

AGENDA (B)

All University Senate Consultative Committee

Campus Club - Room 626 - 12:30 noon*

Thursday, September 15, 1977

1. Approval of Minutes of the July 28, 1977 Meeting
2. Chairman's Report - Betty W. Robinett
 - a. Legislative Relations Advisory Committee
 - b. University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review
3. Koffler-Ibele Memorandum (enclosed)
4. Capital Request (enclosed)
5. 504 Regulations (letter from Ann Pflaum is enclosed)
6. Student Legal Services (one-year vacancy on Board of Directors to be filled by the Senate Consultative Committee)
7. Update - Search Committee for Vice President for Administrative Operations

BWR:llc
Enclosures (3)

* The meeting is expected to run until approximately 2:00 p.m.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University
Senate Consultative Committee
302E Eddy Hall
192 Pillsbury Drive Southeast
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of September 15, 1977

The All-University Senate Consultative Committee convened its second meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, September 15, 1977 at 12:30 noon in Room 626 of the Campus Club at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Mark Bufkin, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Caroline Klaus, Harriet Lewis, Terry Marchiniak, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett (chairman), Phil Ryan, and Barbara Stuhler. (Mahmood Zaidi was unable to attend because he was out of the country at the time of this meeting.) Visitors to the meeting were Professor Robert Brasted, chairman of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (S.C.E.P.) and Maureen Smith of the University Relations Department.

For Information Only

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the July 2, 1977 meeting were approved as submitted.

2. Chairman's Report - Professor Betty Robinett

a. Legislative Relations Advisory Committee (LRAC)

There had been a request that members of the Senate Consultative Committee serve on the University's Legislative Relations Advisory Committee. Members Wendell Glick, Kenneth Keller, and Richard Purple have agreed to so serve. Harriet Lewis raised the question of student representation. There is presently no student on the LRAC. She will contact Dr. Kegler's office and report back to the committee.

b. University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review (UCBRBR)

Professor Mahmood Zaidi and student representative Harriet Lewis will represent the Consultative Committee on UCBRBR. Professor Zaidi will serve as chair for this committee. Two other Senate committees have notified UCBRBR regarding who their representatives will be (S.C.E.P. and the Senate Committee on Research).

Action Items

3. Koffler-Ibele Memorandum

After review of the memorandum on faculty tenure received by SCC in draft form, it was decided that Professor Robinett would convey to Dr. Koffler's office the sentiments of the Consultative Committee. Briefly stated, it was felt that the Tenure Committee would more properly be the group to review this document. She also was asked to relay comments on new Section 8 as contrasted to old Section 7.

Members Keller and Morrison will, in addition to Professor Robinett's discussion with Dr. Koffler's office, relay these same sentiments to the Tenure Committee. It was also noted that it would be preferable to separate department and individual procedures in Section 1, and that the role of the different campuses that comprise the University of Minnesota should be taken into account.

4. Capital Request

After reviewing this document, it was agreed that a letter should be written to Vice President Brown (copy attached). This letter will contain two items: a compliment on the report, and the observation that renovation costs should be part of the total budget for any new building. The latter refers to such situations as the movement of offices from Nicholson to the new Williamson Hall, with the offices in Nicholson sitting in disuse because there are no funds available for renovation. Such occurrences are especially noticeable due to the lack of usable space on the Minneapolis Campus.

It was also suggested that the Consultative Committee raise the question as to why UCRRBR had not been asked to review the capital budget request.

5. 504 Regulation - Regarding Discrimination on the Basis of Handicap

Professor Morrison was given all supporting materials to the letter that the Consultative Committee had received from Ann Pflaum. He will review the regulation and report back to this committee at a future meeting. (Attached for your review is a copy of Dean Frank Sorauf's summary of the regulation.)

6. Student Legal Service

There is a one-year vacancy on the Board of Directors for the University's Student Legal Service. The Consultative Committee had been asked to provide the name of someone to serve on this board. The names of Professor Fred Lukermann and Professor Tom Clayton were suggested. Professor Robinett will contact Professor Lukermann directly to see if he is able to serve. Professor Clayton will be contacted as an alternate for this board vacancy.

7. Update - Search Committee for the Vice President for Administrative Operations

Various ways of setting up the process by which Search Committee members would review candidates' files were discussed. Members will go to the office of SCC on an individual basis to review those files which are complete. At the October 6 meeting of the Search Committee, a general discussion will then be possible. A final meeting of the Search Committee on October 13 will provide the last opportunity for review of files and the compilation of the list of candidates for President Magrath.

For Information Only

8. Consultative Committee Schedule - Fall Quarter '77

Various dates and times were discussed as possible occasions for meetings of the Consultative Committee. The final list was decided on and the attached memorandum distributed after the meeting of September 15. (see attachment)

9. Suggested Items to be Considered During 1977-78


A discussion was then held regarding some of the items which it was felt at this date should be reviewed by the Consultative Committee at some time during the coming year:

- copyright laws
 - guidelines on reproduction of copyrighted materials
 - possibility of a centralized copyright office
 - question of liability in copyright abuse cases
- discrimination on the basis of age vis a vis new legislation which may pass soon prohibiting mandatory retirements prior to age 70 or 72
- cost allocations across departments where use for certain items is consumed primarily by one group but paid for by several, or where certain departments pay for a general use item which is seldom or never used by them
- further considerations concerning the new Student Legal Service
- student access
- faculty salaries policy on allowable external income for professionals
- legislative appropriations for fellowships: available possibly on a quarterly basis? (ask Professor Edward Foster to address the Consultative Committee)
- ask William Kell to talk to the Consultative Committee later this winter about research
- quarter system vs. semester (Calendar Committee will be surveying students regarding the opening date of school - does it have an impact on enrollment?)
- review President Magrath's five year plan
- invite Professor Tom Clayton to discuss the ombudsman plan

10. German University System

Professor Robinett mentioned an article which Professor Mary Corcoran had sent to her regarding universities in Germany which might be of interest to SCC members (copy enclosed).

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda L. Compton
Administrative Fellow
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

*Rec'd 8/15/77
Part "A"*

August 4, 1977

To: The Honorable Erwin L. Goldfine
The Honorable Lauris Krenik
The Honorable Robert Latz
The Honorable David M. Lebedoff
The Honorable L. J. Lee
The Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan
The Honorable Wenda W. Moore
The Honorable Lloyd H. Peterson
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler
The Honorable Neil C. Sherburne
The Honorable Michael W. Unger
The Honorable David C. Utz, M.D.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the retreat on August 11 and 12, one agenda item will be a discussion of the capital request to be presented to the 1978 Legislature. The 1977 request was completed in late summer of 1976 and presented to the Governor last fall, as statute requires that we submit the capital request at the same time as the Operations and Maintenance budget request. The capital request was approved by the Regents in November, 1976, and was distributed to the Legislature, but only a few items were considered since the legislative calendar calls for consideration of capital requests in 1978. Attached is a copy of the Governor's recommendations for the University of Minnesota.

