

MBM
D65

MEETING OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY (precedes the Special Meeting of the University Senate)

Thursday, November 1, 1979
3:15 p.m., Nicholson Auditorium

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly (TCCA) form a trial committee consisting of the chair of the TCCA, or designee, as chair, to act as a non-voting member, and equal numbers of voting unbiased members of University students (excluding TCSA and All-Campus Council student members) and University faculty senators to be selected by the chair of the TCCA to try the cases of Dick Cooke and Steve Carlson and report its findings and recommendations.

COMMENT:

The following is the text of the TCSA resolution on the basis of which the above motion is made.

"Whereas the Chairpersons of the TCSA Committee on Internal Affairs were directed to examine the actions in question by Dick Cooke, Speaker, and Steve Carlson, Steering Committee Chair; and whereas the TCSA Committee on Internal Affairs has examined and cited numerous possible Constitutional and Bylaw violations by Dick Cooke and Steve Carlson; and whereas it is the duty of all TCSA senators, including those on the Committee of Internal Affairs, to ensure justice and due process of law for all parties concerned, be it resolved that TCSA request that the Twin Cities Campus Assembly form the committee as outlined above."

JUDY NORD
DIANE LONETREE
Co-Chairs, TCSA Committee on Internal Affairs

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, November 1, 1979

3:25 p.m.

Nicholson Auditorium—Twin Cities Campus
520 Administration Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
Learning Resources Center—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 225, including the president, 166 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), 59 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (113) must be present. Amendments to the Constitution require advance notice and 150 affirmative votes at one meeting or 113 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which must be the next regular meeting. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 113 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. The members of the Council of Academic Officers are ex officio non-voting members of the Senate.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators may be admitted to meetings of the Senate and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members of the Senate, the members of the Senate Consultative Committee, and, in case of a tie, the chairman, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate eligible alternates from their college, school, or student constituency as the alternate to serve in their place and stand by written notice to the clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate. Each college or school may either elect a pool of alternate representatives or define the pool to be those eligible to vote for senators.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A role of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the auditorium. Members, please check your name to indicate your presence. A summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES GOVERNING THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Rules are available at each door of the auditorium. Please leave rules at the door after the meeting for future use.

I. MINUTES FOR MAY 17, 1979, and MAY 31, 1979

Action (5 minutes)

II. OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Action (5 minutes)

The chairman of the University Senate has designated the following as officers for 1979-80:

Parliamentarian—James E. Connolly
Abstractor and Clerk—Marilee Ward

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Action (10 minutes)

After being named acting assistant vice president for academic affairs, Betty W. Robinett, professor of linguistics, resigned as vice chairman of the University Senate. The Senate must elect a replacement for this year.

RICHARD L. PURPLE, Chr.
Senate Consultative Committee

IV. OUTREACH REPORT

(2 hours)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following resolutions:

(1) The Senate endorses the principle that outreach functions are an integral part of the University's responsibility, and the principle that the responsibility for them is, like responsibility for all of the instructional programs of the University, vested in the faculty.

(2) The Senate endorses the principle that the faculty of the University should consider in all of the instruction the University offers, including outreach instruction, the needs of the students for whom the instruction is to be provided.

(3) The Senate reemphasizes the freedom of the faculty to pursue their chosen research interests, including interactive community-oriented research.

(4) The Senate withholds endorsement of the operational proposals of the Report of the Study Group on University Outreach, and in particular withholds endorsement of the recommendation that "over time, the University should incorporate instruction

now on overload, e.g., CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, into the regular workload of the faculty either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty."

(5) The Senate will reconsider the recommendation of paragraph (4) above at the first meeting in the Fall of 1980, by which time studies should have been completed by the administration in cooperation with SCEP to determine the impact of various methods of implementation on faculties, students, programs, and research capability.

(6) The Senate recognizes the existing authority of the colleges, campuses, departments, and other units, including CEE, Summer Session, and the Agricultural Extension Service, to achieve the principles of outreach enumerated in paragraphs (1) and (2) above through mechanisms which are suitable to them, and encourages the several academic units to act to further these goals.

INFORMATION:

A. HISTORY AND PERSPECTIVES

(1) Professor Robert C. Brasted, Chairperson of the Senate Consultative Committee Subcommittee for the review of the Outreach Report.

(2) A designated member of the Study group on Outreach.

B. THE REPORT. Reprinted below is the overview on the outreach question as contained in pages 9-11 of the Study Group's Report.

