



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

#### MINUTES

#### Faculty Consultative Committee and Regents February 12, 1981

The Faculty Consultative Committee and the Board of Regents held a luncheon meeting on February 12 in the Dale Shephard Room of the Campus Club from 11:00 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.

FCC Chairman Marcia Eaton convened the meeting at 11:15 a.m. and introduced the faculty presentations. Faculty members would describe the process of major change in several University units in the recent past. The context for studying effective changes is the common faculty and Regental concern over the prospect of fiscal emergencies in the 1980's forcing major changes at the University.

#### A. Internal change.

##### 1. Development of the Plant Physiology Program. Douglas Pratt, Botany.

Professor Pratt said the Plant Physiology Program has been in place for some years now and has been a continuing success. Plant physiology emerged as a distinct area of study after World War II in response to intellectual advances. Its significance lies in this country's prime contribution to production of the world's food supply.

Professor Pratt described the poor coordination of and lack of communication about the several plant physiology courses available by 1965, and the process by which faculty and students collectively sought to improve the program. Eventually a faculty of 23 from several departments was identified, a major program, minor program and a graduate program approved, courses consolidated. The program grew, evolved and improved on a spartan budget. It enjoys enlightened support from the deans of the College of Agriculture and the College of Biological Science and from the departments of Botany and of Horticultural Science. Colleagues on other campuses seek out the Minnesota plant physiologists, he said, to discuss ways they can accomplish appropriate changes on their campuses.

Regent Peterson asked Professor Pratt if, when the number of courses in Plant Physiology was cut from 31 to 14, the workload for faculty was eased. Professor Pratt responded that the consolidation led to some instances of professors sharing courses, many having more time for research, and some faculty no longer offering courses in that program.

##### 2. Food Science and Nutrition. Patricia Swan, Food Science and Nutrition.

Professor Swan explained that internal and external forces in the early 1970's compelled changes in the academic areas of nutrition and food science. Internally, the program was diffused. Four different departments each had

as their major charge some aspect of food science and nutrition. As each was required to retrench, the people involved began to see how they were harming the total program. Externally, a challenge for change came from a heightened social conscience regarding the production and distribution of food and nutrition.

She described the faculty's informal conversations, the coalescence of opinion, and the successful appeal to the deans of Agriculture and Home Economics for approval of a faculty inquiry into what response, if any, it should make to the pressures. A year of faculty meetings produced a proposal that the Department of Food Science and Nutrition belong to both colleges. The proposal was adopted about seven years ago and has proved an effective solution. The department is regarded as one of the top two or three nationally. Students gain broader perspectives from the coalesced program. While the joint affiliation is excellent as far as it goes, Professor Swan said additional relationships should be improved, particularly between the nutrition program and the Health Sciences. She perceives that the University's organization to some extent dictates the ways in which people solve problems within the institution. She said that we need to look at the ways we deal with the needs of programs that bridge departments.

3. College of Liberal Arts. Marcia Eaton, Philosophy.

(a) The Chambers Report. Two and a half years ago Dean Lukermann appointed a committee to review the requirements for the B.A. degree and determine whether they were still appropriate. That committee met weekly for 18 months, hearing testimony from faculty, students, and people in the support services. The committee learned a great deal about the students they intended to serve:

- Most students do not complete a degree in four years, but instead are in for a few quarters, then drop out to work, then return; that pattern demonstrated the difficulty presented by a three-quarter sequence.
- About 60% of CLA students are transfers from a wide variety of types of colleges.
- The average student is older.
- Most are deeply worried about getting a job upon graduation.
- They do not read and write as well as the faculty think they should, either when they enter or when they leave.
- They are unacquainted with another culture and fairly oblivious to U.S. culture before 1900.
- They have little acquaintance with a foreign language.

The committee recommended dividing the composition requirement into one quarter in the freshman year and one quarter in the senior year, related to one's major. They added a requirement in history, in another culture, and for a senior project within one's major. The committee, she explained, first said what changes they thought were necessary, without considering the financial difficulties they might bring. There has been some controversy, as over which departments will stand to gain and which to lose through these changes. Various committees are working now to implement the Chambers Report.

