



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

**SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1987
12:30 PM - 3:00 PM
REGENTS ROOM, MORRILL HALL**

AGENDA

FOR INFORMATION:

12:30 - 1:00
(30)

1. Reports:
 - A. FCC & SCC: Professor Berscheid, Chair.
 - B. Student SCC: Mr. St. Laurent, Chair.
 - C. Finance Committee: Professor Shively, Chair.
 - D. Planning: Professors Campbell, Clark and Shively.
 - E. Special Committee on Academic Professional and Administrative Representation in the Governance System: Interim report from Professor Phillips, Chair.

FOR ACTION:

1:00 - 1:10
(10)

2. Approve student appointments to committees and boards and additional faculty appointments.

FOR DISCUSSION:

1:10 - 1:55
(45)

3. The faculty-student governance system: the reviewers' letters and next steps (background material: Filip, Mortimer, and Trow letters, distributed earlier).

1:55 - 2:00
(5)

4. Proposed revision of charge of Senate Committee on Educational Development (attached: May 11 letter from Mary Jo Maynes, Chair, SCEP, and Current Charge).

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT:

2:00 - 2:45
(45)

5. Outcomes of the legislative session: Status of Commitment to Focus.
6. The President's Items.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

June 4, 1987
12:45 - 3:05
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Tim Allison, Ellen Berscheid (Chair), Mark Brenner, Shirley Clark, Brenda Ellingboe, Jill Gaudette, Richard Goldstein, Ronald Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Scott Love, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Ronald Phillips, Roy St. Laurent, Andy Seitel, W. Phillips Shively, Bruce Vandal.

Absent: Charles Campbell.

Guests: Members-elect Sonia Arreaza, Bill Kukowski, Mark Umland, James VanAlstine; President Kenneth Keller, June Perkins (MSA advisor), Marsha Riebe (assistant to the president), Maureen Smith (of University Relations).

1. Correction to minutes of the April 30 meeting.

The last sentence of paragraph 3, page 4 of these minutes should be corrected as follows: "Professor Phillips offered to try to enlist also the University's Regents professors ~~as co-signers~~ in any way they wished."

2. Reports.

A. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Shively reported that at its meeting later in the afternoon, the SFC would discuss with Vice President Kegler the results of the legislative session, and with Vice President Benjamin the first approximation of the 1987-88 budget including the technical shops subsidy.

B. Academic Planning Task Force. Professor Shively reported that the intense schedule will culminate in a June 10-11 retreat and that the report is intended for completion on June 15.

C. Student SCC. Mr. St. Laurent reported the students hope to expand significantly the role of the chair of the Student Senate. SCC will see a proposal in the fall.

On behalf of the SSCC, he thanked Professor Berscheid and the FCC generally for taking care to assure that student members would

be actively involved in the SCC.

D. Special Committee on Academic Professional and Administrative representation in the Senate system. Professor Phillips, chair, noted the question's background, the large and diverse population of the class, and who the committee has so far invited to express their views on the matter. The committee will report in the fall its recommendations regarding representation, together with an underlying rationale.

E. SCC. Professor Berscheid.

(1) AIDS Task Force update. Membership has changed slightly and the Daily will receive the updated list June 4 or 5. There has been a great show of interest in serving. Professor Berscheid has told Professor Robert Kane, the chair, that, given the ever-increasing amount of information emerging about the disease, she could not advise him on a deadline for a final report, but reaffirmed that there should be a progress report to the Senate's October 29 meeting.

(2) A subcommittee of the Sexual Harassment Board has developed a proposal for a survey which the Board will see at its June meeting.

At this point the chair and student chair introduced members-elect in attendance: Bill Kukowski (Crookston Campus), Mark Umland (Waseca Campus), and Professor James VanAlstine (Morris Campus).

3. Nominations to committees. (SSCC Chair Mr. St. Laurent presided for this item.)

A. Approval of the slate of student nominations for Business and Rules, Finance, All-University Honors, Planning, Intercollegiate Athletics, and the President's Student Behavior Review Panel was moved and carried without dissent.

B. Approval of faculty names and back-ups for ACIA and the Student Legal Services Board was moved and carried without dissent.

4. The faculty-student governance system: external reviewers' letters and next steps.

The SCC Chair and the SSCC Chair summarized, respectively, the discussions of each of their committees. The Student SCC holds the position that while the University president can represent the faculty to the Board of Regents (having been a member of the faculty himself), he cannot adequately represent the students; hence some system of student representation to the Board should continue. The students particularly want to learn what was Regental intent and expectation in establishing the positions of student representatives in the first place. Mr. Seitel said he was not disputing the lack of a faculty voice and the students were not suggesting there is not a problem. Among the points enunciated in the SCC's first joint discussion following receipt of the external reviewers' letters were:

- The present student reps system lacks accountability;
- SCC, agreed to be the most representative body on campus, and its FCC and SSCC component parts, have no formal access to the Regents;
- There exists no mechanism for reporting to the Regents actions of the Student Senate;
- Given the Board's operating arena of participatory liberalism, and its legislative inclinations, should the faculty be the only constituency denied access?

-Given the amount of time faculty and students invest in the governance system, it should have greater impact than it does; a portion of the weakness comes from lack of access to the Regents and the resulting presumption that its opinions and actions are not important;

- There are two distinct university models of decision-making influence: that of special interest groups and that of the faculty as academic leadership; the latter should prevail but at Minnesota it appears that, instead, the former does;

- FCC would like realized the optimal situation recommended in the reviewers' letters, one in which the President alone would speak for the University to the Regents, following due consultation; if that ideal cannot be achieved, the Regents should hear corporate input on a regular basis from the faculty and student governance structure;

-If student representation were to end and the president were the University's sole spokesperson, the FCC would have to withdraw its proposal and cease its efforts for representation. But if student representation to the Board continues, it is not good for the University for the faculty to be excluded from representation. Mr. St. Laurent said he thought there was no opposition to that idea among the students. Mr. Allison argued: improve the faculty access but don't eliminate student access.

- Professor Berscheid promised to report back to the student leadership the outcome of the FCC's meeting with the Regents June 11.

President Keller joined the meeting as the discussion was concluding. Professor Berscheid asked him to comment on the students' perception that he, as President of the University, cannot adequately represent them to the Board. He told the committee that he represents the administration to the Regents; he is responsible for seeing that the entire array of constituencies -- faculty, student, civil service, as well as external constituencies -- is served. He added that if decision-making does not arise out of the governance process, after faculty-student governance has fed all appropriate business into the central administration, then everything happens as a result of direct access, there is very little reason for the governance system at all, and central administration should not invest its time in that system. What makes sense to him, he told SCC, is that the governance of the University takes place within the governance structure. We ought to correct the failings, not redesign the system.