We have continued to work on facilities questions in the interim, and several additions and changes in the request are being prepared and will be recommended to the Board for information at the August retreat and for action at the September meeting.

During the past year, Mr. John Byrd, our new Director of Space Programming and Management, and members of the Office of Physical Planning have given particular attention to the use of existing buildings, both those to be vacated because of new construction and other buildings for which no new replacement space is anticipated. We are taking seriously the wishes of the Governor and the Legislature that we make every possible effort to use existing buildings as efficiently as possible, requesting new facilities only when no alternative can be found. Our emphasis in this capital request is on renovation and remodeling, and we would like to request a planning appropriation for an even greater effort in this kind of development of physical facilities in the future. We will, of course, need to ask for some new construction in certain areas, both on the Twin Cities and at the coordinate campuses and stations.

Before I briefly outline some of the significant changes in the revised 1978 capital request, let me make a few comments about the entire request. (A comparison of the 1977 Legislative Request to the proposed 1978 Legislative Request is attached.) The total request submitted to the Governor last fall totaled \$55,949,858. This figure did not include the \$12,965,232 for Unit F, Nursing and Pharmacy. Since the costs of construction have been escalated by eight percent due to inflation and a number of remodeling projects have been added, the new request will total \$68,388,019. This request includes a number of projects that are system-wide, such as an item which, for the first time, would enable us to maintain continuing, systematic updating and repair of University facilities. This item totals \$5,000,000, and we hope it can be a biennial item in our appropriation, similar to the "repairs and betterment" items now appropriated for the State University System and for the Community College System.

For many years most remodeling projects were carried out using Regents' Reserve funds. Regents' Reserve funds were internally generated from reversions from the colleges and from other sources. In the past, these funds allowed the University to undertake renovation projects and equipment acquisitions totaling several million dollars each year. For a number of reasons, this fund was small in 1973-74 and 1974-75, and the number of renovation projects for 1975-76 and 1976-77 which could be funded in this way has dwindled to almost zero. Only very small projects have been funded at all in the past two years. The maintenance fund, which provides for routine painting and repairs to our buildings, also is not large enough to handle the renovation and remodeling needs in many of our facilities.

An additional system-wide request has been prepared for 1978 which incorporates those 1977 requests for projects that the University is required to complete by federal and/or state statutes or rules and regulations promulgated as a result of federal and/or state statutes. Numerous projects are proposed to meet facility requirements for the physically handicapped, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, energy code and conservation projects, and other projects to meet environmental quality standards. Subsequent to the 1977 request, regulations have been written which require the University to step up its timetable to make the existing facilities accessible to the physically handicapped. In order for the University to comply with the regulations within the stipulated time, the 1977 request for \$500,000 to upgrade the facilities for the physically handicapped has been increased to \$2,000,000.

As in the past, we have grouped the items under six categories: "preliminary planning," "working drawings," "new construction," "remodeling and rehabilitation," "miscellaneous," and "utilities and services." Since most of the major changes in our capital request are in Twin Cities Campus items, I want to provide more detail on this part of our capital request.

One of the most significant changes in the request is item A-1 (East Bank Planning for Recycling Existing Facilities) for the non-Health Science units on the Twin Cities Campus. In this item, we would like to ask for a somewhat different kind of preliminary planning funding for technical advice and planning for the remodeling and reuse of a number of older campus buildings. We would study all of the alternatives for programmatic use of the buildings, resulting in recommendations for the best use of a particular building, given its location in relation to other

relevant units. After determining which facility is most appropriate for a given unit or program, the planning team would make detailed recommendations as to the renovation necessary and estimate the cost of this work. These renovation projects would be placed in priority order for submission to subsequent Legislatures as part of a longer range plan to make maximum and most efficient use of buildings on the Twin Cities Campus, focusing mainly on the East Bank at this time. This item (A-1) in the request includes previous requests for the Electrical Engineering Addition, Music Building, Architecture (third floor addition), and the Zoology Building. Item A-1 also includes detailed planning for relocation, remodeling, and if deemed necessary, new construction to provide space urgently needed to accommodate the academic programs in the College of Liberal Arts, the Institute of Technology, and the General College. These programs are now housed in the following buildings: Appleby Hall, Electrical Engineering, Ford Hall, Jones Hall, Klaeber Court, Lind Hall, Mines and Metallurgy, Music Education, Pillsbury Hall, Scott Hall, Walter Library, and Wulling Hall.

While the total costs for renovating a significant number of buildings on the East Bank will be high, especially because of the need to meet OSHA requirements, building codes, energy saving goals, and access for the handicapped, we are hopeful that this approach toward fulfilling our space needs will, in fact, be more economical to the state.

I am recommending moving one building from the preliminary planning stage to working drawings because of the urgency of the state and national problems which are addressed by the faculties in this area. New facilities for Civil and Mineral Engineering (B-1) are needed to house this faculty in modern research and teaching quarters, as they address a variety of physical environment problems. The use of underground structures for the conservation of energy has been a well-publicized activity of this unit, but it also works on a number of other major environmental concerns.

The Agronomy and Plant Genetics addition (A-3) would be expanded to include the closely allied departments of Soil Science and Plant Pathology. All three faculties serve the growing needs of the state and the world in food and feed production and need enlarged facilities for these activities.

I want to call your attention also to changes made in Section D of the revised request under Remodeling/Rehabilitation. Some of the items which were previously in this list have been included in A-1, which I have just discussed above.

We have found it necessary to include three new items which either were not on the request prepared last year or now have a different and higher priority rating. We are now proposing to ask the Legislature to provide funds to complete the construction project for new facilities for Studio Arts in the College of Liberal Arts. Senator Moe, Representative Norton, and Representative Faricy have reviewed our plans for Studio Arts and have given informal approval for the construction of a small building attached to the main Studio Arts building to house ceramics, glass, and the foundry. The Board reviewed and approved this project at the July meeting. About half of this project can be completed with internal funds, and we need to seek the balance from the 1978 Legislature to finish this urgently needed facility.

The next item in this section of the request (D-2), namely, Fraser Hall and Folwell Hall, is part of a major effort to bring the humanities departments in CIA into closer physical relationship to each other and to house them, for the first time in many years, in quarters that are adequate in both quantity and quality. We have submitted a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for a grant of approximately \$1,000,000 which, if granted, we would need to match with \$3,000,000 in non-federal funds. Requests for Phase I remodeling for Folwell Hall are included in the 1978 request, and the remainder of the project would be requested from the 1980 Legislature. This is a new program of support for the Humanities by the NEH, and we are optimistic that we can be successful in obtaining funds.

