



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

ALL-UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 4, 1982

12:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Dale Shephard Room, Coffman Memorial Union

1. Set agenda.
2. Minutes of January 28 (to be distributed at meeting).
3. Report of the Chair.
 - D. Pratt and P. Swan report from meeting with Administrative Council of Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics.
4. Report of the Student Chair.
5. Committee Reports
6. Old Business.
 - a. Budget Priorities - University-wide consultation. For action. Should the "SCC schedule a number of open meetings for faculty and students to question a representative of the Budget Executive on the Budget Principles document," as requested by the Senate Planning Committee? (enclosure: Keller memo and examples of Program Planning Priorities.)
 - b. Unit consultation - update on reports. For action: publication? and if so, in what mode? Limited to all Senators plus all departmental offices? Campus-wide in Daily or "Brief" type?
7. New Business.
 - a. Steering. Memo from Registrar's Advisory Committee on "Reinstating the F," forwarded to SCC by Thomas Kraabel, Chr., Committee on Student Academic Services (enclosure).
 - b. Steering. Faculty Consulting Policy (enclosed).
 - c. President's Development Committee on review of grant proposals (please bring copy sent from President's office).
 - d. Agenda for February 18 Senate meeting.
8. Adjourn



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 4, 1982

The meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Chairman Douglas Pratt at 12:45 p.m., February 4, 1982 in the Dale Shephard Room, Coffman Union. Other SCC members present were Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton, Virginia Fredricks, John Howe, Patricia Swan, Donald Spring, T. J. Grbich, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Dennis Kronebusch, Kit Wiseman. Guests were Marion Freeman, Peter Robinson, Maureen Smith, Don Vesley.

Agenda

Additions-

1. The report of the chair will include a supplementary report from John Howe on the Big 10 Faculty Governance Conference.
2. Don Vesley, chairman of the Senate Calendar Committee will give a report on the calendar survey at 2:30 p.m.

Changes-

The report of the chair and the report of the student chair will be interchanged.

Minutes of January 28

Approved.

Report of the student chair

There are two new representatives to the ACIA. They are Bruce Thorpe and Ann Larson. One more representative is being sought. Hopefully the person will be from one of the cultural centers or MISA.

Professor Swan is invited to speak to students about program priorities sometime in March.

Students are very much concerned about the possible additional 2% tuition increase. Although it is generally agreed that faculty salary increases are much needed, increased tuition (along with federal financial aid cutbacks) would be very difficult for students to bear.

Discussion- Dennis Kronebusch said that students on the Waseca campus had heard nothing about the possible 2% increase. Kit replied that students on the Twin Cities

campuses had not been consulted as yet about this increase. Professor Pratt asked whether unspent money generated by this year's 3% tuition surcharge could be used to supplement faculty salaries. Professor Swan replied that the money planned for library acquisitions had been spent and the remaining money was already planned to be spent for equipment. However, it might be possible that faculty salaries would have higher priority and the money could be transferred. Professor Swan added that Vice President Keller is asking the SCC to make a recommendation concerning the tuition increase which he can bring to the Regents next week. Professor Howe commented that it might be unwise to take a firm stance on the tuition increase until salary increases are decided upon. Professor Eaton agreed that it is difficult to separate the issues. Professor Swan said that there are many alternatives to tuition increases that have not yet been seriously considered. Professor Spring moved that the SCC, while reaffirming the primacy of the need for faculty salary increases, cannot in good conscience recommend tuition increases beyond those already recommended in order to achieve those salary increases. Professor Howe offered a friendly amendment: The SCC is of the opinion that further tuition increases would impose an unbearable burden upon students and bring about a decline in enrollment, thus proving counter-productive. Furthermore, in the light of increasing federal cutbacks in student loan programs, the imposition of additional tuition increases could well violate the principle of public access to higher education. The motion passed without dissent.

Report of the Chair

Copies of the response of the Department of Agricultural Engineering to Vice President Keller and materials from the Big 10 conference are available.

Professor Pratt, Professor Swan, and Nancy Brecht attended the meeting of department heads from the College of Agriculture with Dean William Hueg. Professors Pratt and Swan described the activities of the SCC, especially in regard to attempts to deal with the present financial crisis. Professor Swan commented that many questions centered on the consulting process more than budget problems. They were especially interested in the "cost-effectiveness" criteria used in determining program priorities. It seemed apparent that many faculty were unaware until late that certain priority decisions had been made; even to the extent that the head of Agricultural Engineering learned only on January 25 that abolishing the department was planned.

Discussion- Professor Brasted commented that many faculty are unaware of program priority discussions. Professor Swan said that curriculum decisions are made with faculty input but resource decisions ultimately come from central administration. Professor Howe suggested that after reviewal of the consultation surveys, the SCC look into the University's consulting processes even more aggressively in order to keep improving the consultation system. Professor Eaton said that the Business and Rules Committee could be asked to investigate whether or not each unit has developed a constitution and, if they have, whether or not it has been submitted to the University Senate. In addition, case studies could be compiled that would be histories of the consultation, planning, budgeting processes of units. Professor Spring observed that much of the success of the consulting process depends on whether enough trust has developed between Deans and faculty to allow consultation to take place even while discussions are being held at the Budget Executive level. Professor Eaton asked what budget priorities are to be presented to the Board of Regents. Professor Swan replied that the Regents will not be acting on specific unit programs but will be giving approval or disapproval to planning approaches. No cuts are to be finally decided at the meeting.

Some of the items discussed at the Big 10 Faculty Governance Conference were program discontinuance, tenure, unionization, affiliation with research corporations, and inter-collegiate athletics. Professor Howe reported that there was a general feeling that the practice of tenure is being eroded and many felt that tenure will soon be impossible to achieve. Professor Pratt reported that it was decided that it would be helpful if each institution distribute to the others a list of those involved with the governance structure at their own university and then keep up an exchange of information by mail.

Committee reports

There were no committee reports.

Old Business

a. Budget Priorities- Professor Swan. The SCC decided that the Finance Committee's report to the Senate on University program priorities be entered as a joint SCC/SFC item on the Senate agenda.

b. Unit consultation- Four reports still have not come in, among them IT and Medical School. Kit replied that there are mixed responses from student senators. A follow-up is still being conducted to obtain a complete set of responses.

New Business

a. Steering. Memo on reinstating the "F" to be sent to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Student Assembly.

b. Steering. Faculty Consulting Policy, already approved by the Senate in 1975, to be sent to the Committee on Faculty Affairs for quick review.

c. President's Development Committee. Professor Pratt expressed to President Magrath the SCC's concern that administration will be unable, due to the extremely wide variety of research proposals generated by an institution as large as this university, to judge fairly the quality of proposals. President Magrath indicated his willingness to discuss the activities of the Development Committee. The President told Dr. Pratt his purpose was to prevent "end runs" and assure that proposals to foundations bear some resemblance to the priorities of the University. Professor Eaton requested that this item be placed on the agenda of the next Conversation with the President.

d. Calendar Committee report. (Vesley) Don Vesley, chair of the Campus Calendar Committee, reported on the results of a study, requested by Vice Presidents Keller and Wilderson, about the early start/finish and semester systems. The survey results indicate that most faculty are opposed to breaking winter quarter (which would occur in an early start/finish calendar). Surprisingly, though, a large number indicated their approval of a semester system. The Calendar Committee has just sent a memo to deans and department heads reporting the results and asking them to assess the implications of a semester system with an early start for their units. It may be possible to develop a semester calendar for the 1984-85 academic year. Dr. Vesley asked for a steering recommendation from the SCC.

Discussion- Dr. Vesley noted that a change to a semester calendar would save a lot of money because there would be only two registration periods. Professor Marion Freeman (Office of Student Affairs) added that a semester system would benefit the education-ally disadvantaged who often require a longer time to study and absorb course content. Kit

Wiseman said that an early finish would enable students to compete for jobs that become available in spring and also provide opportunity to participate in more student travel programs. Peter Robinson, a member of the Calendar Committee, pointed out that the proposed change raised a number of questions requiring solutions, such as what should happen to the faculty leave system.

It was the concensus of the Senate Consultative Committee to create a Special Committee, made up of the members of the Calendar Committee, augmented by representatives from coordinate campuses, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and the Faculty Affairs Committee, with total composition to be determined following the February 25 Facilitative Committee meeting. The Special Committee should make a preliminary report to the Senate this spring. No formal action was taken.

e. Dennis Kronebusch distributed and briefly commented on results of the Waseca student survey.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Helmstetter

February 8, 1982

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear President Magrath:

While the Senate Consultative Committee reaffirms its commitment to the primacy of faculty salary increases among University priorities, we cannot at this time in good conscience recommend that a part of the increase be achieved through a tuition rise beyond that already recommended.