5. Discussion with President Keller: Status of Commitment to Focus.
The President distributed copies of the letter about to go to the faculty regarding the outcome of the legislative session.

The ensuing discussion elicited these points:

- In future legislative sessions, the University will start from a different point because some understanding of CTF has been achieved;
- The University needs to overcome the perception, often accurate, of disjointed lobbying;
- A legislative rider eliminates the University's "banding" (from 14 to 18 credits) in the tuition schedule; U will try to change this law next year;
- Both the governor and the legislative leadership give the University encouraging messages;
- Among the important budget items are the faculty salary increases (4.5% appropriated); comparable worth (University intends to budget to complete that change in seven years); \$6 million a year (up from \$2 million) for physical maintenance; \$3 million to \$4 million to upgrade classrooms; 2% to 5% increase for graduate assistantships;
- Biggest loss is the absence of any funding to operate new space--an effective retrenchment; the items left unfunded make the University's internal planning process even more important.

6. Plaudits for the Committee.

Today's meeting was the final SCC meeting of the 1986-87 year. Professor Berscheid called this SCC probably the best University committee she has ever worked with. She extended her compliments to all the members. President Keller described the committee as one with a substantial agenda which is effective because it does its homework and tries to find solutions.

On this congratulatory note, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

June 2, 1987

To: Dr. James L. Anderson
Professor Charles Backstrom
Dr. Arthur L. Caplan
Professor Miriam Frenier
Professor Robert Fulton
Mr. Jan D. Halverson, ex officio
Dr. Jonathan M. Hanft
Ms. Nancy Jardin
Mr. David W. Johnson
Dr. Robert Kane, Chair
Mr. Ronald Kubik
Ms. Abigail Lamberton
Mr. Randall Lewis
Dr. Kristine MacDonald
Mr. Gregory Plotnikoff
Mr. Timothy Rich
Dr. Frank Rhame
Dr. Paul Rupprecht
Professor Mark Snyder
Ms. Virginia Stainbrook

From: Ellen Berscheid
Chair, University Senate Consultative Committee and
Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee

Re: Establishment of a University AIDS Task Force

After hearing testimony about AIDS at its March meeting, the Senate Consultative Committee was persuaded that the University's faculty-student governance structure should initiate investigation of whether the University of Minnesota's current response to the threat of an AIDS epidemic is adequate or whether more needs to be done, especially in the areas of information dissemination and of testing. This letter is to ask you to serve on a task force to address this question. Dr. Robert Kane, Dean of the School of Public Health, has generously agreed to chair the task force.

If, after considering the matter, the AIDS task force concludes that it would be advisable for the University to do more than it is doing to protect the University community from the spread of the AIDS virus, we would like you to recommend specific activities the University should undertake. We add mention of only one factor that will inform your deliberations: cost. As you consider the various possibilities of appropriate action, please try to estimate their relative costs, for these inevitably influence likelihood of implementation.

We would like the AIDS Task Force to report its progress to the University Senate at its Fall 1987 meeting (October 29). If you can by that time have resolutions that the Senate can consider and vote upon, so much the better. If not, we would hope to see such resolutions for the Senate's Winter meeting (February 18).

We very much hope that you will be able and willing to serve the University community in this way. This task is an important one. If you simply cannot serve, please call Meredith Poppele in the SCC office (626-1850). Thank you.

Dr. James L. Anderson
Associate Director, Student
Health Clinic and
Associate Professor,
Clinical Sciences
Student Health Clinic
University of Minnesota
Duluth, Minnesota 55812
(218) 726-8155, 726-8976

Professor Charles Backstrom
Chair, Assembly Committee on
University Health Services
Political Science
1380 Social Sciences
West Bank
624-9558

Dr. Arthur L. Caplan
Director-designate, University
of Minnesota Biomedical Ethics
Center
Box 33 Mayo
Minneapolis Campus
625-4917

Professor Miriam Frenier
Division of Social Sciences
116 Camden Hall
University of Minnesota
Morris, Minnesota 56267
(1) 589-2211

Professor Robert Fulton
Department of Sociology
1167 Social Sciences
West Bank
624-1895, 624-4300

Dr. Jonathan M. Hanft
Research Associate
Department of Agronomy and
Plant Pathology
411 Borlaug Hall
St. Paul Campus
625-7773

Ms. Nancy Jardin
Student
University of Minnesota
Morris, Minnesota 56267

David W. Johnson
Civil Service
Employee Assistance Program
1313 5th Street SE
Suite 233
Minneapolis Campus
627-4242

Dr. Robert Kane, CHAIR
Dean, School of Public Health
Box 197 Mayo
Minneapolis Campus
624-6669

Mr. Ron Kubik
Student
Box 637 (Residence: 101 East
First Street)
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Ms. Abigail Lamberton
Student
2546 11th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404
871-9245

Mr. Randall Lewis
Student member of University
Health Services Committee
6117 Centennial Hall
Minneapolis Campus
625-5929

Dr. Kristine MacDonald
Assistant State Epidemiologist
Minnesota Department of Health
P. O. Box 9441
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440
623-5414

Mr. Greg Plotnikoff
Medical School Student
325 Harvard Street SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Mr. Timothy P. Rich
Student
Griggs Hall
University of Minnesota
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

Dr. Paul Rupprecht
Director, Boynton Health
Service
Minneapolis Campus
625-1612

Professor Mark Snyder
Department of Psychology
N218 Elliott Hall
Minneapolis Campus
625-1507

Ms. Virginia Stainbrook
Director, Health Service
Bede Hall
University of Minnesota
Technical College
Crookston, Minnesota 56716
(218) 281-6510 ext. 261

Dr. Frank Rhame
Infection Control Department
University Hospital and Clinic
Box 421 Mayo
626-5036

Ex officio:

Jan D. Halverson
Associate University Attorney
for the University
Box 708 Mayo
626-5429

June 1, 1987

STUDENT SCC COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS (Item 2 on SCC's June 4 agenda).

Senate Committee on Business and Rules

Jason Brendan
Lorne Knutson

Senate Finance Committee

Robin Colliander
Rick Mealy

(To be named in the fall: one SSCC member and one coordinate campus student)

Senate Committee on All-University Honors

John Prarie
John Brinkman
Angela LaSell

Senate Planning Committee

Colin Walden
(To be named in the fall: one SSCC member)

Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

Ed Seelant
Christian Nelson
Kevin Hansen
Matt Evans
Brad Carlson

President's Student Behavior Review Panel

David Irvine
Steve Boland
Jackie Morrill



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

May 6, 1987

Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan
Chair, Board of Regents
104 West Redwood Street
Marshall, Minnesota 56258

Dear Dr. McGuiggan:

As we indicated at our Fall meeting, at our Spring meeting with you on June 11 we should like to continue our discussion of the faculty-student governance system and its proper relationship to the Board of Regents.