The remainder of Section D lists much needed facilities for our intramural program and for the continuation of the major remodeling program under way in Smith Hall (Chemistry). We have shifted the Smith Hall remodeling to priority six and moved the sitework for the tennis courts enclosure to priority seven. With the changes I have just noted, these would be the major revisions in the entire 1978 capital request to the Legislature. I can assure you that we have given considerable thought and study to these proposed changes, both in regard to the impact on current academic and non-academic programs and the impact on future legislative requests. We believe that the changes are justified.

For the Health Sciences on the Twin Cities Campus, the requests are limited and include renovation and changes in the utilities in several buildings. For example, the largest item is for energy conservation measures in Diehl Hall and the air-conditioning of the Bio-Medical Library. In addition, we are requesting conversion of the primary electrical services to the Health Sciences 13.8 KV service in order to replace the less efficient 4 KV existing service.

All of the coordinate campuses have items included in this capital request, and I will note only some of the larger items. At the University of Minnesota, Duluth, we are requesting new construction of a Business and Economics building, primarily to respond to the doubling of enrollment in this school in the past five years. We anticipate the enrollment pressure to continue. Another item with long range implications and benefits to the UMD Campus is a request for the Coal Gasifier and Heating Plant modifications, which will be matched by funds from the Federal Energy Research and Development Agency (ERDA).

At the Morris Campus, in keeping with the emphasis on remodeling of existing buildings, we are giving first priority to completion of the remodeling of the Science Building, which includes making usable the uncompleted space beneath the Science Auditorium. A much needed environmentally-controlled greenhouse for the biological sciences is also included in the request.

At the Crookston Campus, the highest priority item in the request is for a Food Service Facility to serve 1,000 students. The present facility is both outdated and far too small. This facility would also provide a laboratory for Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management students. Physical education facilities, the second item, would replace the outdated facilities in current use.

At the Waseca Campus, five items are included, with the top priority given to a Classroom-Laboratory Building and an addition for Special Purpose Laboratories. These are needed to accommodate increasing student enrollment and alleviate the overcrowding that exists.

Board of Regents
August 4, 1977
Page Five

All eleven outlying stations have one or more items in the capital request, from relatively low-cost items like the extension of sewer lines at the Cloquet Forestry Center to construction of a Teaching Laboratory and Animal Holding Facility at the Lake Itasca Forestry and Biological Station and construction of a Feed Handling and Mixing Facility at the Agricultural Experiment Station, Rosemount.

These are recommendations from the administration and are subject to Regents' review. I look forward to discussing this request with all of you on August 11, and I would welcome any comments or questions you may wish to make to me, to Vice President Brown, or to Mr. Wilson in advance of that meeting.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:nw

Enclosures: 1. Comparison of the 1977 Legislative Request to the Proposed
1978 Legislative Request
2. Governor's Recommendations on the University of Minnesota's
1978 Legislative Request

cc: University Vice Presidents
Mr. Duane Wilson, Secretary to the Board of Regents
Central Officers Group
Council of Academic Officers

*See the book #4
see #1/17
and 3*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Comparison of the 1977 Legislative Request to
the proposed 1978 Legislative Request

SYSTEM-WIDE REQUEST

<u>1977</u>		<u>Proposed 1978</u>	
1. Repairs and Betterment	\$ 5,040,608	1. Repairs and Betterment	\$ 5,000,000
2. Facilities Utilization Study	200,000	2. Facilities Utilization Study	200,000
3. Educational Communication Equipment	738,100	3. Educational Communication Equipment	770,700
4. Upgrade for Physically Handicapped*	500,000		
5. O.S.H.A. Projects*	1,000,000		
6. Energy Conservation Projects*	500,000		
<hr/>		<hr/>	
TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 7,978,708	TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 5,970,700

* Placed in special request for 1978.

SYSTEM-WIDE REQUEST

Special Items

Funds are requested to meet Federal and State statutes and/or rules and regulations promulgated as a result of Federal and State statutes. All of the items were requested in the 1977 Legislative Request for capital improvements except the Energy Conservation Survey.

Item	Estimated Total	Proposed 1978
<u>System-Wide</u>		
Upgrade for Physically Handicapped (Does not include requirements for hearing & sight disabilities)	\$6,300,000	\$2,000,000
O.S.H.A. Projects	In excess of several million	\$1,000,000
Energy Retrofit Projects	To be determined	\$1,500,000
Energy Conservation Survey		Unknown pending receipt of state manual of procedures
<u>Twin Cities Campus</u>		
Environmental-Animal Waste Recovery Unit, St. Paul	\$ 235,440	\$ 235,440
<u>Crookston Campus</u>		
Environmental-Heating Plant Improvements	\$ 270,000	\$ 270,000
<u>North Central Experiment - Grand Rapids</u>		
O.S.H.A. and Environmental-Chemical Storage and Handling Facility	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
<u>West Central Experiment Station - Morris</u>		
O.S.H.A. and Environmental-Chemical Storage and Handling Facility	\$ 13,054	\$ 13,054
<u>Southern Experiment Station - Waseca</u>		
O.S.H.A. and Environmental-Chemical Storage and Handling Facility	\$ 15,120	\$ 15,120

(Special Items, continued)

Item	Estimated Total	Proposed 1978
<u>Cloquet Forestry Center</u>		
Environmental-Polishing Pond for Sewage Treatment Plant	\$ 30,240	\$ 30,240
<u>Horticulture Research Center - Excelsior</u>		
O.S.H.A. and Environmental-Chemical Storage and Handling Facility	\$ 25,406	\$ 25,406
		<hr/> \$5,104,260

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS REQUEST

1977

A. PRELIMINARY PLANNING - priority ranked

1. Civil/Mineral Addition \$ 160,000

2. Animal Science, Phase II 107,000

3. Agronomy & Plant Genetics 40,000

SUBTOTAL \$ 307,000

Proposed 1978

A. PRELIMINARY PLANNING - priority ranked

1. East Bank Planning for Recycling Existing Facilities (\$23,000,000) \$ 345,000

Appleby Hall	Mines & Metallurgy
Electrical Engineering	Music Education
Ford Hall	Pillsbury Hall
Jones Hall	Scott Hall
Klaeber Court	Walter Library
Lind Hall	Wulling Hall