(b) Enrollment decline. CLA has at the same time been facing the prospect of enrollment declining to too few students to support the present faculty. It has adopted a "transfer of effort" program which is a kind of tax on departments. Each department must teach a small, fixed number of courses per year in another department. Faculty can thereby help out other programs, although some faculty feel this is to the neglect of each department's immediate needs.

4. The Contemporary School of Nursing. Paul Quie, Pediatrics.

Dr. Quie said his practical involvement as University Hospital Chief of Staff had made him alert to and curious about ways in which the University of Minnesota has dealt with the contemporary challenges in the nursing profession. The rapid expansion of medical knowledge has significantly affected the field of nursing. Treatment changes have required nursing changes; textbooks change every three to four years. He outlined five areas of change within the School of Nursing:

(a) The caliber of the faculty has changed. Twenty-one of Nursing's faculty now hold Ph.D.'s, all in departments other than nursing.

(b) Their mission, both as perceived and as revealed, has changed. There appear to be enough nurses entering at the basic level, but there is a need for nurses who keep up with the advances in care and treatment.

(c) The research program has developed steadily since 1973. He cited Ida Martinson's project on home care for the dying child, which has become a model throughout the world, and another project which studies the response of patients to invasive procedures. Altogether 14 research projects have been funded in the School of Nursing.

(d) The School produces didactic advance training in which faculty make presentations in Duluth and Rochester to nurses who subsequently come to this campus to complete the course.

(e) Some 4,000 nurses have enrolled in continuing education.

Dr. Quie referred warmly to the upbeat spirit in Dean Fahy's administration, newly housed in Health Sciences F with Pharmacy fortuitously by its side.

Questions and discussion followed the four presentations. Regent Latz asked if studies are available showing trends on student enrollments and choices in various programs. Professor Spring cited the various disciplines' national associations as an excellent source. They have the capacity to and do make studies on trends so departments can make their decisions based on hard data. Regent Latz asked how this University responds to the data generated.

President Magrath said that the Management Planning office collects the data; the University follows them; the deans take advantage of the data. It is easier to track changes in vocational courses, he said, than, for instance, political science. He said it might be worth checking to see just how much attention and response to the data there is.

On another aspect of curriculum planning and control, Professor Brasted commented that Chemistry has given state high schools notice that after ten years no student will be admitted to the General Chemistry course without four years of high school math and a year of high school chemistry.

Regent Schertler said that while high school teachers are aware of changes in college curricula and in entrance requirements, high school counselors unfortunately seem not to get the message. She advocated getting many collegiate units out of remedial instruction by informing the high schools of higher entrance requirements, thereby forcing the high schools to teach a thorough basic curriculum.

Regent Goldfine asked if the University could investigate the demands on faculty to publish. He questioned whether it will be possible to maintain the same standards in publishing requirements in the probably more fiscally stringent years ahead. Professor Swan urged attention to the meaning of publication: publication measures the amount of new knowledge being generated by the University. Publication questions thus relate to the University's mission. The University is the only institution in Minnesota clearly charged with generating new knowledge. This knowledge is transferred through teaching. The state must recognize, she said, that the University needs to have active research and to generate knowledge.

Vice President Keller applauded the cross-charging practice in teaching and urged initiating it across collegiate lines as well as within colleges. Among other benefits, he called it a key to the University's remaining flexible as enrollments shift.

Regent Krenik asked how long it would be before we see colleges and Universities organized in ways other than along the traditional departmental lines. Vice President Keller said administrative subdivisions are necessary for workability, but that this University wants as much flexibility as possible and that tight barriers should be removed. Professor Scriven said that the degree of flexibility at the University is noted nationally. Physical proximity among major units (IT and Health Sciences, for example) promotes interfusing and intermingling which keeps them flourishing.

Regent Goldfine asked whether flexibility is favored throughout the University or whether the faculty and administrators here present were the most flexible. Dr. Keller said that assistant professors are understandably worried about "turf" questions and about the criteria for promotion and tenure. The University must assure them that they are being measured for promotion and tenure by the same criteria that they are being encouraged to work on.