We have now received the individual reports from our three external reviewers who visited us in February, and we are attaching these for your information. As you shall read, none find the present situation entirely healthy and all believe the Academic Senate to be in need of strengthening. On the other hand, not one believes that adding a non-voting faculty representative to each of the four working committees of the Board would remedy our problems; indeed, they believe the current existence of student representatives to these committees to be unfortunate for a number of reasons, including its symbolic meaning to the faculty and its pernicious influence upon the Academic Senate, particularly the Student Senate.

The Faculty Consultative Committee is currently discussing the matter, involving in this discussion recent past chairs of the FCC and other faculty leaders, as well as the leadership of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, preparatory to full Senate Consultative Committee discussion.

We confess, then, that we have not yet formulated an alternative proposal to discuss with you. Since all agree that the present situation is unsatisfactory, however, we will attempt to construct other suggestions. We remain aware, of course, that it is for the Regents to decide what kind of relationship they wish to have with the Academic Senate; our obligation, as we have perceived it, is only to tell you of our dissatisfaction with the present arrangement and our reasons, to systematically seek external opinion, and to suggest possible alternatives. To be frank, we are hopeful that the Board, experienced as its members are in dealing with questions of the proper representation of varying viewpoints and also with organizational matters, may itself have some ideas about possible solutions. It is in this spirit, so that the Board has all the information we have, that we are enclosing the three reviewers' opinions. If there are other materials or information we can provide, please let us know.

Finally, since the matters to be discussed importantly engage the student portion of the Academic Senate, at some future point the Board may wish to invite the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee to meet with it and with the Faculty Consultative Committee in a joint discussion.

Sincerely,



Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate and Faculty
Consultative Committees

EB:mp

c: Honorable Wendell R. Anderson
Honorable Charles H. Casey
Honorable M. Elizabeth Craig
Honorable Jack P. Grahek
Honorable Wally Hilke
Honorable Elton A. Kuderer
Honorable David M. Lebedoff
Honorable Wenda W. Moore
Honorable David K. Roe
Honorable Stanley D. Sahlstrom
Honorable Mary T. Schertler
Shirley Clark
Associate Chair, Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees
W. Phillips Shively
Chair-elect, SCC and FCC
Ronald Phillips
Associate Chair-elect, SCC and FCC
President Kenneth H. Keller
Barbara J. Muesing
Secretary, Board of Regents

Encl.: Letter from Mark Filip, dated April 20, 1987
Letter from Kenneth Mortimer, dated April 14, 1987
Letter from Martin Trow, dated March 19, 1987



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

May 11, 1987

Dr. Kenneth P. Mortimer
Vice President and Vice Provost
The Pennsylvania State University
201 Old Main
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dear Dr. Mortimer:

This note is simply to thank you on behalf of the Senate Consultative Committee, and indeed the entire University community, for your letter of opinion on how the University of Minnesota's faculty-student governance system might be improved and for the time each of you took from your very busy schedules to help us in our deliberations. It was a difficult task and we are amazed at how much you absorbed and understood on such a short notice and with only a brief visit.

We (the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee) are currently discussing the content of your letters, with the aim of making concrete proposals to the Senate next year. In June the FCC also will be discussing the present situation with the Board of Regents, which has been provided copies of your opinions for information and, in some cases I'm sure, edification.

Thank you again. We shall try to keep you posted of the outcome.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative
Committee

EB:mp

bc: Shirley Clark
Phil Shively
Ron Phillips
Roy St. Laurent



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

May 11, 1987

Mr. Mark R. Filip
Student member, University of Illinois Board of Trustees
284 Illini Union
1401 West Green Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Dear Mr. Filip:

This note is simply to thank you on behalf of the Senate Consultative Committee, and indeed the entire University community, for your letter of opinion on how the University of Minnesota's faculty-student governance system might be improved and for the time each of you took from your very busy schedules to help us in our deliberations. It was a difficult task and we are amazed at how much you absorbed and understood on such a short notice and with only a brief visit.

We (the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee) are currently discussing the content of your letters, with the aim of making concrete proposals to the Senate next year. In June the FCC also will be discussing the present situation with the Board of Regents, which has been provided copies of your opinions for information and, in some cases I'm sure, edification.

Thank you again. We shall try to keep you posted of the outcome.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative
Committee

EB:mp

bc: Shirley Clark
Phil Shively
Ron Phillips
Roy St. Laurent



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

May 11, 1987

Dr. Martin Trow
Director, Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Dr. Trow:

This note is simply to thank you on behalf of the Senate Consultative Committee, and indeed the entire University community, for your letter of opinion on how the University of Minnesota's faculty-student governance system might be improved and for the time each of you took from your very busy schedules to help us in our deliberations. It was a difficult task and we are amazed at how much you absorbed and understood on such a short notice and with only a brief visit.

We (the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee) are currently discussing the content of your letters, with the aim of making concrete proposals to the Senate next year. In June the FCC also will be discussing the present situation with the Board of Regents, which has been provided copies of your opinions for information and, in some cases I'm sure, edification.

Thank you again. We shall try to keep you posted of the outcome.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative
Committee

EB:mp

bc: Shirley Clark
Phil Shively
Ron Phillips
Roy St. Laurent

MAR 26 1987

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CENTER FOR STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

March 19, 1987

Professor Ellen Berscheid, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
and Faculty Consultative Committee
Mr. Roy St. Laurent, Chair
Student Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Professor Berscheid and Mr. St. Laurent:

In your letter to Mark Filip, Kenneth Mortimer and myself of November last you asked us to visit the University on February 9 and 10 of this year to help you and your colleagues think about several aspects of the organization and operation of your Senate. In your letter you raised two questions specifically: the efficient organization and operation of your system of university governance, and the clarity of the faculty voice to the administration and the Board of Regents on those matters where it is appropriate. In the course of our discussions at the University of Minnesota a number of other issues arose.

During our two days at the University you arranged meetings for us with a wide range of leaders. We met with the President of the University, the Academic Vice President, the Chairman of the Board of Regents, the leaders of the Student Senate, and past and present leaders of the Academic Senate. In the course of those two days of intensive discussions, we explored many aspects of the operation of the Senate, with special attention to the role of the faculty in university governance and its relations to the Board of Regents.

Every great university is the product of a unique historical development and exists in a political, social and economic environment peculiar to itself. While there are broad similarities among universities, especially among the great public research universities in the United States, an observer cannot assess the operation or success of any organizational arrangements by reference to their similarity with counterparts elsewhere. I stress this, because in certain respects the University of Minnesota is almost unique in its modes of governance. Some experience of university governance elsewhere may be relevant to your situation; nevertheless, I have had in mind in writing these notes the special circumstances of the University of Minnesota and its history.