2. Animal Science, Phase II (\$11,636,006) 116,000

3. Agronomy & Plant Genetics, Soil Science & Plant Pathology Additions, New Construction (\$13,064,395) 130,000

SUBTOTAL \$ 591,000

B. WORKING DRAWINGS - priority ranked

1. Electrical Engineering \$ 530,000

2. Music Building 200,000

3. Vocational-Technical Education Building 273,645

4. Architecture, Third Floor Addition 100,000

5. Green Hall Addition and Remodeling 122,000

SUBTOTAL \$ 1,225,645

B. WORKING DRAWINGS - priority ranked

1. Civil/Mineral Engineering (\$17,221,680) \$ 680,000

2. Vocational-Technical Education Building (\$7,388,427) 295,537

3. Green Hall Addition and Remodeling (\$3,969,084) 134,000

SUBTOTAL \$ 1,109,537

C. NEW CONSTRUCTION - priority ranked

Veterinary Medicine	\$17,706,000
2. Archives Research Bldg.	\$ 1,500,000
3. Maintenance and Central Storage Building	500,000
<hr/>	
SUBTOTAL	\$19,706,000

C. NEW CONSTRUCTION - priority ranked

1. Completion of McNeal Hall Remodeling	\$ 170,000
2. Veterinary Medicine	\$19,160,880
3. Archives Research Bldg.	1,620,000
4. Maintenance and Central Storage Building	540,000
<hr/>	
SUBTOTAL	\$21,490,880

D. REMODELING AND REHABILITATION - priority ranked

1. Nicholson Hall	\$ 1,760,000
2. Zoology Building	1,530,000
Intramural Sports, St. Paul	492,789
4. Cooke Hall & Norris Gym	838,210
5. Tennis Courts Enclosure, Sitework, Mpls.	145,100
6. Smith Hall Remodeling & Rehabilitation	300,000
7. Fraser Hall	N/A
<hr/>	
SUBTOTAL	\$ 5,066,099

D. REMODELING AND REHABILITATION - priority ranked

1. Studio Arts - Completion	\$ 300,000
2. Complete Remodeling - Fraser Hall & Folwell Hall, Phase I (Phase II-1980: \$1,250,000)	3,800,000
3. Intramural Sports, St. Paul	532,212
4. Nicholson Hall	1,900,800
5. Completion-Cooke Hall & Norris Gym	905,267
6. Scott Hall	750,000
7. Smith Hall	324,000
8. Tennis Courts Enclosure, Sitework, Mpls.	156,708
9. Agricultural Engineering	1,787,545
<hr/>	
SUBTOTAL	\$10,456,532

E. MISCELLANEOUS - priority ranked

Theatre Arts Equipment & Rarig Completion	\$ 525,984
---	------------

E. MISCELLANEOUS - priority ranked

1. Theatre Arts Equipment & Rarig Completion	\$ 568,063
--	------------

(E. Miscellaneous, continued)

2. Animal Waste Recovery*	\$ 218,000
● Roadway Project, St. Paul	731,230
	<hr/>
SUBTOTAL	\$ 1,475,214

(E. Miscellaneous, continued)

2. Roadway Project, St. Paul	\$ 789,728
3. Tree Replacement, Twin Cities (\$757,000 future)	390,000
	<hr/>
SUBTOTAL	\$ 1,747,791

F. UTILITIES AND SERVICES - priority ranked

1. Pollution Control & Plant Expansion, Twin Cities Campus Heating Plant, Mpls.	\$ 3,194,300
2. Primary Electric System, Mpls.	515,565
3. St. Anthony Storm Sewer, Final Assessment	140,334
4. Sewer Separation Program, East Bank	296,500
● Plotland Irrigation System, St. Paul	200,000
6. Water Distribution System, East Bank	187,550
7. Water Distribution System, St. Paul	157,300
	<hr/>
SUBTOTAL	\$ 4,691,549

F. UTILITIES AND SERVICES - priority ranked -

1. Pollution Control & Plant Expansion, Twin Cities Campus Heating Plant, Mpls.	\$ 3,673,000
2. Primary Electric System, Mpls.	556,810
3. Water Distribution System, St. Paul	169,884
4. Water Distribution System, East Bank	202,554
5. St. Anthony Storm Sewer, Final Assessment	151,561
6. Sewer Separation Program, East Bank	320,220
7. Plotland Irrigation System, St. Paul	216,000
	<hr/>
SUBTOTAL	\$ 5,290,629

TOTAL REQUEST \$32,471,507

TOTAL REQUEST \$40,686,369

* Placed in special request for 1978.

HEALTH SCIENCES

<u>Proposed 1977</u>		<u>Proposed 1978</u>	
1. Pharmacy and Nursing Facilities	\$ N/A	1. Conversion of Primary Electric Services in Health Sciences Complex	\$ 300,564
2. Conversion of Primary Electric Services in Health Sciences Complex	278,300	2. Diehl Hall Energy Conservation & Bio-Medical Library Air Conditioning	343,440
3. Diehl Hall Energy Conservation & Bio-Medical Library Air Conditioning	317,735	3. Ventilation Rehabilitation, 4th Floor Variety Club Heart Hospital-Animal Areas	194,238
4. Ventilation Rehabilitation 4th Floor Variety Club Heart Hospital-Animal Areas	179,850		
<hr/>		<hr/>	
TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 775,885	TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 838,242

DULUTH CAMPUS

Proposed 1977

Proposed 1978

A. ACADEMIC FACILITIES - priority ranked

A. ACADEMIC FACILITIES - priority ranked

1. School of Business and Economics
 a. New Construction \$ 2,796,630
 b. Remodeling & Renovation 931,825

1. School of Business and Economics
 a. New Construction \$ 3,028,360
 b. Remodeling & Renovation 1,006,371

2. Greenhouse 233,300

SUBTOTAL \$ 3,728,455

SUBTOTAL \$ 4,268,031

B. UTILITIES & SERVICES - priority ranked

B. UTILITIES & SERVICES - priority ranked

1. Coal Gasifier & Heating Plant Modifications \$ 643,223
 2. Campus Utilities 215,000
 3. Water Distribution System Improvements 210,200

1. Coal Gasifier & Heating Plant Modifications \$ 643,223
 2. Campus Utilities 232,200
 3. Water Distribution System Improvements Phase II of III 200,000

SUBTOTAL \$ 1,068,423

SUBTOTAL \$ 1,075,423

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 4,796,878

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 5,343,454

MORRIS CAMPUS

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Science Building Remodeling	\$ 138,000
2. Science Greenhouse	171,000
3. Plant Services Center	330,000

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 639,000

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Science Building Remodeling	\$ 149,000
2. Science Greenhouse	184,680
3. Plant Services Center	366,400

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 690,120

CROOKSTON CAMPUS

Proposed 1977

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Food Service Facility	\$ 2,400,000
2. Physical Education Bldg. & Outdoor Recreation & Athletic Complex, Planning Funds	33,047
3. Rehabilitation of Owen Hall for Agriculture & Construction of Agricultural Operations Lab, Working Drawings	133,514
4. Campus Improvements & South Road Improvements	283,270
5. Heating Plant Improvements	250,000