BASIC POLICY AND ISSUES: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Study Group's basic policy concerning outreach is that outreach functions are an integral part of the faculty's professional responsibility in the University. This is to say that, since the responsibility for all of the academic programs of the University—both instruction and research—is vested in the faculty, the faculty is, therefore, responsible for the academic aspects of the University's outreach activities. Or to put the matter another way, the Study Group rejects the idea that there is a part of the University's academic enterprise, namely outreach instruction and research, for which the faculty is not responsible. Consequently, over time, faculty activity and the faculty reward structure should be modified as necessary to reflect this responsibility. University organization should provide focus and leadership, and funding should support outreach.

With regard to the policy just stated, the Study Group makes note of the considerable variation across the University in the extent to which faculty exercise their responsibility for outreach activities. The range is from departments and colleges in which faculty, as a matter of course and as a part of regular workload, plan, offer, and evaluate their outreach activities to departments and colleges in which the outreach activities have no place in the academic planning or regular workload of the faculty.

Moreover, with regard to faculty responsibility for outreach, the Study Group emphasizes that the responsibility is a corporate rather than an individual responsibility. The Study Group does not expect each and every faculty member to engage in outreach instruction or interactive research. What is being asserted, however, is that just as the departmental faculty as a body exercises responsibility for both its traditional graduate and undergraduate instruction and for its total research effort so it must likewise exercise responsibility for the outreach activities that take place in its name.

This orientation has provided the frame of reference within which to discuss four basic issues raised by the Study Group's charge. These issues are:

- 1) How should outreach relate to the instruction, research, and service aspects of the University's mission?
- 2) How should outreach be organized and administered?
- 3) How should outreach activities be funded?
- 4) How should the University's outreach activities relate to other systems of higher education in Minnesota?

First, it should be emphasized that these recommendations are made in the context of long-range planning. It must be clearly recognized that much of what is proposed herein will require some departure from current practice and that these departures necessitate thoughtful consideration and intensive planning over a long period of time.

Second, the variety and complexity of the University's activities must be emphasized so that both within and outside the University it is remembered that, although instruction is a basic and central responsibility of the faculty, it is not their only basic responsibility. Research, scholarship, and creative effort remain the foundation upon which both instruction and public services are built in a university.

In the sections that follow, the Study Group reports its recommendations and their rationale regarding the following aspects of University outreach: instruction, interactive research, related service, organization, funding, and inter-institutional relations. In brief overview, the Study Group has concluded that:

- 1) outreach instruction is the academic responsibility of the University faculty;
- 2) although academic responsibility for all instruction is vested in the faculty as they are organized into colleges, responsibility for the support and manage-

ment of outreach instruction should not rest exclusively with the colleges. There will continue to be a need for central support, assistance, coordination, and leadership such as is provided, for example, by Continuing Education and Extension and the Agricultural Extension Service;

- 3) the University should integrate and, over time, inload instruction because such steps can result in:
 - more uniform high quality university level of instruction,
 - more effective accommodation to a wider variety of students, and
 - more efficient use of University resources by both faculty and students;
- 4) without interfering with the necessary freedom of faculty to pursue their chosen research interests, the Study Group recommends that interactive community-oriented research be encouraged and expanded because:
 - this area of research activity has been undernourished in the past,
 - it is an integral aspect of the University's responsibility to the State,
 - it can foster and further develop a sensitivity and responsiveness to community needs among the faculty, and
 - the University has unique resources to bring to community concerns and problems;
- 5) the delivery of services that are related to research and instruction or that extend unusual University resources to assist in the solution of problems is a major dimension of the University's mission;
- 6) existing University organization and administrative structures may not be fully adequate to meet anticipated needs because:
 - they neither foster nor provide for effective overall planning and all-University management of the institution's multifarious outreach activities, and
 - they were not designed with a view to building outreach activities into the fabric of the colleges and the departments;
- 7) the funding of outreach will present difficult problems—both in the University System and in the State—but there are guidelines and a process that the University can employ in making decisions about the funding of its outreach activities;
- 8) the University and other Minnesota institutions and agencies should press for a plan that will encourage assiduous voluntary coordination of outreach activities;
- 9) moving the outreach functions from the margin to the core of the University's mission and activities will require:
 - that outreach is clearly defined into and understood as an integral part of the University's mission,
 - acceptance of outreach by faculty (as a corporate body) as a part of their teaching, research, and service obligation,
 - modification of the faculty reward structure as necessary to recognize contributions to outreach,
 - an appropriate organizational framework,
 - adequate and equitable funding, and
 - clear understanding and acceptance of a plan and process for implementing the changes that are necessary.