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Two

The basic question in university governance is what compromises inherent in governing any large institution are appropriately made inside the university, by the faculty, students, and administration, and what compromises and decisions are properly made outside the university, by the legislature and governor. The Board of Regents is the link between these two worlds, turning now inward toward the institution, now outward toward its environment. A good deal of thought has been given to this question, most notably by the Carnegie Commission under Clark Kerr's direction, and most recently by Kerr himself in his recent books on the presidency. (See, for example, Clark Kerr and Marian L. Gade, The Many Lives of Academic Presidents, Association of Governing Boards, Washington, D.C., 1986, and their Presidents Make a Difference, Association of Governing Boards, Washington, D.C., 1984, especially pp. 46-47 and Chapter 8.) In his view, and on this there is broad agreement, the external public authorities have the right and responsibility to determine the broad character and mission of a university: among these are its size, the state funds committed to it, the location of its several campuses, faculty and staff salary levels, and the standards for admission of its undergraduates. The "internal" members of the university appropriately determine the way those resources and constraints can be translated into education, research and scholarship. So while the Board may lay down a broad faculty salary schedule, the faculty and administration between them appropriately determine what compensation is appropriate for specific individuals; where the Board may initiate or mandate a new professional school or college, the academics inside properly determine its curriculum and forms of instruction.

There are of course many issues on which both the academics and the representatives of the larger society have a joint interest: the requirements for admission to the undergraduate colleges are an example. This is of obvious interest to the citizens of the state, and their representative, but also to the academics who do the teaching. And on those issues, the public authorities need the best advice they can get from the academic professionals.

In all this, the president of the university stands in a crucial position. He or she is the one person who has responsibility for the university as a whole rather than for any of its constituent colleges or groups. He is properly the spokesman for the university to the Board; discussions and debates about university policy, and most especially about the allocation of funds internally, ultimately must take the form of recommendations by the parties inside to him, and his decisions represent compromises inherent in the existence of different and competing claims on resources, or their equivalent in decisions about mission and direction even when resources are not at issue.

Professor Ellen Berscheid and

Mr. Roy St. Laurent

March 19, 1987

Page Three

It is these decisions, reflecting the outcomes of internal debates mediated through his own best judgment, which the president reports as recommendations to the Board of which he is a member. He has in his recommendations to the Board the special weight of being their appointment, serving at their pleasure, and having, presumably, their confidence. No one else in the university can claim so much of the Board as the president; and indeed it is their trust that is on the whole the basis of his authority. Where he loses that, he has lost his authority, and usually shortly thereafter his job.

From this perspective the president is not one of the contending interests in the university, alongside the faculty, students or staff. Rather he is the voice of the university to its governing body, and to state authorities and the outside world. If he speaks to the Board as one interest among others, then the Board must be the mediator of conflicts among the academic parties, and the key compromises and decisions on academic affairs will be made there, by laymen with strong political (and other) ties and loyalties. The consensus among students of university governance is that that is not the best way for these decisions to be made.

My impression is that at least some of the problems associated with governance at the University of Minnesota arise out of confusion about the proper role of the president, other parties, and the Board in university governance. My impression is that all parties do not accept that internal debate should be directed at and with the president (and his senior staff), or that his decisions, when reported to the Board as his recommendations, must be supported by all parties even when they do not exactly coincide with the positions of the various internal interests. There is in Minnesota the sense that after the internal process of debate and compromise has produced a decision by the president, an appeal can still be made over the president's head directly to the Board. But this tendency to make an end run around the president to the Board cannot help but weaken the president, and thus the whole mechanism for internal discussion, compromise and decision within the university, including the Senate and its component parts. It also makes much of the internal life of the university subject to debate and decision in the Board, and many observers would take that to be unhealthy for the academic quality of the university. Needless to say, this tendency to take internal issues to the Board encourages the members of the Board to take a lively interest in the internal life of the institution, and to cultivate ties and channels of communication to various members of university--in their turn, to make an end run around the president directly into the academic life of the university.

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Four

The major changes in governance that occurred in Minnesota, as elsewhere, during the late '60s and early '70s tended to strengthen the role of students in the governance of the university. As Professor Mortimer has noted, Minnesota carried this further than most states by giving students a larger voice and larger representation in university governance. But that itself did not constitute a radical change in university governance. Indeed, although students have a larger role in university governance at the University of Minnesota than in other American universities, we did not hear any complaints on this score from leaders of the Academic Senate or administrative officers. But in Minnesota, by contrast with most other states, the changes in the late '60s also placed elected students directly on the four working committees of the Board of Regents, and this step gave students, but not faculty, a direct voice in the detailed discussions of the Board, and not just in its broad policy pronouncements. This student representation on the Board's committees is resented by some leaders of the Academic Senate who feel, understandably, that if the Board is to be making decisions about the internal life of the university, they want to have at least an equal voice with the students in that arena. It troubles them both as a source of additional influence for students, and as a symbolic statement by the Board about whose views it wants to hear in its working committees. And some of these faculty members would very much like to have representatives of the faculty also present on these working committees of the Board.

My impression is that the appointment of faculty members to the committees of the Board is not likely or politically possible. But I also believe that if it were possible or feasible, it would be unwise. Such a step would reinforce an arrangement which was unwise from the beginning. Faculty members on the committees of the Board would encourage continued appeals from compromises reached internally, and thus inevitably weaken the Academic Senate itself. Many times during our short visit to the university we heard faculty members speak of the need for a fairer "balance" on the Board, with faculty present as well as students. But the cost of achieving that balance would, in my view, far outweigh the gains, for the faculty as well as for the university as a whole.

If it is any consolation to the concerned faculty, my impression is that the student representatives on these working committees of the Board do not carry great weight in their discussions. They are also resented by the elected leadership of the Student Senate, as reducing the authority of that body. Moreover, the issue may be more symbolic than substantive, since many issues which come before these committees have been largely framed and decided before they arrive there. Indeed it may be that the Board itself somewhat regrets the presence of students on these committees, but politically is unable to remove

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Five

them. My sense is that it would be advisable for both the Faculty and Student Senate members to ignore the presence of students on these committees insofar as possible, and to try to strengthen the voice of the President of the University as the only legitimate voice of the university community to the Board. And that means not taking opportunities to make end runs, as well as finding ways to condemn and indeed to punish direct appeals to the Board by inside interests against compromises and decisions in which their voices have already been heard. Over time the political culture of the university ought to define such end runs as illegitimate, and as an attack on the procedures whereby all interests are heard inside the university, in ways that lead to broad and legitimate compromise positions defined and carried to the Board for their information and ratification.