We are sensitive to the large increase in tuition recently proposed to the Regents and are aware that further increases could bring decreased enrollments and thus be counterproductive. Moreover, considering the projected federal cutbacks in student grants and loans, the University must seriously concern itself with preserving the principle of access to public education.

We hope that central administration and the consulting bodies will continue to explore possible combinations of other budget actions to fill the gap between what the state will contribute to faculty salary increases and the ten per cent average the University wants to award for 1982-83.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

DCP:mbp

bcc: Kit Wiseman
Bruce Thorpe



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

February 8, 1982

To: University Senators

From: Douglas C. Pratt, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
Patricia B. Swan, Chair, Senate Finance Committee

The University's program planning priorities documents will be available in each departmental office after February 11. We urge Senators to study these documents prior to the February 18 meeting of the Senate.

We also suggest you alert your faculty colleagues to the availability of the set of documents within your department.

For the convenience of student Senators, one set will be available in each of the following locations:

Minneapolis - MSA

Crookston - Office of Student Affairs

Duluth - Student Association

Morris - Student Association

Waseca - Office of Student Affairs

:mbp

REPORT TO THE SENATE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAM PRIORITIES

(In preparation for this report all Senators are asked to go to their departmental offices, or the MSA office, to read the Program Priorities Statement that was prepared for the Regents. This statement will be available after February 11th. Senators at each coordinate campus are asked to bring one copy of this statement to the Senate meeting. It will serve as a substitute for visual aids employed at the Twin Cities Campus).

The academic units of the University have been engaged in a program planning process that began in 1979. Planning documents, originally prepared by the Colleges in the summer of 1979, were modified late in 1979 and reviewed by central administration during 1980. The President sent a planning memorandum (his response to College plans) to each college late in 1980. Several colleges revised their plans again during the summer of 1981. When it was learned that the University's appropriation from the State would be reduced, the President presented a plan for reducing the budget that involved selected rather than across-the-board cuts. Non-academic support units were assigned deeper cuts while academic units were somewhat protected. It was decided that academic cuts would be made programmatically and that the cuts would be consistent with college plans:

1. The process and the criteria being applied in linking the college plans to decisions about budget reductions will be outlined and evaluated.
2. The current thinking about program priorities across the University will be described.

3. Plans for continuing examination of program priorities and for beginning implementation of these priorities through the 1982-84 budget will be discussed.
4. Questions about all aspects of the process and about the current thinking on program priorities will be welcomed by Senate committees and central administrators present at the meeting.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

January 21, 1982

TO: Professor Patricia B. Swan, Chair
Senate Finance Committee

FROM: Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

Attached is a packet of materials which I would like to discuss at today's Finance Committee meeting. I regret that this information was not distributed sooner; however, I know that the committee understands the extremely short deadlines under which we have been operating these past few months.

This packet is intended to give the committee an overview of the program priorities document we are proposing to present to the Regents at their February meeting. Attachment A is a general outline of the document; attachment B is a rough draft of the introductory section; and attachment C contains samples of materials for three colleges. It should be understood that these materials are currently being reviewed by the college and may undergo some changes in the next two weeks. I look forward to receiving the committee's suggestions for structuring the document and presenting the materials.

The process in which we are engaged, namely the determination of academic program priorities, is one important step in arriving at a two-year budget plan for 1982-83 and 1983-84. This step is intended to discuss and decide on which academic programs the University intends to emphasize and which it intends to de-emphasize. Decisions on the specific amounts of monies which will be retrenched from each unit and the funds then remaining for reallocation will be determined through the budgetary process. As the schedule shows on attachment D, we hope to present a two-year budget to the Regents at their April meeting.

:jhh

cc: C. Peter Magrath, President
University Vice Presidents

Attachment A

PROGRAM PLANNING PRIORITIES: THE UNIVERSITY'S CHOICES FOR 1982-84

Proposed Outline

I. Introduction (see attachment B for draft)

- context
- criteria
- caveats

II. Detailed Explanation of Program Priority Process (not yet drafted)

- relationship to budgeting
- designation of programs to be emphasized and de-emphasized
- options for encouraging voluntary separation
- program development through reallocation

Appendix (samples: attachment C)

- summary of program priorities for each college

*These figures are not what
could be attained in the next
year*

DRAFT

PROGRAM PLANNING PRIORITIES: THE UNIVERSITY'S CHOICES FOR 1982-84

Section I - Introduction

Any organization must make choices. Even when we avoid making difficult decisions, we have in fact made some choices, if only by default.

This document is a comprehensive, detailed plan delineating the program choices which the University will pursue over the next three years. There can be no disguising the fact that these choices have been colored by the stringent financial situation currently facing us and the state. However, and even more importantly, 1980 ushered in a new era for higher education and the University of Minnesota. The period of tremendous growth and expansion is behind us. This will be a decade of decision...one in which difficult choices will have to be made by weighing the competing needs of many high quality programs. Yet if the University is to continue to develop, such choices are essential; for if we refuse to examine our existing programs, then resources will not be available to develop new ones.

The program choices laid out in the pages which follow should be viewed as the culmination of the first cycle of the University's long-range planning process. The final, short-range decisions necessary to cope with the existing financial crisis will build on the program priorities outlined in this document.

In reading this document the interdependence of the University's on-going planning, budgeting, and legislative request process must not be overlooked. Our approach is built on the underlying principle that all decisions relating to budgeting and the acquisition of resources...should flow from a clear set of agreed upon program priorities. In this sense, this document contains the principles for constructing the two-year (1982-83, 1983-84) budget of the University.

Thus, and perhaps to the frustration of some readers, this document does not contain the financial implications which will follow from enacting these program choices. Budgets are not included for a number of reasons. First, as noted above, we have purposely separated the process of program choice from detailed budgeting. We believe, and our experiences here reinforce, that these two

processes are characteristically different, requiring different types of thinking and different forms of analysis. Program choice is the fundamental, initial step in resource allocation (budgeting). Second, the total level of resources available to the University for the 1982-84 period is not yet known. Third, detailed budgeting which implements these choices will follow immediately on the heels of this process. By early April, a draft of a two-year University budget will be completed and submitted to the Regents.

Because budgeting implications are not shown, it must not be forgotten that the recommendations contained herein will have significant impact on this University, on the programs being offered, on the students, and on the lives of the faculty and staff associated with these programs. The decision to develop or to terminate a program must not be taken lightly, for it will fundamentally alter the character of the University.

To arrive at these recommendations, general financial guidelines were given to each unit director. Academic units were requested to produce a plan which would reallocate no less than 10% of their resources from low priority programs to high priority ones. They were told also to expect that up to 5% of their budgets might be retrenched by the end of the 1983-84 planning period. Academic support units were given similar guidelines while other support units were asked to present plans for a 10% cutback. Each unit then presented its plans through a combination of planning documents and a "planning-decision" conference with the appropriate Vice President.

All the materials were then reviewed in the context of ^{six} ~~five~~ decision-making criteria:

- Quality - (description to be supplied) KK's highest
- Uniqueness -
- Connectedness - sine qua non
- Integration -
- Demand - (ambiguity - student demand? scholar or societal demand?)
- Cost effectiveness

Recommended program choices were then arrived at and a program priority

statement was drafted. For the academic programs, these statements were developed in consultation with the Deans and the faculty governance bodies within each college.

In reading this document, a number of points are important to note. There has been considerable discussion considering the wisdom of stating our program priorities so precisely. Some have argued that publicly stating which programs will be de-emphasized or terminated will be demoralizing and counterproductive. Although we recognize the importance of this perspective, we feel that it can be just as damaging when people incorrectly speculate about priorities. Also, we feel strongly that it is incumbent upon the University to put forward its plans so that our constituencies and the citizens of the state can debate the choices we are recommending.

Although many programs are mentioned specifically, only those programs have been cited which are earmarked for growth, contraction, or possibly reorganization. In an institution as vast as this University, it is not feasible to cite each program. It should also be known that proceeding in parallel with this intense activity has been the development of a comprehensive plan for working with faculty and staff who are affected by these program shifts. Specifically, faculty who are in programs that have been designated for de-emphasis may opt for one in a series of arrangements which would facilitate their change to some other program, some other institution, or some other type of appointment if they so desire. A draft of this personnel plan is being presented to the Regents on _____ (or: is part of this document as an appendix).

This document is divided into two sections. The first section outlines the general priorities of the University; this section can serve as an executive summary highlighting the broad implications of the detailed program choices which have been made. The second section is a compendium of program priorities laid out for each major planning unit within the University. For ease of reference, the unit statements have been organized functionally with an index at the beginning.

