



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING WITH REGENTS

MINUTES

Thursday, November 13, 1980

11:30-1:30 p.m.

Dale Shephard Room, Coffman Memorial Union

The Faculty Consultative Committee and the University Regents held their quarterly meeting at a luncheon on November 13. Following the social hour and lunch, Chairman Marcia Eaton of the Senate Consultative Committee introduced her faculty colleagues, both those present and those unable to attend, to the Regents, giving a little biographical and career information about each. The other FCC members present were Paul Quie, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Patricia Swan, John Verrill, and Al Ward.

1. Outreach was the first agenda item. The faculty has two main fears from the proposal--loss of income, and increased work load. Professor Eaton explained that many faculty members depend upon the income from overload teaching in evenings and summer sessions to be able to send their children to the school and college of their choice. Hence they are anxious over the prospect of losing that source of supplementary income through a system of total inloading. On the other hand, the faculty members who are good citizens are pulled in many directions, fulfilling many kinds of obligations. Policy changes at the University create many additional man/woman hours of labor. While the faculty recognize the importance of outreach, many fear the full implementation of the proposal will create more work for them and stretch them more thinly. She expressed thanks to the Regents for their faculty salary request to the legislature.

Professor Eaton introduced Professor Vera Schletzer, a member of the SCC's subcommittee on monitoring the Outreach proposal. Professor Schletzer backed the position that implementation of the proposal as such is unnecessary. Through Continuing Education and Extension, outreach offerings are well integrated into the departments, she said. CEE students are motivated because they are taking their studies by their own choice. For many CEE students, their studies relate directly to their vocational development. Faculty enjoy considerable flexibility, such as being free to try things out in some non-credit courses. Thousands of CEE students are working toward degrees, and thousands others towards certificates. Many register for one very particular course; many come to update their career discipline. She called the University's Continuing Education and Extension program one of the best in the country and said the people who provide it should be rewarded.

CEE at Minnesota was about the first such program to hire a professional counseling staff and counseling is available to all men and women students in CEE. Professor Schletzer and her colleagues last year saw 21,000 people for educational and career counseling.

She praised the flexibility of the present arrangement. Both inloading and overloading are allowed. Almost everything the outreach proposal addresses can actually be carried out under the present system. Because night school students want the courses that are already the most popular in the day program--those practical and occupational, inloading would not redistribute students to intrinsically valuable but under-enrolled courses. She questioned whether centralizing the management of outreach will really bring any kind of salvation during anticipated enrollment diuption. In questioning the usefulness of implementing the outreach proposal she said she was speaking also as a voting member of the Psychology department in whose considerations of the proposal she had also participated.

Regent Latz said that he did not understand the economic fear related to the inloading proposal. He assumes that people who undertake an extra workload would still be paid for that.

Professor Schletzer said there are some departments in which it appears inloading preserves some jobs, while other departments can only meet inloading requirements by additional hiring. Latz asked if there is no advantageous pay allowance for teaching in the less desirable times. The answer is 'no,' and in fact the actual pay rate through CEE is lower than for regular day teaching. Regent Latz also asked if it is largely uncertainty that makes the faculty fearful. Professor Eaton offered that to a considerable extent it was. She suspects that had the proposal been introduced at a time when there weren't already funding anxieties, it would probably have received a different reception.

President Magrath acknowledged that there are very real fears among the faculty. If the University could received increased state appropriations to pay for integrating its outreach effort, these fears would be alleviated. That is a very big 'if', however.

2. Sexual Harrassment: Guidelines for dealing with the problem. Professor Eaton noted that a year ago the FCC and the Regents had discussed the beginning of efforts to establish guidelines for handling the problems of this area. She reported that the committee charged, the University Committee on Tenure, is working very seriously to complete its recommendations, after receiving numerous responses to the initial form of its proposal.

3. University Budget. Professor Eaton introduced Professor Swan, Chairperson of the University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review, who expressed her committee's appreciation and pleasure at the Regents' firm, strong show of support to the legislature for faculty salary increases. She emphasized that to have the people who stand behind the University take this firm position does a lot for faculty morale. She further expressed appreciation to the Regents, as outstanding and very busy citizens of the state, for their dedication of time to the University. She called their contribution extremely important to the state.

UCBRBR, she said, is deeply worried about this year's financial situation, both the cuts already made and the uncertainty about the future. The committee is beginning to engage in conversations with central administration to order their thinking and priorities for the hard decisions which may have to be made. She referred to tentative further reallocations for next year which the Regents have already looked at.

She described the role of UCRRBR as one of attempting to express the thinking of the faculty and students about what is the best process and what are the best principles to use in making hard decisions about the available resources, and of communicating to the Regents and the central administrators faculty and student sympathy in the decisions those leaders have to make. She expressed her hope for a continuation of the good consulting process.

4. Other discussion. Regent Shertler expressed appreciation for the fact that SCC minutes reach the Regents now more promptly than formerly, and that the Regents receive unapproved minutes when necessary to avoid great delay. She added that the Regents are happy to have any FCC member speak in their meeting when the Consultative Committee is attending to the same or a related item. Regent Latz recommended the participants reacquaint themselves with and follow the carefully worked out policy providing for faculty to speak in Regents meetings.

Regent McGuiggan observed with regret that every meeting he attends at the University is largely directed toward finances rather than towards educational policy. He sees the need for a redirection of efforts. He does not want the outreach proposal to remain stalled on questions of finance. He asked if there can be a commitment to implementing the outreach program, a commitment to providing accessibility to programs. The Regents, he said, are awaiting some report out from the Senate on the outreach proposal. There needs to be redirection in recognition of the lowered availability of money. Changes can take place apart from money requests, he stressed.

Professor Schletzer said that changes do take place in CEE all the time to try to meet the changing needs of students and prospective students. Professor Eaton referred to the role of the Senate's Educational Policy Committee in moving the outreach proposal. SCEP participated in the development of a questionnaire which has been submitted to sample departments of the University in an effort to discern some of the anticipated effects and requirements of inloading. SCEP is awaiting the report of that pilot study, which was carried out from the Office of Academic Affairs. Vice President Keller assured those present that the University is continuing and can continue to move forward in aspects of outreach other than inloading.

Professor Eaton reiterated her concern that dedicated faculty may be given too many additional tasks and finally not have time to do any of their jobs well. Regent McGuiggan expressed sympathy with the faculty, but asked that the Regents not be told that money is the stumbling block to change.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Meredith B. Poppele,
Secretary,
Senate Consultative Committee