The other central problem that we were asked to address, that of the clarity of the faculty's voice in internal discussions of university policy, arises out of the structure of the Academic Senate which brings together the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate in one legislative body. While, as I have said, we did not hear complaints from faculty members about the role of students in university governance, nevertheless considerable concern was expressed about the difficulties the faculty has had in developing and expressing its own views on issues of special interest to the faculty.

My own view is that an Academic Senate has two quite distinct functions: legislative and consultative. And of these, I believe, the consultative is by far of greater importance. The constitution of the university now clearly mandates that most legislation must go through the Academic Senate which combines faculty and student representatives, and it is that fact that makes faculty members unhappy about their inability to define a "clear" faculty voice. But it seems to me that that opportunity does lie within the Faculty Senate itself. There is, so far as I can see, nothing to preclude the Faculty Senate, and particularly its powerful and representative Faculty Consultative Committee, from considering the wide range of issues in which the faculty has an interest. Nor is there any reason why that body should not convey its views directly to the President. The Faculty Consultative Committee is itself composed of experienced members from various parts of the University, and is connected with a whole range of other standing committees whom it can consult on a variety of issues. The advice and decisions that arise out of these discussions within and among faculty committees should be transmitted directly to the President in the many cases where they do not bear on legislation. And it is appropriate for the Student Senate to do likewise--that is, to develop its own positions through its own committees and consultative machinery, on issues that it takes an interest in, and communicate them directly to the President as well. It is only on the narrow range of issues that require legislation that

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Six

these positions need to confront one another within the Academic Senate as a whole, and be resolved there through a vote. There indeed the results will not be that of the faculty alone, but of the faculty and students together, and that is inherent in the constitution and organization of the Senate itself.

So, in short, I think the Faculty Senate, and particularly its Consultative Committee, should develop regular procedures for arriving at positions on issues that reflect a clear faculty voice. And it ought to regularize, and expand if necessary, the channels and occasions through which it can convey faculty sentiments directly to the President and his senior administrative officers. Moreover, it already conducts some of its discussions in closed session. I understand that the political culture of the University and the State tends to encourage open meetings of bodies like the Consultative Committee. Nevertheless, I think the Faculty Senate and its committees should recognize the very great advantages to candor and effectiveness if more of these discussions can be held in closed session. My impression from discussions on this issue lead me to believe that the Faculty Consultative Committee would not be constrained by law or regulation from expanding the number and length of its closed sessions, especially if it could explain to others why those closed sessions were likely to lead to wiser and clearer faculty views on difficult and sensitive issues. For example, the faculty might wish to develop a position on the internal allocation of research overhead funds. There are of course different views on this issue within the faculty, and those views ought to be argued out on their merits, without direct intrusion by other parties within or outside the University. The decision the President ultimately makes on this issue, and recommends to the Board, may or may not coincide with the faculty's views, but he should have heard its views, as presented clearly and forcefully by its Senate committees. Moreover, I do not see the necessity of taking and printing extremely detailed minutes of these meetings, which must also inevitably inhibit the candor of debate and discussion. It would seem to be enough to identify the subjects discussed, to summarize the issues and arguments, and the recommendations to be made to the President.

Here I recognize that I am touching directly on the sensitive political culture of the University, and on strongly held notions about what are appropriate procedures. Nevertheless, it is impossible to talk about developing a clearer faculty voice without addressing precisely these procedures. I was especially concerned in our discussions with many participants to learn whether strengthening the consultative role of the Faculty Senate and of its chief committees would in some way violate the constitution of the University or the sentiments of other actors. On the whole, my understanding is that it would not, and that the Faculty Senate could move rather further to strengthen its

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Seven

consultative, as over against its legislative, functions, and to do so by strengthening the conditions for spontaneous and candid discussions in its own committees among knowledgeable faculty members, insulated from the pressures of an audience and of other actors in the governance system as a whole.

The final question, of whether the current system of governance requires too much time, and how this affects the participation of students in the various committees and on the Student Senate, is rather more than I can handle. There is no question but that the governance system of the University does make very large demands on participants, and I was greatly impressed by how devotedly faculty members accept very heavy burdens of involvement in the committees and activities of the Senate. I was also greatly impressed by the devotion and quality of the student leadership that I met, but also could understand how below this top layer of student leadership it would be more difficult to involve and retain the interest of large numbers of students in the many committees and activities of the Student Senate. I cannot recommend on this issue beyond suggesting to the student leadership of the Student Senate that it consider whether all of its committees are necessary, and whether the numbers of students necessary to develop and present student views on these issues are as great as is currently assumed. Beyond that there is, I think, an inherent tension between student participation in university governance, and the heavy burden on students of their studies, their relative inexperience in the governance of big institutions, the many other interests they have, and the relatively few years that they are in attendance at the university. The problem of "student apathy" is present all over the world where students are part of the governance structures of universities; I think it is less acute in Minnesota than in most places. As elsewhere, a relatively small stratum of active student leaders will be speaking for the great mass of relatively uninterested students, and the other participants in university governance must hear the student representatives and recognize the problems they have in achieving and claiming genuine representativeness. Nevertheless, it may be that their views are valuable not so much in terms of how representative they are, as in how wise they are in recommending good policies and decisions. Again, as on the faculty side, my sense is that the Student Senate is more important as a consultative than as a legislative body, which permits the student perspective to be present and well argued in the arenas within the university where decisions are made. I understand that in Minnesota, as elsewhere, students have other means of influencing university policy--not only the students on the working committees of the Board, but the student Regent, and student representatives that lobby directly in the legislature. There seems little danger that student views will not be heard in Minnesota--the real issue is whether their effectiveness outside the University will both undermine the Student Senate itself, and indirectly weaken the effectiveness of the President as the only legitimate representative of the whole university to the Board and to the legislature.

Professor Ellen Berscheid and
Mr. Roy St. Laurent
March 19, 1987
Page Eight

In closing, I found the two days I spent at the University of Minnesota intensely interesting, and want to thank you and the other members of the University who made my stay there so rewarding. I hope these reflections are of help to you and to other members of the University in your efforts to improve and perfect your system of university governance.

Sincerely,



Martin Trow
Professor, Graduate School
of Public Policy, and
Director

MT:jl

cc: President Kenneth H. Keller
Professor Shirley Clark
Professor Kenneth Mortimer
Mr. Mark Filip

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

201 OLD MAIN
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

Kenneth P. Mortimer
Vice President and Vice Provost

April 14, 1987

Dr. Ellen Berscheid, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee and
Faculty Consultative Committee
Mr. Roy St. Laurent, Chair
Student Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 E. River Road
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Dr. Berscheid and Mr. St. Laurent:

I enjoyed my February 9 and 10 visit to the University of Minnesota. I especially enjoyed the opportunity to get to know you and to work with Martin Trow and Mr. Filip. Thanks go both to you and your colleagues for your friendly hospitality. Your willingness to go to one more meeting and talk further about the effectiveness of faculty and student participation in governance was indeed gratifying. As you may know, I have conducted various studies of governance at Minnesota, and made my first trip there in 1969. I returned in 1970, 1975 and again in 1980, so this visit was a welcome opportunity to watch things evolve at one of the nation's great universities.