1. Food Service Facility	\$ 2,600,000
2. Physical Education Bldg. & Outdoor Recreation & Athletic Complex, Planning Funds (\$2,400,000)	35,691
3. Rehabilitation of Owen Hall for Agriculture & Construction of Agricultural Operations Farm Lab, Working Drawings (\$3,304,698)	144,196
4. Campus Improvements & South Road Improvements	329,932

TOTAL REQUEST

\$ 3,099,831

TOTAL REQUEST

\$ 3,109,819

WASECA CAMPUS

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Classroom-Laboratory Bldg.
& Addition for Special
Purpose Laboratories | \$ 2,498,819 |
| 2. Upgrading of Heating Plant | 42,000 |
| 3. Greenhouse | 51,077 |
| 4. Outdoor Physical Education
Facilities | 71,940 |
| 5. Development of Roadways &
Parking Lots | 71,940 |

TOTAL REQUEST

\$ 2,735,776

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Classroom-Laboratory Bldg.
& Addition for Special
Purpose Laboratories | \$ 2,698,725 |
| 2. Upgrading of Heating Plant | 45,360 |
| 3. Greenhouse | 55,163 |
| 4. Outdoor Physical Education
Facilities | 77,695 |
| 5. Development of Roadways &
Parking Lots | 77,695 |

TOTAL REQUEST

\$ 2,954,638

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION - ROSEMOUNT

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Dairy Breeding & Nutrition
Research Laboratory,
Working Drawings | \$ 61,749 |
| 2. Feed Handling & Mixing
Facility | 756,569 |

TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 818,318
---------------	------------

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Feed Handling & Mixing
Facility | \$ 817,095 |
| 2. Dairy Breeding & Nutrition
Research Laboratory,
Working Drawings | 66,679 |

TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 883,774
---------------	------------

NORTHWEST EXPERIMENT STATION - CROOKSTON

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Forage and Feed Handling System	\$ 56,353
2. Completion of Storm Water System	119,181
3. Agricultural Research Center Auditorium, Remodeling & Addition	130,571

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 306,105

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Agronomy Field Laboratory Building	\$ 42,840
2. Forage and Feed Handling System	60,861
3. Agriculture Research Center Auditorium, Remodeling & Addition	141,017
4. Completion of Storm Water System	128,715

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 373,433

NORTH CENTRAL EXPERIMENT STATION - GRAND RAPIDS

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Land Acquisition	\$ 50,000
2. Silo With Unloader & Bunk Feeder	25,000
3. Roadway and Drive Resur- facing	30,000
	<hr/>
TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 105,000

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Land Acquisition	\$ 80,000
2. Silo With Unloader & Bunk Feeder	27,000
3. Roadway and Drive Resur- facing	32,400
	<hr/>
TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 139,400

WEST CENTRAL EXPERIMENT STATION - MORRIS

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Machinery Storage Building	\$	54,396
2. Road Surfacing & Drainage		49,300
3. Chemical Storage Facility *		12,097

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 115,793

* Placed in Special Request for 1978

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Machinery Storage Building	\$	58,748
2. Road Surfacing & Drainage		53,244

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 111,993

SOUTHERN EXPERIMENT STATION - WASECA

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Land Acquisition	\$ 288,000
2. Shop and Farm Operations Center	159,947
3. Machinery Storage	62,000
4. Pesticide Storage and Disposal *	14,000
5. Water Management System	31,000

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 554,947

* Placed in Special Request for 1978

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Land Acquisition	\$ 288,000
2. Shop and Farm Operations Center	172,743
3. Machinery Storage	66,960
4. Water Management System	33,480

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 561,183

SOUTHWEST EXPERIMENT STATION - LAMBERTON

<u>Proposed 1977</u>		<u>Proposed 1978</u>	
<u>ITEM</u> - priority ranked		<u>ITEM</u> - priority ranked	
1. Resurface Roadway and Parking Lot	\$ 15,539	1. Resurface Roadway and Parking Lot	\$ 16,782
2. Addition to Plot Research Building	25,419	2. Addition to Plot Research Building	27,453
3. Grain Drying and Storage System	40,000	3. Grain Drying and Storage System	43,200
4. Field Laboratory	79,200	4. Field Laboratory	85,536
	<hr/>		<hr/>
TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 160,158	TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 172,971

CLOQUET FORESTRY CENTER

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Dining/Kitchen Remodeling
& Commons & Classroom
Addition | \$ 350,000 |
| 2. Campus Improvements--
Roads and Lighting | 40,526 |
| 3. Remodel Staff Cabin | 19,838 |
| 4. Extension of Sewer Lines | 9,592 |
| 5. Polishing Pond for Sewage
Treatment Plant * | 28,000 |

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 447,956

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Dining/Kitchen Remodeling
& Commons & Classroom
Addition | \$ 378,000 |
| 2. Campus Improvements--
Roads and Lighting | 43,768 |
| 3. Remodel Staff Cabin | 21,425 |
| 4. Extension of Sewer Lines | 10,359 |

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 453,552

Placed in Special Project for 1978

LAKE ITASCA FORESTRY & BIOLOGICAL STATION

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Resident Manager's House & Office	\$ 52,756
2. Teaching Laboratory and Animal Holding Facility	210,000
3. Rehabilitation of Station Facilities	35,970

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 298,726

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Resident Manager's House & Office	\$ 56,796
2. Teaching Laboratory and Animal Holding Facility	226,800
3. Rehabilitation of Station Facilities	38,848

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 322,624

CEDAR CREEK NATURAL HISTORY AREA - BETHEL

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Garage/Storage/Research Building | \$ 65,727 |
| 2. Bio-Electronics Laboratory Remodeling | 39,324 |

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 105,051

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Garage/Storage/Research Building | \$ 70,986 |
| 2. Bio-Electronics Laboratory Remodeling | 42,470 |

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 113,455

HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER - EXCELSIOR

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Chain Link Fence	\$ 69,682
2. Nursery Storage Facility	99,877
3. Apple Grading & Storage Building	55,694
4. Refurbish Greenhouses	21,582
5. Pesticide Handling & Storage Facility *	23,524

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 270,359

* Placed in Special Project for 1978

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Chain Link Fence	\$ 75,257
2. Nursery Storage Facility	107,867
3. Apple Grading & Storage Building	60,150
4. Refurbish Greenhouses	23,309

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 266,583

LANDSCAPE ARBORETUM - CHASKA

Proposed 1977

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Sewer & Water Connection	\$ 205,320
2. Machine Shed Expansion	34,540
3. Parking Lot Expansion	30,000

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 269,860

Proposed 1978

ITEM - priority ranked

1. Sewer & Water Connection	\$ 221,746
2. Machine Shed Expansion	37,303
3. Parking Lot Expansion	32,400

TOTAL REQUEST \$ 291,449

A. J. J. J. J.

Total University Request

500 500 700 800

\$ 68,849,858

The Governor recommends the following items for action
in F.Y. 1978:

1. Energy Conservation Projects	500,000
2. Diehl Hall Energy Conservation (air conditioning eliminated)	150,000
3. Duluth Coal Gasifier and Heating Plan Modifications	643,223
4. Upgrade for Physically Handicapped	500,000
	<hr/>
F.Y. 78 Subtotal	\$ 1,793,223

The Governor recommends the following items for action
in F.Y. 1979:

System-Wide

1. OSHA Projects 1,000,000

Twin Cities Campus:

2. Planning for Agronomy and Plant Genetics	40,000
3. Veterinary Medicine	17,706,000
4. Maintenance Building	500,000
5. St. Paul Intramural Sports (492,789)	Student Fees
6. Smith Hall	300,000
7. Tennis Court Enclosure Sitework	145,100

Utilities:

8. Pollution Control Expansion	3,194,300
9. Primary Electrical System	515,565
10. St. Anthony Storm Sewer	140,334

Health Sciences:

11. Conversion of Primary Electrical System 278,300

Duluth:

12. Campus Utilities	215,000
13. Water Distribution System Improvements	210,200

Crookston:

14. Food Service Facility	2,000,000 ¹
15. Planning Funds for Phy-Ed Complex	33,047
16. Heating Plant Improvements	250,000

Waseca:

17. Upgrade Heating Plant	42,000
18. Development of Roadways and Parking Lots (71,940)	Parking Fees
19. Waseca Greenhouse	51,077
20. Waseca Phy. Ed.	71,940

Experiment Station:

21. Chain Link Fence at Excelsior Hort. Research	69,682
F.Y. 79 Subtotal	\$ 26,762,545

F.Y. 1978-79 Total \$ 28,555,768

¹These amounts are recommended from the bond fund.
This item will be partly financed by University services.

The Governor recognizes that the School of Nursing needs better facilities. It is recommended that the school receive more adequate housing.

The current proposal for Nursing also includes the College of Pharmacy in an inseparable federal match package known as Unit F. However, pharmacist replacement rates for Minnesota, the existing regional pharmacist supply situation, and rising operating costs all are factors which indicate that a state commitment would be unwise.

Because of these reasons Unit F cannot be recommended.

In regards to the University's proposal for the development of a clinical pharmacy program, it is recommended that the possibility of a shared cost regional facility be explored with neighboring states.

Summary of Governor's Recommendations

F.Y. 1978 Bond	\$ 1,793,223
F.Y. 1979 Bond	26,762,545
Total 1978-79	<u>\$28,555,768</u>



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President
for Administrative Operations
200 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

August 30, 1977

Professor Betty Robbins
154 Klæber Court
320 - 16th Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Professor Robbins:

Thank you for taking time to talk over the impact of the 504 regulations on the University. They have set in motion two concurrent task forces: one newly created to assess programmatic access, which is mandated as of August 2, 1977, and a second one, the committee for improved physical access, an existing committee coordinated by the Office of Physical Planning. The program access task force membership list is enclosed; you will note that it had a good sampling of faculty with experience relating to the needs of handicapped persons.

The 504 regulations impose on the University a task that is in some ways far greater than that of earlier civil rights legislation. The civil rights mandate is, on the whole, an absolute standard of nondiscrimination. The 504 regulations, on the other hand, mandate a relative standard of accessibility. In employment, "reasonable accommodation" must be made to restructure jobs so that they can be performed by handicapped persons. In some instances, academic adjustments must be undertaken to make courses, programs, and majors more accessible to handicapped students. However, there are other situations where no adjustments have to be made, due to a faculty judgment that the requirements in question are essential to a given program.

Clearly then, the regulations allow a healthy dose of faculty discretion in planning to accommodate handicapped students. This discretion is vital. Judging from the very fine record of the faculty as these problems have been dealt with in the past, I am confident that the discretion will be used wisely. The problem simply is, that being relative, the standards for 504 can be quite difficult to define. The task of compliance with the 504 regulations is further compounded, due to the fact that the regulations encompass a much broader group than persons simply with physical handicaps. Also covered in the regulations are emotional and mental illnesses, chemical dependency, mental retardation, and learning disabilities. It will be quite a challenge to develop mechanisms throughout the institution which will enable the faculty to make "reasonable accommodations" to the needs of all of these groups.

Professor Robbinet
August 30, 1977
Page Two

The program access task force was not able, in its four working sessions, to initiate contact with the entire faculty. Instead, it recommended that materials be prepared summarizing the impact of the regulations and that these be distributed to the faculty for discussion during the fall quarter.

It is important that faculty members be aware that the regulations do not require total physical or program accessibility. Rather, this is another instance of a relative rather than an absolute standard. Structural remodeling is only required if other approaches to program accessibility fail to work. (Section 84.22 of the regulations are worth referring to on this point!)

I would be grateful for any suggestions or reactions that you may have and would be happy to talk about this further.

Sincerely,

Ann M. Pflaum

Ann M. Pflaum
Assistant to the Vice President
Administrative Operations

Enclosures: 504 Regulations, 504 Task Force Charge, and the Task Force Report

AP:mkc



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

August 15, 1977

TO: Professor Betty Robinett
FROM: Henry Koffler

Enclosed is a revised draft of a memorandum which Dean Ibele and I would like to send out in connection with the call for promotion and tenure recommendations. Also enclosed is last year's version for comparison.

We have had several requests asking us to be more specific regarding types of documentation, and this revision attempts to address that issue.

Does the Senate Consultative Committee wish to make suggestions?



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Directors, Department Heads and Chairpersons

FROM: Henry Koffler, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Warren Ibele, Dean of the Graduate School *W. E. I.*

SUBJECT: Procedures and Documentation Supporting Recommendations for Promotion and Tenure of Individual Faculty Members

Promotion of a faculty member to a rank which carries indefinite tenure, particularly under the relatively stable conditions for the foreseeable future, demands careful consideration and review of the individual's fulfillment of the primary substantive criteria on which the recommendation is made: namely effectiveness in teaching and advising students and professional distinction in research and writing or in artistic production. Promotion to the rank of professor is also important for the future of the academic unit and the University; therefore, individuals who are recommended for that rank should have achieved a sound scholarly reputation in their field or discipline.

Because of the general coordinative responsibilities of the Dean of the Graduate School for the maintenance and improvement of the quality of the graduate faculty, and hence, the quality of the graduate programs of the University, and because the Dean of the Graduate School is in a position to have an overview of the University without responsibilities for a specific collegiate or campus unit, the Dean reviews personnel recommendations in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs takes such observations and recommendations as are offered by the Dean from this broad comparative perspective into consideration in making a final set of recommendations to the President and to the Board of Regents for action.