We believe that this document is an important improvement in the University's overall planning and budgeting processes. The entire University

community, particularly the faculty, have contributed substantial time and effort to our long range planning effort. We feel that the quality of this effort is demonstrated in the clarity of the recommendations. Although the process has taken place under extremely short deadlines and dire financial circumstances, these choices should permit the University to survive this financial crisis and develop in the years ahead.

Budget Executive
January, 1982

:jhh

Budget 2000 estimate of the saved maximum savings ultimately achievable

EDUCATION

Program Priorities Summary

Proposed Program Changes

Rationale/Implications

Emphasis

Continued shift toward graduate programs and research

Only PhD program in state; developing our unique program while reducing those programs offered by others

Exercise physiology in HPER

Shift toward area of high quality and need

Institute of Child Development

Maintain existing preeminence; assist in search for new head

Research in teaching and instruction

Needed in comprehensive school of education

De-emphasis

Educational Administration - *phasedown, not out*

Need improved productivity and improved quality

General physical education

Shift toward area of high quality and need

Reduce Educational Career Development Office consistent with internal review team recommendations

Maintain field experience component; cut back on placement and/or student counseling

Other Actions

Reorganization of Psychologists into one department; transfer SPFE to Educational Administration

Consolidation of like programs to provide added momentum

Consolidation of Home Ec Ed & Ag Ed with Voc-Tech Ed

Shore-up quality; reduce civil service staff

RESOURCE ACQUISITION

Appropriations

Capital

Private

No items

No items

None specified

Draft

January 20, 1982

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Program Priorities Statement

*a piece of the planning
memorandum
The President's response to the
unit's planning document*

Since the early 1970's the College of Education has had in place a process for making program choices and redistributing resources from lower to higher priority programs. As a result, since 1972-73 the College has reallocated over \$1 million so that today selected programs such as those in curriculum and instruction consume a significantly smaller portion of the College's budget whereas child development has an increased share. This facet of the College's history is evident in the high quality planning materials it submits. Moreover, Education has built a highly useful, comprehensive data base on which it can draw information to assist in its decision-making. Thus, the College is well positioned to face the continuing challenge of the 1980's.

In general terms, throughout the 1970's the College has moved to build increased strength in its graduate and research programs. This conscious choice has resulted in the de-emphasis of selected undergraduate programs. We support the College's plans which call for the continuation of these general program priorities.

Specifically, the College of Education is currently undergoing a review of its psychology related programs. We endorse a proposal under consideration which would combine the psychologists from Psychoeducational Studies and those from the department of Social, Psychological and Philosophical Foundations into a single department of educational psychology. This would consolidate faculty with similar scholarly interests into a single program, thereby providing additional momentum for this area. As this occurs, it will raise the question of how to reorganize those faculty remaining in the area of social and philosophical foundations. A number of alternatives seem plausible: these faculty might wish to move to the basic disciplines within CLA; selected individuals may choose to locate within the College's department of Curriculum and Instruction; or the group might decide to move collectively to the policy area within Educational Administration. The College and the faculty should work out the alternative which seems most congruent with people's needs and sound program development.

The Institute of Child Development, one of the premier units of its type in the country, will continue to be accorded a high priority in order that its outstanding quality can be preserved. We are optimistic that the search underway for a new head will result in the appointment of a preeminent scholar and leader. Yet it must also be pointed out that there will be a general University review of programs in social development and social work. Although ICD is outside this subject area, potential linkages between ICD and the Center for Youth Development and Research in the College of Home Economics may be touched upon in this study.

It is recommended that the College further develop its research program in teaching and instruction. Historically, other areas have been emphasized, yet the College recognizes the importance of this program in the years ahead. Resources to build this area will come from internal reallocation.

Overall, the College's vocational-technical education program is one of the best in the country; and it will be further strengthened with the completion of its new building on the St. Paul campus. Because this additional space will permit the physical consolidation of home economics education and agricultural education, we are expecting better integration of the faculty in these units with the result of improved overall quality.

It is recommended that the undifferentiated graduate program in educational administration be de-emphasized. Although the program currently has strong appeal to significant numbers of students, the program does not appear to have a level of research activity appropriate to its size. It is recommended that the broad subject area of educational administration be reviewed with an eye toward differentiating amongst its subfields. It is assumed that some of these fields would be curtailed while others are emphasized, with the overall result being a cutback in the number of resources allocated to this general program.

It is also recommended that the programs within physical education be differentiated so that resources may be reallocated. Physical education

administration and assessment should be cut back while exercise physiology should be strengthened. This focusing of priorities is consistent with the longer term needs of society and builds on the developing strengths within the department.

Currently three-person study groups are examining selected student services within the College. In this process we recommend that the Educational Career Development Office be carefully reviewed for possible cost savings. In so doing it will be important to maintain at their current level, those functions which are a part of on-going instructional activities such as the field experience program.

Appropriations Request

- No items.

Capital Request

- No items.

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Program Priorities Summary

Proposed Program Changes

Rationale/Implications

Emphasis

Biophysics and plant biomass within botany

Changing strengths within department; future needs of state and nation

Ecology & behavioral biology, specifically behavioral

Changing strengths within department; target of opportunity

Dight Institute for Human Genetics

Target of opportunity

Biomolecular structure

Target of opportunity

De-emphasis

Systematics within botany - *phase out*

Changing strengths within department; future needs of state and nation

Cell Museum - reduce curatorial staff

Lacks level of scholarly output required of unit of this size

Other Actions

EBB assumes greater responsibility for teaching general biology

Changing strengths within department; target of opportunity

Genetics and Cell Biology - increased productivity with differential teaching loads *- vague, no difficult to implement*

Recognizes different productivity levels of faculty within department

Move 10-15% of academic year salaries to research funding

Good research funding with light teaching load

In-load faculty effort for Itasca and Cedar Creek

Reduce overload teaching funds - summer appointments - for faculty involved

RESOURCE ACQUISITION

Appropriations

Capital

Private

Special for biomolecular structures

Addition or renovation for EBB on St. Paul Campus

Dight Institute

Draft

January 20, 1982

COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES Program Priorities Statement

Through sound management and comprehensive collegiate planning with extensive faculty involvement, the College of Biological Sciences has clearly delineated its program priorities. These program choices will continue the development of the quality of the College and should enhance its position as one of the most active research units at the University. Yet this is being done with careful attention to the effectiveness of the College's instructional program.

It is recommended that the following program shifts occur within CBS. Within the botany program, the fields of biophysics and plant biomass should be emphasized while the field of systematics should be cut back. These changes are suggested by the evolution of scholarly interests in the field and the imbalance between resources devoted to systematics and the current level of scholarly activity in the area. Research in biophysics and biomass appears to have high potential both in terms of its scientific interest and the University's talent in these fields.

Within the field of ecology and behavioral biology, it is proposed that there be a gradual reduction in staff in population biology with emphasis instead placed on the development of behavioral biology. Some support staff and supply funds would be cut back to remain consistent with this shift and to reach a level of support consistent with the teaching and research activities of the department. At the same time, the department should assume a greater share of the responsibility for teaching general biology to increase its productivity. It is essential to work at building a critical mass in both faculty and support in behavioral biology to build on the nucleus of strength in the University. Also, it is recommended that the University seek funds to construct adequate facilities for the EBB department on the St. Paul campus rather than renovate the existing space in Minneapolis. This new facility would contain adequate space to house the herbarium, thereby making available additional laboratory space in existing St. Paul facilities. This move will join most of the College in one location and free-up space on the crowded Minneapolis site for other uses. When taken together, these changes should lead to marked increases in teaching and research productivity for the EBB program.

The department of Genetics and Cell Biology appears to be operating at less than peak effectiveness in terms of the balance of teaching and research. Thus, it is recommended that the college and the department review the productivity of the department with an eye toward either contraction by not replacing resignations and retirements or greater productivity by differential teaching loads to compensate for variations on research activity among its faculty.

Two research efforts are singled out for development. The University gives total support to the interdisciplinary, on-going effort to develop the Dight Institute for Human Genetics. It is proposed that the funds for this important work be raised from private sources and that the University consider this as one of its high priority, research fund raising efforts. Second, central administration is willing to study a proposed state special appropriation to establish a center for biomolecular structures.

The Bell Museum has long been recognized for the important service and educational role it plays within the state, particularly for primary and secondary school youth. These functions must be maintained; yet it does not appear that its level of research and teaching is sufficient to warrant the size of its staff. It is recommended that one or more curatorial specializations be eliminated in areas where the integration of research, teaching and service activities has diminished in recent years.