C. REPORT TO THE SENATE OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE'S SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE OUTREACH REPORT

The Senate Consultative Committee designated a subcommittee to provide the parent committee (the SCC) with information, recommendations, and a general review of the Report of the Study Group on University Outreach. The subcommittee study was also to include a review of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy's report on outreach as published in the May 10, 1979, Minnesota Daily, page 15, as an agenda item for the May 17 Senate meeting.

The membership of the subcommittee includes Professor Robert Brasted, SCC member, and Chair of SCEP for 1977-78 (the year in which the interim report on outreach was submitted), Professor Donald Browne, Chair of the 1978-79 SCEP, Professor James Terwilliger, Chair of the 1979-80 SCEP, and Professor Vera Schletzer of CEE and also a member of the SCC. It may be assumed that considerable continuity and familiarity with the Outreach Report is represented on and by this subcommittee.

A series of meetings has been held among representatives of the Study Group, the subcommittee, and the President or his designate. Issues and points in need of clarification have been candidly discussed at these meetings.

The far-reaching implications of the recommendations which are part of the Outreach Report necessitate unique and intense faculty exposure and understanding.

There is now and has been complete agreement among the many committees and interested groups of the University community on the most important issue: that whatever is done should be done in the best interests of the student and his or her educational goals.

If the basic recommendations of Outreach are to be implemented, a number of questions, issues, and considerations should be aired. Some of them, perhaps many, might be thought of as details to be left until the Outreach implementation has been initiated. The subcommittee is not convinced that many key questions should be left until such a time. Senate debate and discussion may provide much needed input.

The membership of the University Senate is asked to give thought to the issues that follow. It is important to repeat that all of these have already been frankly discussed in the sessions previously referred to. However, these issues are only a fraction of the number that could have been discussed and could have been included.

I. There is a critical need for a more comprehensive statement as to what primary advantages the Study Group expects to accrue from implementation.

II. Unfavorable evidence which is more than anecdotal in nature should be available in the Report as to the bases for the Study Group's judgment to the effect that there are inadequacies in our current mode of operation. Anecdotal evidence is available for all parts of our institution and to support almost any point of view. Should not any such demonstrable inequities and/or inadequacies be resolved at the departmental level?

III. We do not find enough evidence that the implementation processes will increase or otherwise improve access to our current programs or curricula. Will new admission standards be adopted to apply to students who presently can take our Outreach courses without adhering to usual "day" standards?

IV. There appears to be a reasonable possibility that implementation could decrease the level of instruction and access. Conceivably the result could be "inequality" and "deterioration" rather than equalizing or improvement.

V. Regarding characteristics of new faculty: A philosophical issue is the possible result through implementation of many large service-oriented departments being forced or at least encouraged to hire teaching staff who are more "generalists" than specialists. Although both are necessary to a large university, the reputation of a department, a college, and indeed the University is likely to depend more on contributions of the specialists. Not all specialists either desire or are competent to handle the challenging and necessary service function.

Will the University attract either the young staff of great potential or the "first order magnitude" star if he or she knows of the responsibilities that are described by "Outreach"?

VI. What governance and administrative problems might be encountered when a faculty work load might be spread over a "14-hour day"? Added responsibilities include Senate functions, committee assignments, oral examinations, advising, maintaining services over longer periods of the working day. Is it not a logical implication of these recommendations that the entire faculty, or at least a sizable core in each department, be given 'A' appointments (or a "super 'A'" if such an appointment involves the "super" day)?

VII. Might perceived improprieties in the current mode of operations be corrected to accomplish many, if not most, of the Study Group's recommendations? The gradual phasing in of the recommendations might result in sufficient disorder and inconsistencies in financial rewards to minimize the ultimate success of an all-University conversion to the Outreach recommendations.

Answers to some, perhaps to all, of the issues and questions above might be derived from following a suggestion which arose from discussion among representatives of the Study Group and the subcommittee. Much information, including cost estimates as well as a broader data base, is derivable at the department level. A representative for Outreach might be designated in each department for some trial period, say for one year. Anecdotal reports could be verified, necessary changes in staff with regard to numbers and remuneration could be established, service and staff support systems in need of expansion could be identified, and concerns of increased over-all financial support could be determined.

ROBERT C. BRASTED, Chr.
Subcommittee for Review of Outreach Report
RICHARD C. PURPLE, Chr.
Senate Consultative Committee

V. ADJOURNMENT