President Magrath commented that there is a tendency to take for granted the sort of changes, the quiet reorganization, being described at this meeting. It is the perception of many people that the University never changes. Dr. Keller emphasized that all the developments described above started with the faculty. The energy for new developments, he said, comes from enabling faculty to do what they see needs doing.

#### B. Legislative Relations.

Regent Schertler asked what the faculty was stressing as priorities for the legislative session.

Professor Pratt first described the systematic efforts in faculty communication. Informal caucuses have been held with key legislators in their districts with the faculty residents, and roughly a dozen additional such caucuses have

been organized in other Twin Cities legislative districts. Professor Peter Robinson issued a general invitation for faculty to organize these. The faculty are relying on Robinson to develop the priorities. Professor Pratt referred to the endless problem of identifying faculty by legislative districts. Professors Eaton and Swan named the priorities from their caucuses as maintaining quality, including faculty salaries, money for retention, and adequate research facilities, and maintaining excellent libraries to back up teaching and research.

President Magrath said both lobbying and objective evidence have convinced the legislators that the University has a serious salary problem. He sees no disharmony in emphasizing this need and the University's other needs as well.

Regent Peterson said there are old questions about the University that arise perennially among new legislators. Regent Latz suggested that the University spotlight has too narrow and too brief a focus. The rank and file of the legislative committees and the new legislators need to hear the evidence and be persuaded; the effort needs to be continuous; the University should not relax its effort when each legislative session ends. The University is trying to reach legislators at the beginning of the session when every other interest group is doing the same thing, when the pressures on the legislators are tremendous and they have a great deal on their minds. They have more leisure to contemplate the University's message outside of the session itself. He further said there is no excuse for the University not to have the faculty list computerized by legislative district.

Professor Pratt said that to reach legislators statewide would require a different vehicle than the evening home caucuses, since there are many legislative districts with sparse or no faculty population.

Regent Goldfine referred to the trials of regential elections and re-election processes. Legislators typically want to hear about the domed stadium. He described as the hardest part of his re-election campaign getting the legislators to discuss educational issues. Regent Krenik noted the hazards in visiting outstate and giving constituents and legislators a message contrary to what they want to hear, or contradictory to messages they get from other specialists. He cited gasahol production cost estimates as an example.

Regent Shertler expressed agreement with Regent Goldfine on the difficulties of focusing the legislators' attention on educational concerns. She heard legislators ask about local specifics--recreational facilities for Crookston, and so on. On the other hand, she said, some legislators complain of provincialism on the part of the faculty they talk with. Each only talks about his or her own departments and its needs, so the legislators hear numerous different, intense messages. She asked for a coordinated effort that would produce a collective message. Professor Eaton agreed it is hard for faculty to get the big picture and said the faculty look to groups like the Regents to remind them of the University's overall mission.

Regent Peterson asked if the University sends a weekly communique to the legislators, noting they do read the Daily. Dr. Keller said legislators receive "Brief," but that there is nothing specifically directed at them as legislators. The President indicated that Regent Peterson's suggestion was an excellent one.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

January 19, 1981

Mr. Duane Wilson  
Secretary, The Board of Regents  
220 Morrill Hall

Dear Mr. Wilson:

The Faculty Consultative Committee believes that it will be useful to have a specific item to discuss with the Regents at our meeting on February 12. There are, of course, several matters of significant mutual concern, but we have identified one which we hope you will relay to the members of the Board for us.

The University of Minnesota will, like other institutions of higher education, be a different place in the 1990's. As faculty we are, of course, primarily concerned with the academic changes that will take place, that must take place due to a variety of financial and social pressures and needs. The core problem as we see it is maintaining academic integrity while responding to these demands. We would like to discuss with the Regents the role of faculty in solving this problem during the next decade.

Several of us will be prepared to discuss "case studies"-- specific examples of changes ~~within units~~ that have recently taken and are currently taking place within specific units: development of a program in plant physiology, the development and implementation of new B.A. requirements in the College of Liberal Arts, ways in which General College has responded to social change, development of the department of Food Science and Nutrition, and new degree-granting programs in Nursing. We hope the Regents can share with us their views of the changes we face, and their conception of the faculty's involvement as the University responds to these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Marcia M. Eaton, Chairman,  
Senate Consultative Committee

MME:mbp

cc: President Magrath, FCC members