The final plan submitted by CBS also contains a number of important points which call for comment. The CBS faculty have expressed concern that the present system of accounting for workload by utilizing student credit hours may not accurately represent the full range of teaching activities including laboratory and field work. We view this concern as an all-University issue and therefore are recommending to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy that it work with representatives from CBS to study this issue. Second, in planning discussions the possibility of in-loading the Itasca and Cedar Creek summer programs was discussed. In principle we support this change and recommend that CBS begin discussions with the Summer Session to develop a specific proposal which would accomplish this switch. Finally, central administration recognizes the outstanding

efforts of the CBS faculty in securing research contracts. However, even though the CBS faculty is optimistic that it will continue its current rate of growth, given the uncertainty of our nation's economy and the federal budgetary situation, we are less optimistic that this can continue. Hence, we caution the College to temper its plans and future financial commitments with this perspective in mind.

Overall, programmatic shifts within CBS will orient the college's activities toward those research and graduate areas which have the most potential for the future. In so doing, it is suggested that CBS begin to budget its funds such that 10-15% of academic year salaries would be covered from external sources. Those faculty less highly involved in research should assume a larger responsibility for teaching and maintaining the core curriculum.

Appropriations Request Items

- o State special in molecular structures

Private Fund Raising

- o Dight Institute for Human Genetics

Capital Request Items

- o Addition to St. Paul Campus for EBB

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
Program Priorities Summary

Proposed Program Changes

Rationale/Implications

Emphasis

Further expansion of EMBA

Continued demand

Expansion of PhD enrollments

Nationwide demand for high quality faculty

Continued refinement of new UG curriculum

Improve quality of high demand program while holding enrollment constant

De-emphasis

Industrial Relations - made more cost effective by increasing teaching load

Low teaching load with low scholarly output

Other Actions

Funding of 10% of faculty positions from EDC and non-credit offerings

Generation of revenue; service/outreach requested by community

Reminder to have funds available to cover "endowed" chairs

Funding commitment is for only 10 years

Fold Bureau of Business Research special into O&M

No reduction currently; could bring into program choice process

Shift costs of Labor & Employee Education Services to users

Cost shift to students to bring these into line with Regents 25% tuition policy

RESOURCE ACQUISITION

Appropriations

Capital

Private

None

Building awaiting funding

No more specified in plan

Draft

January 20, 1982

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT Program Priorities Statement

Building on the strengths of a fundamental level of quality, unprecedented demand, and its location in a dynamic urban setting, the School of Management has developed a sound academic plan which it has been methodically and aggressively pursuing for the past three years.

During this period the School has had a remarkable development, assisted by a significant investment of resources from both private and public sources. These funds have enabled the School to expand the size of its faculty by approximately 50% while at the same time improving the quality of its offerings. Overall, the School of Management is striving to become one of the top public business schools in the country by the end of the decade. Central administration remains committed in its support for developing the School, consistent with the original plan put forth at the time the current dean was appointed and restated in subsequent planning documents.

Student demand for undergraduate training outstrips the school's capacity to provide instruction to prospective majors and makes it virtually impossible for majors in other colleges to receive instruction in day school. Demand is expected to remain strong for at least the next five years. Despite the fact that the school is unable to handle student demand, it has taken steps to improve the undergraduate curriculum, using resources already available in the School.

Part of the School's strategy for expansion and improvement has been the acquisition of faculty chairs endowed by the business community. These funds reflect the business community's confidence in the School's education and research expertise. Given that the funding agreement for these chairs is a ten-year renewable "endowment," School of Management should be continually aware that it alone is responsible for securing continuing funding for these positions.

In response to industry needs, the School is expanding its evening MBA offerings while holding the number of undergraduate majors and day school

master's students constant. Because of the tuition dedication agreement in place for this program, this growth is largely self-sustaining. However, should demand (and hence revenue) for the EMBA program decline, the School will be asked to reduce or replace funding currently generated by this program.

One possibility for replacing this income would be to shift expenditures to the non-credit program offerings in executive education, where additional income might be generated. Independent of any downturn in the EMBA program, the School plans to fund approximately 10% of its faculty from funds generated by non-credit executive education programs. These programs serve the dual objectives of providing a service needed by the business community while at the same time providing faculty with insights into current problems and issues in business.

In response to the nationwide shortage of PhD's in business, the School is expanding its PhD enrollments and course offerings while strengthening the research component of the degree. Funds for this programmatic enhancement will be made available through internal reallocation.

The Bureau of Business Research is currently supported by a special state appropriation. Because these activities are closely linked with the teaching and research mission of the School, the University should seek to have this appropriation folded into the O&M fund so that Bureau activities can be subject to ongoing programmatic choices.

We recommend that the Labor Education Service increase its fees so that they are consistent with the Regents' resolution that instructional offerings should generate 25% of their costs through tuition revenue. The Employer Education Service, because of the nature of its clientele, should move toward complete tuition support of its offerings.

We recommend that the program in industrial relations be made more cost effective. It is our judgment that the program's productivity needs to be improved through a combination of reduced resources and increased teaching loads, bringing it more closely into line with other programs in the School.

With its recent expansion, the School of Management is under intense pressure for adequate faculty office space. This was recognized by the Legislature

Draft

School of Management
Program Priorities Statement
Page 3

when it authorized construction of a \$5.7 million addition to the Business Tower. Until bonds can be sold to begin construction, the School remains in a highly undesirable situation. The Budget Executive has instructed the Office of Space Management and Planning to treat the resolution of this situation on the West Bank as one of its top priorities.

Subsequent to the completion of the addition to the Business Tower, no other major capital projects are on the horizon.

Appropriations Request

- Shift Bureau of Business Research from Special to O&M.

Capital Request

- Addition to Business Tower has been approved by the Legislature and is awaiting financing.

1981-82 Planning-Budgeting Activities

82-85 University Program Priorities

(October - March)

Oct - Nov : Planning Conferences in
Vice Presidential Areas

Dec : Budget Executive Recommends
Program Priorities to President

Jan : Internal University
Consultation

Feb : Regents - Information

March : Regents - Action

82-84 Budget Plan

(March - May)

March : Budgeting Conferences
Budget Executive
Recommends to President

April : Internal University
Consultation
Regents - Information

May : Regents - Action

83-85 O & M Request

(April - July)

April - May : Appropriations Request
Materials Developed
Budget Executive
Recommends to
President

June : Internal University
Consultation

Regents - Information

July : Regents - Action

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
SPECIAL STATE APPROPRIATIONS
1981-83 Biennium

Because approximately half of the State Special dollars in the University are in Academic Units, half of the target figure of \$2.5 million in reductions might be assessed against Academic Affairs specials. Working toward a reduction target of \$1.25 million, each State Special was assigned to one of four categories as follows:

- 1) Specials to be protected from any cuts;
- 2) Specials where cuts should be less severe;
- 3) Specials where cuts should be more severe; and,
- 4) Specials to be eliminated or deferred.

In specials where cuts were to be made, tenured and tenure-track dollars and dollars associated with academic professional positions were considered in order to assure that these cuts do not exceed the funds not committed to such lines. The criteria for placing specials into these categories were as follows:

Specials to be protected from any cuts

- Specials serving minority or disadvantaged students (MLK, HELP Center, and Minority Graduate Fellowships). The economic climate at the University in the coming year will disproportionately affect these students so it is important that the University maintain its efforts to be supportive of such students. Efforts in this area are beginning to pay off. The enrollment increase experienced in 1981-82 is more than accounted for by the increase in minority students. So the number and needs of these students make it important not to reduce funding in this area.
- Specials that provide mandated services for the State for which there is no alternative. (The Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory.) This unit is inadequately funded to provide the services the State expects and cannot sustain a funding cut.
- Specials that serve a critical need within the University which given other funding cuts, could not adequately be fulfilled (The General Research Fund). Other seed monies have been essentially eliminated (the 2.5 percent ICR monies). In order to sustain vitality in research, especially for new faculty just beginning their research programs, these funds should not be reduced. The distribution of these funds is both effective and efficient and the function should continue at full scale.
- Specials that have no funding in the second year of the biennium. (Immigration History Research Center.)

Specials where cuts should be less severe

- Specials where the impact on the State's economy is fairly direct (Agricultural Extension Service, Agricultural Experiment Station and MRRC). All of these specials strengthen industries which have been important historically to the State's economic well-being.
- Specials which are, though relatively small, making important scientific contributions in areas that have the potential for developing the State's natural resources in such a way as to improve the State's competitive advantage over other States (Biomass, Sea Grant, and Lake Superior Basin Studies and Homel Institute).
- Specials which serve the State in numerous, though generally small project-oriented ways, but which also serve a quasi-instructional purpose by their use of graduate students in projects (CURA). CURA is well-integrated into numerous academic programs and provides a visible University presence in State communities and in areas of important social needs.
- Specials which have a direct impact on the level of tuition students must pay vis a vis regular, day school tuition (Summer Session and CEE, Tuition Equalization Special).