Finally, I was especially pleased to participate in a meeting with so many of the former Consultative Committee chairs. I was delighted to learn that our visit was the cause of getting them all together for the first time. It was indeed a rare moment in the University's history, and I was glad to be a part of it.

This report is organized around the two essential questions you posed in your November 17 memorandum. The questions are as follows:

1. Does meaningful faculty and student participation in university governance require the magnitude of time commitment that our system entails, or, is there a more efficient design by which we might achieve the same goal?

2. Does the system allow the administration and the Board of Regents to hear a clear faculty voice on those matters where it is appropriate?

These are, of course, difficult questions and no outside consultant can hope to provide a definitive answer. The history and tradition of the University are important ingredients in the specific response to the question of whether the University's governance structure can be simplified. In 1978, for example, I co-authored a book with T. R. McConnell, Sharing Authority Effectively, in which we trace some of the governance patterns at the University. In general, we commented that the University of Minnesota has a long tradition of effective governance patterns and relatively cordial relationships between the faculty and the Board of Regents. Part of this tradition includes regular examination of Senate effectiveness. The Senate has been a subject of intense study by scholars such as Ruth Eckert, and periodically the Senate itself has commissioned studies on its structure and functioning. (The most recent of these, the report of the Special Senate Committee on Governance, was issued in May, 1986 and I found it very useful in arriving at generalizations about the current structure.)

I would also point out that the answer to the question of whether the governance structure is a bit cumbersome, relies on basic values. For example, how much time do the faculty and students believe should be spent on governance? Like Aristotle, I have come to believe that people are not "political animals," and that intensive participation in governance appeals to a rather small group of faculty and students. In most systems of democratic governance the issue is one of legitimacy--can those who are active in the governance of the polity legitimately speak for the larger group? There is little evidence that the elected faculty members do not accurately reflect the views of the faculty. The student representatives are somewhat more problematic largely due to their diversity and the different ways they are chosen for Senate and Regents' committees.

The evidence on the students is quite similar to what one finds in other large institutions. That is, students seem to be less willing to fulfill the responsibilities of participation required for governance to be effective. It is difficult to get them fully involved, and to educate and orient them to the extent to where their participation is effective. This is exacerbated by the fact that the data indicate that students tend not to go to meetings (their participation rate is around 50-55%, according to your data.)

I suspect also that part of the reason the Faculty Steering Committee has been reluctant to direct more things to the separate Faculty Assembly is a fear that it would add another series of meetings to an already burdensome obligation. Further, if things that were to be discussed in the Faculty Assembly also had to be discussed later in the broader body, it is likely to damage the legitimacy of the debate in the Faculty Assembly.

Nonetheless, I have come to believe that the Faculty Assembly and its consultative committee should perform more aggressively those responsibilities which the governance documents appear to allow--the meeting of the separate

assembly when issues of concern to the faculty arise. I find it difficult to believe, for example, that the Faculty Assembly has not had an opportunity to debate such an important document as Commitment to Focus.

I cannot disagree with the major finding of the Special Senate Committee on Governance which concluded that "a great deal of discussion resulted in agreement that the structure serves very well indeed (p. 6)." I would, however, suggest that a very careful look be taken at some of the "minor committees" and see if they are absolutely necessary to the effective functioning of the Senate. In this regard, I would suggest the examiners be ruthless and set some type of goal that at least 3-5 committees could be eliminated.

My final comment on the matter of efficiency is not to worry about it too much. Senates have three major functions--to legislate, to serve as consultative bodies and to debate issues of importance to the University. The latter two of these--the consultative and forensic functions--are by far the more important. To consult adequately and to debate thoroughly are matters that require time. The reasoned and substantive debate of academic policy is what makes a University unique. While the amount of time it often takes can be frustrating, in most cases it is necessary.

The second major question, whether the Board of Regents and the administration get a clear voice from the faculty, is also a matter of judgment. A major concern on the part of the faculty to whom we spoke seems to be that the students have preferred access to the Board through a student regent and four students who are chosen to meet with Board committees prior to the regular Board meetings. A further issue of debate is whether the president should be the sole voice of the faculty in providing advice and counsel to the Board of Regents on academic matters.

The answers to these questions must be framed with the full understanding of the history and culture of the Minnesota Board of Regents. It is rather unusual to have a board elected by legislators from various districts in the state. While I do know of situations in which legislatures have some responsibility to pick a limited number of regents, I believe the University of Minnesota's legislative district pattern is unique in the American experience. (In 1980 I did a state by state analysis of regential selection and believe this observation is still accurate today.)

The further requirement that one of the regents be a student and the fact that at least one regent has what amounts to office hours for students on campus, would seem to support the view that the faculty needs to have a stronger presence before the Board. Yet when the matter was discussed in our interviews, both faculty and regents reported that informal meetings between the faculty had not been very productive in recent years. The prospect of a greater faculty presence before the Board sets up at least the possibility of more confrontation and articulation of competing interests which I find troublesome.

In the past, the faculty have spoken to the regents directly on such important issues as the need to have new leadership at the University. To expand this to regular, even, daily contact between faculty and regents on matters of academic policy, would in my opinion, be a dangerous precedent. Nor is it likely to contribute to effective long-term relationships between the faculty and the Board.

To understand this point further requires an understanding of the fundamental responsibilities of the governing board. While there are several treatments of this topic in the literature, I believe those provided by John Nason to be the most complete. Nason believes that the functions of the Boards are to appoint, support and evaluate the president, to clarify institutional mission and to approve long-range plans. He would also assign to the Board oversight responsibility for educational programs. More fundamentally, the Board has a fiduciary role, the responsibility to preserve the institution's independence, enhance its public image, and to interpret the community to the institution. The Board also has the responsibility to serve as a court of appeal over internal disputes, when that becomes necessary.

In all of these responsibilities, the lay governing board must rely on the president to be the major voice of the faculty in matters having to do with the academic performance of the institution. A number of recent commentators on the higher education scene have pointed out that the president "serves at the pleasure of the Board" but can "make a difference" in helping the institution deal with increasingly difficult environments.

