consultative Committee convened its second meeting of the 1979-80 academic year at 1:00 p.m. on September 27, 1979 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall on the Minneapolis campus.

Members present included George Blake, Robert Brasted, Scott Carlson, Steve Carlson, Dick Cooke, Mark Davis, Marcia Eaton, Jim Gelbman, Wendell Glick, Cleon Melsa, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Chair, Betty Robinett, Vera Schletzer, L. E. Scriven, Don Spring and John Weis. Visitors included Maureen Smith of University Relations and Carla Wheeler of the Daily.

Professor Purple called the meeting to order and turned the conduct of business over to Professor Brasted, chair of the subcommittee on outreach. Professor Brasted introduced the two memoranda previously mailed to SCC members, one of which, dated 9/19/79, included background information and seven questions distilled from the numerous questions which have arisen in response to the Outreach Report, and the other of which, dated 9/21/79, consisted of four possible motions to bring to the floor of the special Senate meeting, November 1.

Professor Eaton moved, Professor Spring seconded that the SCC adopt Professor Brasted's September 19 report for the agenda of the Senate meeting.

Discussion on the question encompassed several aspects. Professor Robinett told the SCC that on the previous day she had heard three reports from other University campuses regarding "inloading." Waseca, for example, has always had all credit instruction inloaded and Duluth has incorporated

outreach more fully than the Twin Cities campuses. The information was entirely new to her and she remarked that the Senate and the faculty need this sort of information to know what has been good and what has been difficult in the experience of other University campuses.

Professor Brasted explained that the far more extensive lists of concerns about the outreach proposals are not lost. They are retained in minutes and reports of SCEP, the Committee on Summer Sessions and others. Professor Blake remarked that the faculty remain rather in the dark about the outreach proposals. The secretary was instructed to arrange a notice in the Official Daily Bulletin of the Daily to the effect that copies of the full Outreach Report are available from the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. An agenda for the Senate meeting, listing the seven issues, will be published in the Daily two weeks before the November 1 meeting.

The motion to incorporate the September 19 report into the agenda passed without dissent.

Professor Morrison recommended asking the Committee on Business and Rules to assist in structuring the Senate meeting and in dividing the questions of business. It was pointed out that if the Senate accepts the Outreach Report fully, it will not come before the Senate again.

Attention then turned to Professor Brasted's memo of September 21 listing four possible motions to place before the Senate. Professor Glick moved that the SCC eliminate motions #1 and #2, to accept in their entirety, and to reject, respectively, the recommendations of the Outreach Report. Professor Robinett noted that the Regents are very much interested in this issue and that the Consultative Committee should be more circumspect than to simply reject the proposal. Professor Glick's motion passed without dissent.

Professor Morrison stated that to maintain Senate action, i.e., control, on the question it is better to withhold approval until there is more information, instead of approving the proposal with instructions that certain things be done. He moved and Professor Spring seconded that motion #4 be the motion introduced to the Senate. He recommended that part of the wording of #3 be

incorporated into #4 to specify a year's data gathering. Suggested motions #'s 3 and 4 follow:

3. Endorsement in principle of the Report with a request that more substantive data be derived from collegial and/or departmental units of the University over a one year period. Request that at the end of this period the Study Group (or some newly constituted group) should return with suitable modifications.

4. No recommendation possible regarding implementation of the recommendations of the Study Group on Outreach from the Report as currently constituted. Statement that a more substantial data base is needed which might be derived from collegial and/or departmental units of the University.

Professor Glick inquired if it was true that the Study Group did not solicit opinion from the University's 31 collegiate units. There was no direct response but Professor Brasted explained that the lengthy set of questions from SCEP in response to the interim report was not answered in the final report. He believes that the community needs a lot of data, especially figures on the costs involved in implementation.

Professor Robinett noted that one question to be considered is who will be hurt by implementation. One category of people is those who are now teaching overload and have come to depend upon it. She also suggested that someone might take a look at the kinds of faculty members who have consistently been employed on overload to see if this reveals patterns that may or may not be desirable.

The motion to make no recommendation and to request a year of data gathering was passed without dissent and with instructions to modify the wording to make clear the intent of the SCC.

Mr. Steve Carlson asked that discussion of an item regarding tuition determination be placed on the agenda with the president.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary

M E M O R A N D U M

To: SCC members

From: Bob Brasted, Chair, Subcommittee on Outreach

Date: 9/21/79

Listed below are four possible motions for the SCC to consider regarding a Senate stance on the Outreach Report. After considering the accompanying set of questions on the Report, please indicate your choice of motion to place before the Senate, or compose a new motion. You may telephone your opinion to the SCC office on September 25 or 26 and/or hold it for further discussion at the September 27th meeting.

A motion for:

1. Complete agreement with the recommendations of the Outreach Study Group in their Final Report. Agreement that the recommendations should be implemented.
- or:
2. Rejection of the recommendations of the Study Group on Outreach.
- or:
3. Endorsement in principle of the Report with a request that more substantive data be derived from collegial and/or departmental units of the University over a one year period. Request that at the end of this period the Study Group (or some newly constituted group) should return with suitable modifications.
- or:
4. No recommendation possible regarding implementation of the recommendations of the Study Group on Outreach from the Report as currently constituted. Statement that a more substantial data base is needed which might be derived from collegial and/or departmental units of the University.

RCB/mbp