Specials where cuts should be more severe

- Specials which serve State needs which are not highly integrated with instructional programs and whose projects or programs can be curtailed without significant, irreversable negative effects. (Geological Survey, Bell Museum)
- Specials which, although somewhat important to industry needs, are not integrated into academic programs and might be funded from other sources or reduced without serious impact (Bureau of Business Research, Business and Economic Research and Industrial Relations Education Fund).
- Specials which could be reduced without serious impact provided sufficient funds are retained to continue the effort at a reduced level. (Faculty Travel).

Specials to be eliminated or deferred

- Specials which have no relationship to academic programs and which could be performed by other agencies (FIRE, Juvenile Justice Studies)
- Specials which could be deferred for a biennium (Science and Technology Center).

Reductions

January 29, 1982

Page Three

In order to assign dollar amounts to the two categories where cuts are "more severe" and "less severe" the following alternative approaches were used to give a range of possibilities:

1. Shelter tenure and tenure-track items and calculate a 10 percent reduction of the remaining base of specials where cuts were "more severe" and 5 percent on those where cuts were to be "less severe."
2. Calculate reductions on the entire base, with 7 percent applied to where reductions are "more severe" and 3.5 percent applied where cuts are to be "less severe."

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STATE SPECIALS

	TOTAL 1981-82 (incl. sal.inc.)	BIENNIAL REDUCTION \$'s	% OF TOTAL ANNUAL BASE
<u>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS</u>			
MLK	134,820	--	--
Immigration History Center	225,000	--	--
<u>INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY</u>			
Geological Survey	620,455	40,000	7
MRRC	339,000	12,000	3.5
Science and Technology Center	125,000	250,000	200.0
<u>AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE</u>	9,819,663	335,000	3.5
<u>AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION</u>	9,644,129	330,000	3.5
<u>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</u>			
Bell Museum	138,959	10,000	7
Biomass	112,500	4,000	3.5
Veterinary Diagnostic Lab	897,041	--	--
<u>CONTINUING EDUCATION AND EXTENSION</u>			
Tuition Equalization	808,906	30,000	3.5
Juvenile Justice	27,443	27,000	100.0
FIRE	98,636	99,000	100.0
<u>SUMMER SESSION TUITION</u>	461,265	16,000	3.5
<u>GRADUATE SCHOOL</u>			
General Research Fund	684,335	--	--

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STATE SPECIALS

Page Two

	TOTAL 1981-82 (incl. sal.inc.)	BIENNIAL REDUCTION \$'s	% OF TOTAL ANNUAL BASE
<u>GRADUATE SCHOOL cont.</u>			
Hornel	145,649	5,000	3.5
Sea Grant	108,224	4,000	3.5
Graduate Fellowship	71,500	--	--
Faculty Travel	100,000	20,000	20.0*
<u>SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</u>			
Bureau of Business Research	80,676	6,000	7
Industrial Relations	564,706	40,000	10
<u>GENERAL COLLEGE</u>			
HELP Center	288,643	--	--
<u>UMD</u>			
Lake Superior Basin Studies	121,357	4,000	3.5
Business and Economic	30,705	2,000	7
<u>CURA</u>	747,251	25,000	3.5
<hr/>			
TOTALS	26,395,863	1,258,000	4.75%
Eliminate	251,079		
High	1,765,082		
Low	22,078,363		
Protect	2,301,339		

*This special can be cut more deeply in the short term. The plan is to reduce this funding by \$10,000 in the current year and \$10,000 in 1982-83.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

February 9, 1982

To: Stanford Lehmborg, Chairman, Assembly Committee on
Educational Policy

From: ^{WCP} Douglas Pratt, Chairman, Assembly Steering Committee

The attached memos regarding the reinstatement of the letter grade 'F' came to the Senate Consultative Committee from Thomas Kraabel, Chairman of the Committee on Student Academic Services. The SCC asks the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy to study the recommendation from the Registrar's Advisory Committee, a Twin Cities campus body, and to make a recommendation to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for consideration at the first Assembly meeting in the fall of 1982.

Your committee might find it useful to work in liaison with the Student Academic Services Committee. If the committees choose this system, it is possible that a report could go to the Assembly jointly from the two committees.

The matter is clearly also of considerable interest to the Student Assembly, and we are forwarding them a copy of this memo together with the original memos from Student Academic Services.

:mbp

Enc.

cc: Bruce Thorpe, President, MSA

March 16, 1982

To: Stan Lehmborg, Chairman, Senate Committee on Educational Policy

From: Doug Pratt, Chairman, Senate Consultative Committee

I appreciate your taking on the responsibility to appoint the body to study reinstatement of the letter grade 'F' as a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee. That subcommittee will receive its charge from, and report to, SCEP. I will inform the Consultative Committee of SCEP's accepting the task and report the anticipated membership as including two SCEP members, two members from the Student Academic Support Services Committee, and two students to be appointed with the help of Bruce Thorpe.

:mbp

JAN 27 1982



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Classics
310 Folwell Hall
9 Pleasant Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-3912

January 26, 1982

Prof. Douglas Pratt, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
220 BioSci
St Paul Campus

Dear Dr. Pratt,

The attached memo "Reinstating the F" has come to me as Chairman of the Committee on Student Academic Services. It is an issue for us, but -- I expect -- not only for us, since it could represent a policy change of some magnitude. SCC thus needs to direct us to take it up, to pass it on, or perhaps to share it with other committees.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Thomas Kraabel".

A.T. Kraabel
Professor

one attachment

c: J. Preus



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of Admissions and Records
Williamson Hall
231 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

December 22, 1981

TO: Committee on Student Academic Services
FROM: Registrar's Advisory Committee
RE: Reinstating the F

At a meeting on September 30, 1981, the Registrar's Advisory Committee agreed to submit to you a written recommendation to reinstate the F. The committee hereby urges that the grading system at the Twin Cities campus be changed from A-B-C-D-N to A-B-C-D-F (with S-N remaining as a self-contained alternative). Like the N, the F represents work that deserves no credit, and should be assigned when a student does not earn at least a D or does not arrange for an I. But unlike the N, the F should count in the University GPA as 0.00 grade points. The GPA should be computed as the sum of all grade points earned, divided by the sum of all credits assigned an A, B, C, D, or F.

Background of Recommendation

The possibility of reinstating the F was discussed at length at a committee meeting on June 3. Ben Sharpe announced that the IT Academic Standards Student Affairs Committee had unanimously approved a motion to reinstate the F. A subcommittee was formed to outline problems, review other grading systems, and recommend any changes to the full committee.

After studying and debating the issues involved, the subcommittee expressed concern that the N is not figured in the GPA. In response to the subcommittee's findings, a clear majority of the full committee decided to recommend reinstating the F.

Problems with the N

The use--and misuse--of the N have created confusion and false impressions about students' actual performance. The N is inconsistently defined and treated within various units of the University; some even convert it to a grade with 0 grade points. How the N is interpreted influences decisions on admissions, academic progress, probation, registration, grade changes, scholarships and financial aid, honors qualifications, and graduation. Many instructors allow the N to be made up when it lapses from an I. Students sometimes take an N rather than a D or C, or passively allow an I to turn to an N, to protect their GPA. Other institutions do not understand what the N really means. Committee member Keith Wharton, in a memo dated May 29, documented major difficulties caused by the N:

Setting philosophical issues aside, the present A-N system is simply not working and efforts to devise alternative systems

are often misleading and confusing. I cite the College of Agriculture's procedures as an example. About five years ago we became concerned that the GPA, which excluded Ns from its calculation, was often an incorrect picture of a student's academic progress. Examinations of transcripts showed that many students with GPAs of 3.00 or better were actually completing only a few courses each year with grades of C or better and that there were a large number of Ns and Ws on their records. The development of the Coefficient of Completion by Admissions and Records was of some help in identifying these students, but from the questions I get I doubt that the statistic is well understood even today by students and faculty. In 1977 the College of Agriculture followed the lead of the Institute of Technology and instituted an honor point total which in reality is nothing more than a GPA that treats Ns as Fs. As does IT, we require a positive honor point total for satisfactory progress in the College as well as for graduation. Just this quarter we have approved a policy effective Fall 1981 which requires students to have a positive honor point both overall and in the major in order to graduate.

I believe life would be much simpler for all of us if we were to reinstitute the F grade and return to the calculation of the GPA which includes Fs.

History of the F at the Twin Cities Campus

All campuses of the University retained the same basic grading system until the advent of various options such as P-N, S-U, and S-N in the late 60s. This traditional all-University system consisted of five permanent grades (A, B, C, D, F), an I (which became an F if not made up by the sixth week of the next quarter), and a W (which, after the sixth week, was granted only if the student was passing; otherwise an F was given instead). An A was worth 4 grade points; B, 3; C, 2; D, 1; and F, 0. The GPA was the total of grade points earned, divided by the total of credits passed and failed.