There is, in my opinion, little evidence that the regents do not hear a clear faculty voice on the issues, although they may disagree at times. The Board expects that academic policy be debated within the University, and that recommendations on the various issues would come out of the leadership of the University--the president. Any violation of this expectation would call into question the president as the legitimate voice of academic affairs and raise serious issues about his continued effectiveness as an academic leader. In my view, it is difficult to separate academic from other issues before the Board. An insistence that the faculty communicate directly with the Board threatens the basic principle of presidential leadership in matters of academic policy.

The real issue, then, is how the faculty and the administration work together to arrive at basic recommendations on matters of academic policy. In this, I applaud the direction of continued and more frequent meetings between the Faculty Consultative Committee and leaders in the administration. The University is indeed fortunate to have a "faculty-oriented" president.

I repeat, the faculty will always have ways to approach regents directly on fundamental matters of principle. To confuse the issue by demanding or seeking regular direct contact with the regents on matters of internal academic policy seems to threaten both the inherent spheres of influence of the faculty, and may encourage the Board to delve into matters of internal policy. I do not believe the Board needs to be, nor should be, involved in internal academic matters.

The fact that recent informal get togethers between the faculty and the regents appear not to have gone well is troublesome. Some careful thought needs to be directed towards how such informal interchanges can take place in a more cordial atmosphere. Even in this, however, I would insist that the president be present at all such meetings, and participate in the exchanges. In Penn State's case, for example, we find faculty involvement in the social affairs surrounding a Board meeting to be an example of an effective practice. The Board seems to find such informal interchanges useful and has been informed by discussions with faculty. (The outgoing Senate Chair is invited to address the Board annually.)

In short, I believe there are ways to deal with the issue of a clear faculty voice. The Faculty Assembly could meet more regularly, and the Consultative Committee could make sure that issues are formulated in a way that such meetings not be burdensome. A refinement of this structure would assure faculty that their views are being heard and carefully considered. After a judgment is made, the faculty would understand that judgment and should respect the rationale which led to the decision.

I wish you well in your reconsideration of effective governance at the University of Minnesota.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kenneth P. Mortimer". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Kenneth P. Mortimer

April 20, 1987

Professor Ellen Berscheid, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee and
Faculty Consultative Committee
Mr. Roy St. Laurent, Chair
Student Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliot Hall
75 East River Road
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Professor Berscheid and Mr. St. Laurent,

Let me begin by apologizing for the tardiness of this report. Although this is certainly no excuse, I contracted mononucleosis two weeks ago, and the illness really has set me behind in my academic and work schedules. This report should have been done long ago to avoid a problem with this type of unforeseen occurrence, but I was planning to write the summary during the week of April 6th and get it in by April 15th. Once again, please excuse my delay.

In regards to the purpose of this report however, I will now try to address the two areas Professor Mortimer, Professor Trow, and I investigated over the course of our visit. First, I will look at the question which asks, "Does meaningful faculty and student participation in University governance require the magnitude of time commitment that our system requires, or, is there a more efficient design by which we might achieve the same goal?"

To really answer this question, a person must define what is the true "goal" of these efforts. Practically speaking, I feel the expected outcome of this work should be meaningful input on university policy decisions, with an occasional piece of legislation being drafted as well. Of the two of these areas however, the consultative work is certainly the most important, as most university governance tends to involve compromise and consensus rather than power bloc votes.

To fulfill this consultative responsibility, there is really no substitute for simple, long hours of research and hard work. All of the students and faculty that we met with realized this fact, and put in impressive amounts of time to insure that they

were making top quality decisions. This work is indispensable, and will exist in any system. I really don't see any way to escape it.

Although there is no substitute for this type of effort, there may be some structural changes which could improve your current system. First, it seemed as though some issues were reviewed by multiple committees which had overlapping responsibilities. This multiple committee review does give more opinions on each issue or potential decision, but overlap in the system can be rather inefficient. It can lead to long delays, and also makes more work which inevitably is done by the same limited group of faculty and students who serve as representatives of their respective constituent groups. Although this laborious process provides more input, these multiple reviews may simply just create confusion, and be more work than they are worth.

As a university governance system, you will need to review your overall committee set-up, and see if some things might be pruned or merged into more efficient structures. These decisions will not be easy ones to make, and may create great debate. You will need to make these difficult choices however, and realize that there is an inevitable tradeoff between expediency and input. Overall, I think some modest reduction in size and number of committees should be possible, and I advise you to act to see that this reduction is accomplished.

There are some other points related to this question of time required for effective governance that merit some comment. First, although I do not know if this has ever been proposed at your school, I do not think students should ever receive any type of academic credit for participating in university governance activities. This type of arrangement where students get credit for extracurricular activities creates inevitable conflicts of interest. Credit is usually contingent upon some type of professorial approval, to be granted or denied by members or colleagues of members of the very same groups as the students. Obviously, this can lead to compromising of positions in situations where professors have unusual influence over student colleagues. In addition, I simply do not feel this type of participation warrants academic credit. It is an elective activity, not a class. Although this type of activity requires a great deal of work, the intrinsic rewards of such involvement are even greater.

For faculty members however, I think some type of procedural incentive might warrant consideration. At the University of Illinois, candidates for tenure are able to document their participation on departmental and university governance committees. This activity is then considered when deciding to grant or deny tenure, although it obviously is not the paramount

criterion which reviewers use to make their decision. Moving to incorporate this type of consideration might be desirable, as this system gives some incentive to young professors who wish to help govern their university. Without this type of consideration, a professor without tenure is essentially participating "at his own risk," sacrificing time he could use for research and writing.

Finally, it would probably be helpful to try to get more support staff for faculty and student senators, especially for senate officers. Although these individuals will inevitably put in a great deal of time fulfilling the responsibilities associated with their various roles, they should get adequate help to make their burden manageable. Obviously, this will require some budget review, and it may in fact prove to be financially impossible to address the need. If resources can be found however, increasing this type of support would probably be a good idea, as several individuals that we spoke with felt this type of support would allow them to better perform their various tasks.

In regards to the second question, I feel there are indeed some changes which the University of Minnesota should consider to try to allow the faculty voice to be heard more clearly. First, it seems apparent to me that the faculty should meet as a separate group (as the students currently do) to formulate cohesive faculty opinions on specific university issues. By debating issues separately, the faculty members will be able to more clearly voice their stance on issues. Since most university issues are resolved through a process of gathering many groups' opinions and then finding some moderate solution, these clear opinions will help to assure that students, administrators, and Regents are all aware of faculty thoughts and concerns.

In addition, I think the faculty should continue to work with President Keller, using both formal and informal channels of communication. From everyone we spoke with, he truly seems to be one of the strongest faculty advocates at the entire university, rising internally from the professoriate to his current position. Any efforts the faculty can make to maintain and develop even closer ties with Dr. Keller will generally serve to help articulate the faculty voice and advance faculty interests. This relationship will be especially helpful in issues that involve the Board of Regents, where the university president should, by design, exert more influence than anyone else on policy issues.