We shall be able to discharge the requirements of our roles as reviewers more effectively as the quality of the supporting documentation relative to the substantive criteria and standards is improved. The Koffler memorandum of November 1, 1975, as amended, October 1, 1976, addresses the need for systematic collection of information which serves as the basis for departmental and collegiate review of individual faculty members. These data are also useful accompaniments to the recommendations made by the eligible faculty, chairperson and dean, to us. However, for the most part, the supporting material which comes forward to us should be summarized, and evaluations or analyses of performance and activities should be presented rather than raw data.

Therefore, in order to facilitate the central review of personnel recommendations, please provide the kinds of supporting documentation which are listed and discussed below, with each recommendation.

1. A brief, but complete, statement of each department's promotion and tenure review procedures forwarded through the dean and a similar statement relative to the procedures followed at the collegiate level. (Deans are asked to be responsible for collating and summarizing these statements in a covering letter, or providing copies of procedures which are essentially the same for all cases within a given unit.)

Each individual recommendation should include the information relative to the voting process in the department, the majority view among those who voted, the statements of grounds for majority and minority views, and the chairperson's statement of views, per the Koffler memorandum of 11/1/75, section I.6 Procedures, on page 3.

Several of the collegiate units of the University have followed the practice of establishing or inviting a faculty advisory committee to review the various personnel recommendations concerning promotion, tenure or non-reappointment, and advise the dean of their findings. These committees whether formally or informally constituted, have also served to maintain standards of quality and equity in these personnel matters.

2. A complete and current curriculum vitae, including data regarding undergraduate, graduate or professional, and if applicable postdoctorate education and experiences (with relevant institutions, locations, dates and degrees awarded), years of service to the University and dates of service in the faculty ranks, current personnel status and portion of time of appointment. (A single-year faculty activities report is not adequate for the purposes of this review.)

The curriculum vitae should also include information about courses taught, course development, advising and counseling activities; listings of publications and/or other scholarly works or artistic productions; listings of special services and contributions to department, college, or University, and professionally related services to the community. Special care should be taken in the preparation of this portion of the document to insure that the information presented therein is up to date, accurate, significant, and professionally pertinent.

3. Evaluations of teaching quality at the undergraduate and graduate levels to accompany statements referring to teaching effectiveness.

In some instances, the documentation of teaching quality has been anecdotal, impressionistic and fragmentary, or the assessment has been rendered by a single word, i.e., "dedicated", "outstanding", "excellent" or "distinguished". Summary statements such as these need to be supported by relevant data. Particularly where the burden of the case for tenure or promotion rests heavily upon teaching accomplishments, the individual under consideration is best served by appropriate support for his or her achievements, whenever possible provided in a framework that allows comparison with departmental or collegiate norms.

Evaluation of teaching quality may be provided through student and/or peer assessment. Many departments use student survey forms of the kinds available through the Measurement Services Center or their own instruments to document the quality of teaching. Since it is possible to derive numerical and percentage ratings of student response to various instructor and course characteristics, collection of such data for the faculty across departments and colleges provides a benchmark by which student satisfaction with an instructor's performance may be measured. Some units provide summaries of surveys such as those provided by the Measurement Services Center, rather than raw data or individual student rating sheets, along with such interpretative or analytical statements as the evaluating faculty wishes to make of these surveys. Letters from students may also be suggestive of individual response to instruction, but such letters often do not permit comparison in the more objective manner of the student surveys.

Responses from students about to graduate or alumni in regard to their specific educational experiences are often valuable in assessing the effectiveness of teaching, as long as such evaluations either are comprehensive or come from a sufficiently large sample of the student population. By the same token, eventual success of students in subsequent courses or in positions taken after graduation often may be used to document the value of specific educational experiences.

Further strengthening of the evidence in support of teaching effectiveness is provided by peer evaluation based on the direct observation of the candidate's instruction, review of syllabi, tests and other course materials, and interviews with students whom the candidate has taught. Such evaluation of teaching is especially informative if it considers and explicates the criteria established, the procedures used, and the summary of findings. A balanced perspective on quality of instruction may be achieved through a combination of student and peer evaluations.

4. Evidence of scholarly or other creative or artistic productivity, including a complete list of publications and/or other appropriate accomplishments, accompanied by assessment of their quality and significance. Thorough analysis of scholarship, research, and creative productivity should be undertaken by faculty peers at the departmental or unit level, with a description of the standards or judgments about quality which are applied to the work.

Many units have made a practice of including outside evaluations from distinguished experts in their assessment of the candidate's contributions to his or her field or discipline and the candidate's relative standing vis-à-vis specifically named individuals of comparable development in the same field, and include such letters or documents in the file which comes forward.

5. Contributions to advising graduate students at the masters and doctoral levels and service on graduate degree committees, including documented evaluations regarding the effectiveness of the candidate's graduate advising and research/thesis supervision.

October 1, 1976

Page 4

6. Special contributions to department, college and University functions, such as significant committee and administrative responsibilities and accomplishments.

7. Contributions to professional organizations and learned societies, and professionally related services to the community, including an evaluation of the importance of the contributions and the candidate's effectiveness in service roles. Offices and committee appointments, participation on professional programs through presentation of papers, exhibition of artistic work, and concerts as a performing artist, for example.

8. Professional honors, such as honorary degrees, fellowships, awards, citations and other evidences of recognition of the candidate's merit or distinction, if possible, with identification of the nature of the accomplishments for which the honor was given.

:sl

cc: President C. Peter Magrath



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

DRAFT

9/1/77

TO: Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Directors, Department Heads,
and Chairpersons

FROM: Henry Koffler, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Warren E. Ibele, Dean of the Graduate School

SUBJECT: Procedures and Documentation Supporting Recommendations for
Promotion and/or Tenure of Individual Faculty Members

Promotion of a faculty member to a rank which carries indefinite tenure, particularly under the relatively stable conditions for the foreseeable future, demands careful consideration and review of the individual's fulfillment of the primary substantive criteria on which the recommendation is made: namely effectiveness in teaching and advising students, and professional distinction in research and writing or in artistic production. Promotion to the rank of professor is also important for the future of the academic unit and the University; therefore, individuals who are recommended for that rank should have achieved a sound scholarly reputation in their field or discipline.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in making a final set of recommendations to the President and to the Board of Regents for action, considers the full range of contributions to teaching, research, and service of each candidate proposed for promotion or tenure consideration. The Dean of the Graduate School reviews personnel recommendations in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for Academic Affairs because of the Dean's general coordinative responsibilities and overview of scholarly activities in the entire University.