In 1972, as a by-product of the dual transcript system, the F disappeared at the Twin Cities campus: N was viewed as "an adequate notation that the student did not, in one way or another, earn credit." At the same time, the GPA was eliminated, although in 1975 it was officially approved for use and in 1979 approved for inclusion on all University transcripts. The cumulative GPA was set up to include A, B, C, and D--but not N or I. Non-accomplishment grades continue to be ignored in the present calculation of the GPA at this campus.

Use of the F at Other Campuses and Universities

Duluth abolished the F in the early 70s but restored it in 1979. The revamped grading system now comprises eleven permanent passing grades (A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, P) and two permanent non-passing grades (F, N). The F is accorded 0.00 grade points.

Reinstating the F
December 22, 1981
page 3

While Crookston adopted a P-N option in the early 70s, it preserved the traditional grading system with only slight modifications. The F is still included in the GPA.

Since 1972, Morris has not used the F (or the D, I, W, X, and V). Its present grading systems are A-B-C-No Record and Satisfactory-No Record. Transcripts do not document unsuccessful work.

The grading system at Waseca has remained unchanged since its inception in 1971: A, B, C, S, and N, all of which are included on the official record. The S and N, however, do not count in the GPA.

According to a review of randomly selected bulletins, other universities do not use the N the way Minnesota's Twin Cities campus does. Iowa, Kansas, Northwestern, UCLA, and Wisconsin all use the F and compute it in the GPA; likewise Illinois and Ohio with their E. Oregon, Princeton, and Purdue also use the F.

BDF/MEK/mh

Registrar's Advisory Committee Members

Keith Wharton	College of Agriculture
Kathleen Peterson	College of Biological Sciences
Mellor Holland	School of Dentistry
Charles Glotzbach	College of Education
Vickie Roberts	Extension Classes
Jacquelyn Henning	Extension Counseling
John Bell	College of Forestry
Dewain Long	General College
Andrew Hein	Graduate School
Natalie Gallagher	College of Home Economics
Barbara Becker	College of Liberal Arts
Julie Carson	School of Management
Ruth Hovde	Medical Technology
Frances Dunning	School of Nursing
Carol Weisberg	College of Pharmacy
Benjamin Sharpe	Institute of Technology
Marjorie Cowmeadow	University College

F grade flunks key committee test ^{Daily} 3-10-82

By David Taylor

A proposed change in the University grading system from A-N grading to A-F grading probably won't be acted on this academic year.

The Senate Educational Policy Committee took no action Tuesday on the proposal, which, if passed, would mean the reappearance of F grades on student transcripts and in grade-point averages (GPAs).

The University currently employs the A-N grading system. Failing work is assigned an N grade (no credit) and is left out of student GPAs. The A-F system assigns the F grade for failing work and computes the F into the GPA as zero grade points.

Stan Lehmborg, committee chairman, will appoint a subcommittee to look at the proposal further and to make a recommendation sometime this spring or next fall. The committee then will send a recommendation to the full University Senate.

"It would be unwise to decide anything without further discussion and input from faculty and students," said Lehmborg. "The issue is potentially volatile."

Since the proposal is not being acted on this year, Lehmborg said, the A-F system could be installed no earlier than next fall. Lehmborg said he doubts the University would change grading policies in the middle of a school year.

Meanwhile, arguments for and against the A-F policy are taking shape. Andrew Hein, a member of the Registrar's Advisory Committee, which brought the proposal before the Senate committee, said the A-N grading system involves a "truth-in-packaging problem."

The N grade isn't reflected in a student's GPA, and therefore transcripts don't reflect academic performance accurately, Hein said. Some students also let their incompletes and D grades lapse into N's in order to protect their GPAs, he argued.

"In effect, the A-N system has done in the D grade," Hein said. "Students might opt for an N rather than take a D, and all of the negative connotations that go with that."

The A-N system also has the effect of demoting the C to the "lowest possible grade," Hein continued. "When you reduce grading to A-C, you minimize the value of transcripts," he said. "By re-establishing the F grade, you re-establish the D grade and make the C respectable again as an indicator of passing the minimum course requirements."

Misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the N grade was another argument put forth by A-F supporters. "Students don't think the N grade is a failing grade," said Professor A. T. Kraabel, a member of the Student Academic Services Committee, which also looked into the A-F proposal.

On the other hand, Kraabel continued; "everybody knows that an F means failure."

Admissions officers at other colleges—especially law and graduate schools—have a hard time figuring out what an N grade means, Hein added.

However, an A-F system would penalize underachieving or slow students, said Professor Jerry Gates of General College. "From my standpoint, in my college, I like the N grade," he said. "It encourages underachieving students to keep going, whereas an F would discourage them."

Dave Dahlgren, a CLA student and member of the Student Academic Services Committee, asked if more withdrawals would be allowed under an A-F system. James Preus, of the Admissions and Records Office, said the number of W's allowed each year is determined by the different colleges, not by the University as a whole. "That's a registration problem, not a grading problem," he said.

Dahlgren, who said the A-F system would inhibit students from experimenting with courses outside their majors, called the A-F system psychologically damaging.

Dahlgren disagreed that students use the A-N system to avoid bad grades. The A-N system is a "psychological positive," he said. "I'd rather get an N instead of an F."

The Senate committee members also brought up the issue of how the A-F system might affect the S-N grading option, the policy for withdrawals and incompletes, and whether students can retake classes they've received an F in. Currently, the University allows students to retake a course in which they've received an N grade.

Lehmborg said that the subcommittee now being set up will look into those issues. The subcommittee will have representatives from the Registrar's Advisory Committee, the Student Academic Services Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, and student representatives.

Before making a recommendation the subcommittee should look into records of discussions that went on in 1972 when the University first adopted the A-N system, Lehmborg said. This would enable the committee to determine if the switch to A-N grading in 1972 has lived up to its goals, or if the A-N policy was just a reflection of a more liberal atmosphere at the University back then.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

February 24, 1982

To: Art Williams, Chair, SCFA
From: Doug Pratt, Chair, SCC
Re: Faculty Professional Consulting Policy

On February 9 the Senate Consultative Committee forwarded to you the "Proposed Policy on Professional Consulting, Service Activities, and Other Outside Work (Darley Report)" for presumably speedy consideration by Faculty Affairs. Observers at the Regents Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs on February 11 discovered that that body had several questions about the proposal.

Regents asked that one working day per week be defined more plainly, straightforwardly, and that the number of hours constituting a work day be defined less specifically. They also asked that they not be entirely by-passed in the policy implementation, and requested a provision that they receive occasional reports on compliance.

Some members of the Faculty Consultative Committee voiced the hope that changes made to accommodate the Regents' wishes can be interpreted as technical corrections and not require a new vote in the Senate, but that is a bit uncertain at this time, of course. The FCC members believe it would be useful if you and Mary Schertler could chat informally about this document. It might help you to get a better feel for their concerns about the document as it now exists.

:mbp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

February 9, 1982

C. Arthur Williams, Chairman,
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
868 Business Administration

Dear Art:

The Senate Consultative Committee has directed me to forward to the Faculty Affairs Committee the enclosed memorandum from Vice President Keller with a copy attached of the proposed policy on professional consulting which the University Senate approved in 1975. It is our expectation that SCFA will be able to report back to the SCC speedily on this document and that SCC will in turn be able to advise Vice President Keller that the document is indeed ready to go to the Regents.

If you have any reason to believe that significant modifications are in order and that the document, therefore, after revision, should be brought again to the Senate, would you please alert me to that likelihood?

With thanks for your attention,

Sincerely yours,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chairman,
Senate Consultative Committee

DCP:mbp

Enc.

cc: Vice President Kenneth Keller



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

JAN 20 1982

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

January 19, 1982

Professor Douglas C. Pratt, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
St. Paul Campus

Dear Doug:

In order to follow-up the discussion we had at a recent meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee, I am forwarding to you a copy of the proposed policy on professional consulting which was approved by the University Senate in January of 1975. I would very much appreciate it if the Senate Consultative Committee, after appropriate consultation with other committees of the University Senate, would advise me on whether the document is ready to be brought forward to the Regents for approval without further action by the University Senate. I know from our discussion that you share with me the hope that this can be done expeditiously and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

KHK:cac
Enclosure

cc: President C. Peter Magrath
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Duane A. Wilson, Secretary to the Board of Regents

PROPOSED POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING, SERVICE
ACTIVITIES, AND OTHER OUTSIDE WORK
(DARLEY REPORT)

PREAMBLE

The primary missions of the University that define the professional activities of the faculty¹ are teaching and learning, scholarship (including research and artistic creation), and service to the University and to the wider community. While these missions are usually complementary, they sometimes generate conflicting demands on faculty time. Faculty responsibilities for teaching, scholarship, and administration, for example, must frequently be met off campus,² at odd hours, and often exact commitments of evenings and weekends. Similarly, as faculty members respond to the needs of the wider community, they may be required to spend some time on "outside activities" during the "ordinary" working week.