One possible change mentioned by several people centered on the idea of adding faculty members to the Board of Regents. To be perfectly honest, I do not think this would realistically be possible. Moreover, I am not thoroughly convinced this addition

would be desirable even if it could be accomplished. When looking at the history of student representatives on Board of Regent committees, I think this input has only served to undermine any type of democratic input of student opinion. In fact, these student representatives, if anything, only serve to negate the efforts of established student organizations, weakening their rightfully earned power.

These representatives often seemed to have little loyalty to the student government groups which appointed them on their various campuses. Although this is probably the fault of the appointing people (who should be doing a better job of selecting students who represent organizational interests), the fact remains that these students provide a way to "make an end run" to the Board of Regents. Regardless of any previous discussions, agreements, or opinions that legitimate student groups have formulated, these students can interject a conflicting report or unexamined idea straight to the Board. Their presence in their current form is not beneficial to students, as they undermine democratically elected student organizations. In the future, Student Senate and Student Government members should work to assure that these representatives serve as reinforcing channels for democratically reached opinions, or these positions should be eliminated entirely. Failure to do so with the Student Representative positions to Board committees will lead to the undermining of the rightful power of the Student Government, Senate, and Student Members of the Board of Regents.

This measure will also help faculty be fairly heard at the Board of Regents. Obviously, something is amiss when there are students on Board committees who, practically speaking, are not really accountable to anyone. Lessening these students' ability to potentially abuse the democratic process while working to maintain and enhance University President/Faculty relations will help alleviate this problem.

In addition, I found it very distressing that recent Regent/Faculty meetings and dinners have not gone as well as some may have hoped. At the University of Illinois, the institution I am most familiar with, the faculty and Board of Trustees have a great deal of respect for each other and try to take each others' interests into account when making decisions. In the future, I would recommend trying to improve the caliber of discussion and level of goodwill at your joint-group events. This improvement may not be easy to achieve, but perhaps you could prepare advance agendas of topics you are planning to talk about so people know what they will be discussing. This will help avoid situations where one group or another feels as if an issue has been "dumped" into their laps with a request for an immediate solution or answer.

Similarly, perhaps these events could include tours of various research facilities or other such interesting events. A world class university such as Minnesota has dozens of people in many fields conducting research which the Regents would find fascinating. By allowing the scholars to show their facilities and work to the Board on informal tours, and then getting faculty and Board Members together in social settings, both groups will be able to see how their interests are mutually linked to helping Minnesota become even a better place of scholarship and learning. In this way the groups will develop mutual respect, and faculty opinions will, as a result, carry more weight when issues are discussed.

On a final note related to my last point, I would like to offer one piece of crucial advice. I think this comment is the best input I can offer your school and the people who participate in its governance process. This advice, which I'm sure is going to sound somewhat idealistic is "pull together and try to be more of a team."

As I said, that probably sounds rather naive, but the simple fact of the matter is that the people in any organization, not subtleties of structure, determine the group's success or failure. If you will allow me the chance to make an analogy to athletics, the Boston Celtics are so successful because they are a group of talented individuals who work hard together to achieve a common goal. It doesn't matter if they play a slow or quick tempo game, and they really don't have any tricks or strategies any other team does not know about or cannot use. In any system or style or play though, they will be successful because they work hard and help each other to achieve group accomplishments.

Although this analogy may seem to be irrelevant, please let me relate it to your school. First, both situations involve a group of very talented people who have world-class abilities and resources in their respective fields. Both situations involve people who can and do put in great amounts of time and effort to see that they do good work. Each of the students, faculty members, and administrators we spoke with truly had a genuine concern for the quality of governance at the University of Minnesota, and put in many long hours to try to make the situation there as good as possible. This concern is further demonstrated by the number of groups who took time out of busy schedules to see us during our visit, all who had cogent reflections on your governance system. The Board of Regents also feels this concern, and does what it believes is best for the university and state. These people are, by virtue of the selection process used in your state, some of the most respected and powerful citizens of Minnesota; their influence is a valuable resource for the University. Finally, this high level of ability and care is evident in President Keller. As "one of

the flock," he shows a genuine concern for the University of Minnesota and its faculty. He is making some very real efforts to hear faculty opinion on various issues. As a former University of Minnesota Professor himself, there are few people I can imagine who could be a greater asset for the school than Dr. Keller.

As I hope is apparent, all of the basic ingredients for maintaining top-calibre university governance (in which the faculty will be contented with their input and the attention it receives) are already in place. To be sure, Professor Mortimer, Professor Trow, and I have each suggested some small, but hopefully important, structural changes which might make your job easier. Regardless, your challenge still remains to put aside any old differences or less-than-perfect experiences and realize that each group involved in your university governance system is united by one common goal: maintaining and improving the top-flight calibre of research and teaching at the University of Minnesota. As a result, you must all try to be more mindful of each others' needs and opinions when making decisions. That may sound simplistic, but it is the truth. If you have a situation with talented people (as you do), then when they work together great results are inevitable.

This cooperative effort will mean that everyone will need to be more mutually supportive. The faculty will need to depend on the President, as he is by design your voice to the Board. This will avoid fighting a long, and quite possibly fruitless, battle for a Faculty Member position on the Board. It will also keep the Board of Regents from being further fractionalized with "special" or "constituent" Regent positions. Most importantly, it will reduce the chance that the Board of Regents will overextend its rightful sphere of influence and bounds of jurisdiction and begin micro-managing university affairs. That is not the role of the Board of Regents, and it is critical to keep from setting up a system where the Board is drawn into situations where they are ruling on minute issues that they most likely are not best qualified to settle.

In conclusion, I hope these thoughts prove to be helpful. I certainly am not as qualified as Dr. Mortimer or Dr. Trow to give you researched and scholarly opinions on the issue of university governance. My thoughts simply are outgrowths of my experiences as the Student Member on the University of Illinois Board of Trustees and my travels as President of the American Association of University Students. As such, I hope the ideas will be of use, and give you a sense of student perspective on your situation at Minnesota.

Thus, thank you for the chance to come and visit the University of Minnesota. I truly enjoyed meeting with the many members of your university community, and was immediately

impressed by the concern and commitment everyone at your school shares for having a democratic and effective governance system. It was a pleasure to work with Dr. Mortimer and Dr. Trow, and I was honored to be able to work with such scholars. Best of luck in your efforts to review and improve your governance system; I wish you nothing but the best.

Sincerely,



Mark Filip
Student Member
University of Illinois Board of Trustees
297 Illini Union
1401 West Green Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 333-6543