We shall be able to discharge the requirements of our roles as reviewers effectively only if the supporting documentation relative to the substantive criteria and standards is of consistent and high quality. The Koffler memorandum of November 1, 1975, as amended, October 1, 1976, addresses the need for systematic collection of information which serves as the basis for departmental and collegiate review of individual faculty members. These data are also useful if they accompany the recommendations made by the eligible faculty, chairperson, and deans to us. However, for the most part, the supporting material which comes forward to us should be summarized, and evaluations or analyses of activities and performance rather than raw data should be presented.

Therefore, in order to enable us to provide a consistent review of recommendations for promotion and/or tenure please provide with each recommendation the following kinds of supporting documentation:

1. A brief, but complete statement of each department's procedures for promotion and tenure review forwarded through the dean and a similar statement relative to the procedures followed at the collegiate level.

Deans are asked to be responsible for collating and summarizing these statements in a covering letter, or providing copies of procedures which are essentially the same for all cases within a given unit.

Each individual recommendation should include the information relative to the voting process in the department, the majority view among those who voted, the statements of grounds for majority and minority views, and the chairperson's statement of views, per the Koffler memorandum of 11/1/75, section I.6 Procedures, on page 3.

Several of the collegiate units of the University have followed the practice of establishing or inviting a faculty advisory committee to review the various personnel recommendations concerning promotion, tenure, or non-reappointment, and to advise the dean of their findings. These committees whether formally or informally constituted, have also served to maintain standards of quality and equity in personnel decisions.

2. A complete and current curriculum vitae, including data regarding undergraduate, graduate or professional, and if applicable postdoctorate education and experiences (with relevant institutions, locations, dates, and degrees awarded), years of service to the University and dates of service in the faculty ranks, current personnel status and portion of time of appointment. (A single-year faculty activities report is not adequate for the purposes of this review.)

The curriculum vitae should also include information about courses taught, course and program development, advising and counseling activities; listings of publications and/or other scholarly works or artistic productions; listings of special services and contributions to department, college, or University, and professionally related services to the community. Special care should be taken in the preparation of this portion of the document to insure that the information presented therein is up to date, accurate, significant, and professionally pertinent.

3. Evaluation of teaching quality at the undergraduate and graduate levels to accompany statements referring to teaching effectiveness.

In some instances, the documentation of teaching quality has been anecdotal, impressionistic, or fragmentary, or the assessment has been rendered by a single word, i.e., "dedicated," "outstanding," "excellent," or "distinguished." Summary statements such as these need to be supported by relevant data. In those instances where the burden of the case for promotion or tenure rests heavily upon teaching accomplishments, the individual under consideration is best served by appropriate evidence for his or her achievements, whenever possible provided in a framework that allows comparison with departmental or collegiate norms.

Evaluation of teaching quality may be provided through student and/or peer assessment. Many departments use student survey forms of the kinds available through the Measurement Services Center or their own instruments to

document the quality of teaching. Since it is possible to derive numerical and percentage ratings of student response to various instructor and course characteristics, collection of such data for the faculty across departments and colleges provides a benchmark by which student satisfaction with an instructor's performance may be measured. Some units provide summaries of surveys such as those provided by the Measurement Services Center, rather than raw data or individual student rating sheets, along with such interpretative or analytical statements as the evaluating faculty wishes to make of these surveys. Letters from students may also be suggestive of individual response to instruction, but such letters often do not permit comparison in the more objective manner of the student surveys.

Responses from students about to graduate or former students in regard to their specific educational experiences are often valuable in assessing the effectiveness of teaching, as long as such evaluations either are comprehensive or come from a sufficient sample representative of the student population. By the same token, eventual success of students in subsequent courses or in positions taken after graduation may be used to document the value of specific educational experiences.

Further strengthening of the evidence in support of teaching effectiveness is provided by peer evaluation based on the direct observation of the candidate's instruction, review of syllabi, tests, student papers, and other course materials, and interviews with students whom the candidate has taught. Contributions to the improvement of the instructional program through educational development activity can be an important indicator of teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of such contributions by University peers and colleagues in other institutions may be provided. Peer evaluation of teaching is especially informative if it considers and explicates the criteria established, the procedures used, and the summary of findings.

A balanced perspective on the quality of instruction may be achieved through a combination of methods.

In general the same procedures for evaluation of regular classroom teaching for credit can be used for the evaluation of the effectiveness of instruction offered through the various continuing education or extension programs. In some cases the techniques and instruments for evaluation may need to be modified to suit the specific form of outreach activities.

4. Contributions to advising and counselling of students at all levels.

The quality of these activities can be determined by similar methods as effectiveness in teaching (cf. 3).

5. Contributions to furthering the work of students at the master's and doctoral levels and postdoctoral associates, and service on graduate degree committees, including documented evaluations regarding the effectiveness of the candidate's advising and research/thesis supervision.

6. Evidence of scholarly or other creative or artistic productivity, including a complete list of publications and/or other appropriate accomplishments, accompanied by assessment of their quality and significance in advancing the

discipline, field, or application.

Publications in refereed journals or participation in judged exhibits or performances should be so identified. In case the work was the outcome of a cooperative rather than individual endeavor it is important to indicate the relative contribution by the candidate. Thorough analysis of scholarship, research, and creative productivity should be undertaken by faculty peers at the departmental or unit level, with a description of the standards or judgements about quality which are applied to the work. Each publication or related set of achievements should be discussed separately with an assessment of the relative quality and impact of each.

Many units find it helpful to obtain outside evaluations from distinguished experts in the particular specialty of the candidate to help them assess the candidate's contributions, of course consulting a sufficiently large number to assure objectivity. To enable colleagues in other institutions to make a substantive appraisal it is important that they be provided with a list of accomplishments of the candidate and reprints or other samples of the candidate's work. Such evaluations are found to be most useful if they are as detailed as possible, assess the originality of the work and its actual or likely influence on the field, and indicate the relative merit of the candidate's contributions as compared to achievements of specifically named individuals of similar experience in the same or related specialty.

7. Special contributions to department, college, and University functions, such as significant committee and administrative assignments.

8. Professionally related services inside and outside the University, including contributions to professional organizations and learned societies.

The importance of the contribution and the candidate's effectiveness in service as officer or member of committees, participation on professional programs through presentation of papers, exhibition of artistic work, concerts or theatrical performances, and professional consulting activities may be evaluated by similar methods as are teaching and scholarship.

The relevance of the activity to the mission of the University needs to be assessed. Without evaluation, some accomplishments listed as "service" may appear to be normal civic responsibility or routine professional consulting not related to the candidate's likely future contribution to the mission of the department or University.

9. Professional distinctions, such as fellowships, awards, citations, honorary degrees, or other recognitions of the candidate's merit, if possible, with identification of the nature of the accomplishments for which the honor was given.

:paw

cc: President C. Peter Magrath

ACAD
PROF
SOCIETIES

moving away from old & community involvement