Since outside demands for the talents and expertise of its faculty may on occasion affect University service, guidelines are needed to regulate the proper degree of response to these demands. In general, it seems proper to restrict service activities if they may: 1) interfere with a faculty member's ability to carry out his contractual responsibilities; or 2) make use of University resources or facilities.

The University encourages non-University service so long as University responsibilities are fully met. A faculty member may have a talent or be able to provide a service that can be found nowhere else in the community, and employment by the University should not prevent his making these talents or services available to a community that seeks them. Indeed, the provision of this talent or service may enhance the faculty member's capacity or reputation as a teacher or scholar and thus directly contribute to the University's primary missions.

Faculty members, like all citizens, have rights that are protected under the provisions of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Minnesota. While the University can place restrictions on the activity of its employees as necessary to ensure the discharge of their responsibilities, it must take care not to abridge those rights.

This document synthesizes, revises, and extends policies which have grown by accretion since the initial Regents' action of 1914. Omitted from this statement is the 1914 prohibition of employment of the faculty member "which shall bring him as an expert or in any other capacity into antagonism to the interests of the State of Minnesota". It is understandable that the State of Minnesota would find it objectionable for its own employees to serve interests adverse to itself. However, since it is a scholar's obligation to scrutinize proposals, programs, and policies in the light of existing knowledge, it is understandable that he may serve variously as advocate and critic. A University policy on outside

professional activities prohibiting any criticism that could be construed as antagonistic to "the interests of the State" would not serve the interests of the citizens nor the real, long-term interests of the state. Just as Minnesota citizens are entitled to supportive statements where government policies are perceived by faculty members to be of benefit, so, too, are they entitled to expert challenge of government policies perceived by faculty members to be in error. Such challenges may take the form of scholarly publication,³ legislative drafting and lobbying, or expert testimony in litigation. Of course, any such activity must satisfy the criteria set forth in Section I of this policy.

The intent of this policy is to: 1) identify professional contributions and service rendered by the University to the outside community; 2) establish mechanisms for assuring the accountability⁴ of the University and its faculty with respect to outside activities⁴; and 3) provide rules which attempt to reconcile, as equitably as possible, conflicts between outside demands on faculty members' time and their varied University responsibilities.

Many of the activities subject to the provisions of this policy are an important part of the mission of the University. No inference should be drawn that such activities are deemed inappropriate or are to be discouraged.

SECTION I. GENERAL POLICY

A. Application of Policy

This policy statement applies to individuals holding appointments at the rank of instructor and above (including positions as research fellow, research associate, and general administrative officer with academic rank) for the term of appointment. The term of appointment for a B appointee is nine months - 16 September to 15 June; for an A appointee the term is effectively eleven months, since one month is officially recognized as vacation. For those on less than 100 percent time, or on any other lettered appointment, the policy shall be applied in a manner consistent with the individual's University commitment.

B. Definition of Outside Activity and Outside Professional Activity

"Outside activity" means work for any non-University entity whether or not performed on the University campus.

"Outside professional activity" is outside activity of a nature requiring the special training, expertise and/or certification that qualifies the faculty member for his University appointment.

For certain faculty members, the distinction between involvement in community activities as a citizen and involvement in such activities as a professional is difficult to determine. Faculty members may judge the nature of their community activities and, if they deem them to be citizen-related rather than professional activities, such activities may be exempt from the prior approval and reporting requirements of this policy.

For purposes of this policy, work supported by grant or contract funds awarded to the University and accepted by the Board of Regents does not constitute outside activity. Similarly, teaching in extension courses does not constitute outside activity for the purposes of this policy. For some units, community contact and outreach are part of their University responsibilities and, therefore, are not considered an outside activity under the terms of this policy. All such activities will be governed by departmental, collegiate, and other University policies.

C. Conditions Under Which Outside Professional Activities Are Permitted

Faculty members may engage in outside professional consulting or service activity which 1) does not interfere with the discharge of their teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities to the University; and 2) does not exceed the time limitation on outside commitments specified in Section E below.

D. Prior Approval and Reporting of Outside Professional Activities

This paragraph specifies those activities for which prior approval and/or annual reporting are necessary. The faculty member shall obtain prior approval, when required, in the manner outlined in Section II-A, below. The faculty member shall report in the manner outlined in Section II-B, below.

1. Prior Approval

The faculty member shall obtain prior approval for each outside professional activity that is engaged in for more than an average of one day per month in any single term of University appointment.

2. Reporting

The faculty member shall report each outside professional activity that is engaged in for more than three days in any single term of University appointment.

3. Activities Excluded from the Prior Approval Requirement

Under the terms of this policy, the following activities do not require prior approval, as they represent normal forms of professional activity:

- a. holding office in a scholarly or professional organization
- b. editorial office or duties for a learned journal

These activities, however, must be reported if they are engaged in for more than three days in any single term and, in any case, shall not interfere with the discharge of faculty members' other teaching, service, research, or administrative responsibilities.

4. Activities Excluded from the Prior Approval and Reporting Requirements

Under the terms of this policy certain outside activities are expected of faculty members as part of their normal scholarly activities and are therefore exempted from the requirements of prior approval and reporting, and from the time limitations of Section I., Subsection E below.

Among such exempted outside activities are the following:

- a. attendance at professional meetings;
- b. the writing of books or articles or the creation of works of art;
- c. the giving of occasional lectures and speeches, participation in colloquia, symposia, site visits, study sections, and similar gatherings;
- d. ad hoc refereeing of manuscripts.

These activities, however, shall not interfere with the discharge of faculty members' other teaching, service, research, or administrative responsibilities. Such activities will be governed by collegiate or academic unit policies.

E. Time Limitation on Outside Professional Activities

The outside professional activities of the full-time faculty member shall not exceed an average of one day per seven-day-week for the term of the appointment.

The activities listed in I.D.4, above, are excluded from this limitation as they are from the approval and reporting requirements.

The way in which all outside professional activities are scheduled, including the activities listed in I.D.4, above, shall, in the judgment of the unit administrator, be compatible with the faculty member's obligations to the University. The arrangements may, if judged necessary by the unit administrator, include provisions for a special contract or reduction in University compensation.

F. Appearance Before Public Bodies

Any member of the faculty who testifies either in person or by way of a written communication, before any public body or public official, regarding any issue or matter up for consideration, discussion, or action, and who is identified as a faculty member, shall make known clearly, completely, and candidly whether he is, or is not, speaking on the matter as a representative of the University. Where he is not speaking for the University, he shall either indicate that he is speaking for himself, or shall identify the sponsoring individual, corporation, or organization which is supporting or has supported his studies relevant to the testimony, or under whose auspices he is appearing or sending the communication. He shall also explain the conditions of his association with the sponsor.

G. Use of the University Name

No member of the faculty shall use the University name for advertising purposes. A member of the faculty engaging in outside activity may identify his association with the University, but shall take care that the name of the University is not used in any way that implies endorsement or approval of the activity.

H. Use of the Official Stationery or of the University Address

No member of the faculty shall use the official stationery of the University, or give as a business address, any building or unit of the institution, in connection with: 1) outside nonprofessional activities, or 2) outside professional activities engaged in primarily for private purposes.

I. Use of University Facilities

No member of the faculty shall use University equipment or services for activities not relevant to his University responsibilities in a way that significantly depletes University resources without first obtaining approval⁶ for and arranging for payment of a reasonable fee for such services with the University Administration. Use of certain University equipment or services may not require prior approval when it is understood that such equipment or services are generally available to the University faculty for the payment of a reasonable fee.

J. Holding Public Office

1. Faculty members share with their fellow citizens the right to campaign for and to hold public office without their employer's prior approval. It is desirable, however, that any faculty member contemplating candidacy for elective political office or appointment to public office where the duties of a campaign or the holding of the office would seriously interfere with the fulfillment of University responsibilities, consult in advance with the appropriate collegiate and administrative units of the University. Consultation should focus on the question of whether or not temporary suspension of some portion of the faculty member's responsibilities can be accommodated without serious impairment of the function of the department or unit involved.
2. When a faculty member is appointed to or elected to public office, e.g., to the State Legislature, requiring absence from University duties for continuous periods of time of one year or less, it is anticipated that normal leave of absence procedures, or other appropriate arrangements such as a special contract or a reduced teaching load with a commensurate adjustment in salary, for the year or portions thereof will be invoked. The faculty member shall provide to the unit administrator as much notice as possible to insure that ample time will be provided the unit to replace or otherwise arrange to meet the absent faculty member's responsibilities. Prior approval by the Board of Regents continues to be required for any full or partial leave of absence.

3. When a faculty member is appointed to or elected to public office requiring continuous full-time service for a specified period of more than two years, it is expected that he will resign from the University faculty position after such election or appointment.

When a faculty member's reelection or reappointment to public office causes continuous absence to exceed two years, it is expected that he will resign from the University faculty position after such reelection or reappointment.

In the case of appointments for an indeterminate period of time, full or partial leaves of absence may be negotiated annually, or if requests for leave extend beyond reasonable limits, resignation may be expected.

The purpose of this section of the policy is to balance public service of University faculty with the University's primary obligations to maintain its teaching programs and foster research and creativity. At the same time, it seeks to encourage public service, including the holding of public office, and, in any case, not to interfere with the faculty's right freely to participate in the political process. It is, of course, understood that the faculty member's association with the University should not be misused in campaign activities or campaign literature.

K. Special Requests for Exemption

It is recognized that special circumstances arise from time to time in the personal lives of faculty members or in the nature of their University commitments. Because of such circumstances, faculty members may seek exemption from any of the specific provisions of this policy. Such a request shall be made in writing to the unit administrator. The request will be reviewed by the unit administrator, dean, and Academic Vice President in the same manner as for routine requests for prior approval (Section II.A. below). Any activity approved under this provision shall be reported (Section II.B. below).

SECTION II. PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL, REPORTING, AND MONITORING OF OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES

A. Prior Approval

1. Prior approval of the appropriate unit administrator (department, unit, or division chairman) must be secured for those activities specified in Section I as requiring such approval. The faculty member contemplating such activity shall initiate the request for approval. Approval forms may be obtained from the appropriate unit administrator and shall be submitted to that office.
2. The request form for approval shall include the following information: name of faculty member; name of client; type of outside activity involved; period of time during which such activity is to be performed; estimated amount and distribution of time, in days or fractions thereof, to be spent on the activity; whether or not this activity will be compensated⁷; and signature and date.

3. The request shall be approved or denied by the appropriate unit administrator, within a reasonable time, normally not to exceed two weeks. Failure of the unit administrator to respond within two weeks shall be construed as approval. The request shall then be reviewed by the collegiate dean or campus administrator for academic affairs, and by the Academic Vice President, and may be approved or denied at these levels. The faculty member may proceed on the basis of approval by the unit administrator, but shall cease the activity approved by the unit administrator if a denial has occurred at the higher level unless permitted to continue pending appeal. If denied at any administrative level, the reasons shall be stated in writing. In case of denial, the faculty member may request review at the next higher administrative level, up to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the action ultimately taken, he may invoke the procedures for resolution of disputes between faculty members and the University. In such a case the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have the burden of demonstrating that the proposed activity violates this policy.

B. Procedures for Reporting

All faculty members shall report to their appropriate unit administrator on an annual basis those activities specified in Section I as requiring such reporting.

1. Forms for annual reporting of these activities shall include: name of faculty member; project description; number of days or fractions thereof spent on the project; dates of initiation and termination of the activity; and signature and date. These reports shall be filed with the unit administrator and kept for at least five years.
2. These annual reports submitted to the appropriate unit administrator shall be summarized and the summary forwarded to the dean or academic vice provost. This annual summary shall include a statement of the number of denials and the reasons therefor; the summary may identify activities by individual.
3. The dean or academic vice provost shall submit an annual summary of the outside activities of his unit to the Academic Vice President. This summary shall also include a statement of the number of denials and the reasons therefor.
4. The Academic Vice President shall maintain these records and shall make this information public in manners consistent with University procedures, giving proper attention to rights of privacy of individual faculty members. Information on individuals shall be kept confidential as are personnel data in general.

C. Procedures for Monitoring

The Academic Vice President, in cooperation with the appropriate dean, shall periodically review a random selection of individual and unit reports in order to evaluate the approval and reporting systems, and

shall make recommendations regarding the effectiveness of this policy to the President.

SECTION III. DISSEMINATION OF POLICY STATEMENT

- A. The Academic Vice President shall annually advise all faculty members of this policy.
- B. All candidates interviewed for faculty positions shall be informed of the University's policy.
- C. Copies of the current policy shall be available in the Academic Vice President's office for distribution in response to requests for information about the University's policy.

SECTION IV. VIOLATION OF POLICY

- A. Students, faculty, and staff may report alleged violations of this policy to the appropriate unit administrator. The unit administrator, after consultation with the faculty member involved, shall investigate the complaint. If he finds cause to proceed further, he shall take action in accordance with established policies and procedures but only after consulting with the faculty of the unit. In any event, he shall report his findings and the action taken in writing to the complainant and to the faculty member. If the complainant is not satisfied with the action, he may appeal to the appropriate University grievance committee. The grievance committee shall report its findings in writing to the unit administrator, the faculty member involved, and the complainant. The unit administrator shall take action in accordance with established policies and procedures and shall report his action in writing to the faculty member involved and to the complainant.
- B. Persons who are not members of the University community may report possible violations of this policy to the Office of the President.
 - 1. The President shall transmit the complaint to the unit administrator through proper channels.
 - 2. The unit administrator, after consultation with the faculty member involved, shall investigate the complaint. If he finds cause to proceed further, he shall take action in accordance with established policies and procedures but only after consulting with the faculty of the unit. In any event, he shall report his findings and the action taken in writing to the President through the same channels and to the faculty member.
 - 3. If he concurs, the President shall report the action taken to the complainant. If the President does not concur, he shall return the complaint through the same channels to the unit administrator requesting consideration by the unit administrator in consultation with the faculty of the unit or an appropriate faculty committee. After such reconsideration the unit administrator shall report the findings and the action taken in writing to the President through the same channels and to the faculty member.

- C. A faculty member affected by a finding of violation of this policy and/or by an action taken by the administrator may appeal the action through the procedures established for the resolution of disputes between faculty members and the University. In such an appeal, the administrator shall have the responsibility of demonstrating the fact of violation and the appropriateness of the action.

END OF POLICY

"On behalf of the committee I make the following motion: When this policy has been in force for one complete academic year, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall report on its application to the University Senate, with such recommendations for change as he deems appropriate."

John G. Darley
Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on
Faculty Accountability
Approved January 23, 1975

Source:

University of Minnesota Senate Minutes
1974-1975, No. 1

Office of the Board of Regents
September 20, 1977

REFERENCE

- 1 "Faculty", as used in this document, includes administrative officers with faculty rank.
- 2 Indeed, faculty load studies conducted over the last forty years have consistently reported a fifty-five to sixty hour work week for the average faculty member. See Fall '73 Faculty Activity Analysis: Brief Summary, March 12, 1974, Management, Planning and Information Services; Faculty Activities Report, fall quarter, 1969, Bureau of Institutional Research; and Career Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers, conducted under a grant from the Cooperative Research Program for the U.S. Office of Education, 1958.
- 3 The University Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, of December 3, 1970, as approved by the Board of Regents, explicitly provides for freedom of inquiry and dissemination. "Freedom of dissemination means that the scholar has the freedom to discuss his ideas and to make them public."
- 4 "Outside activities" are defined in Section I-B.
- 5 For those with "B" appointments, this amounts to a maximum of 39 days in the term of appointment; for those with "A" appointments, this amounts to a maximum of 48 days in the eleven months of active service. The full-day equivalence of activities carried out in a series of fractional-day blocks shall be computed by dividing the total number of hours expended by twelve.
- 6 B.A. Form 39
- 7 A "compensated" activity is one for which honoraria, fees, or other benefits over and above expenses are received; reimbursement for expenses is not to be construed as compensation.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

1 February 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Directors and Department Heads

FROM: Campus Calendar Committee

SUBJECT: Potential Change to Early-Start, Early-Finish Calendar

In December, this committee solicited your comments relative to the impact of a potential change in the Twin Cities Campus Calendar to an "early-start, early-finish" system. We have had a considerable response to that inquiry and appreciate your cooperation. The committee has now digested and summarized the many comments received.

While the University community is by no means unanimous in its thinking about the calendar, there were several overriding issues raised. There was a general consensus that splitting Winter Quarter into two segments was educationally unsound and that teaching faculty would be disadvantaged by the lack of working days for grading and for course preparation between Fall and Winter Quarters.

There was a surprising number of responses, on the other hand, which implied that the early-start would be advantageous if implemented along with a change from the quarter system to a semester system.

Because so many responses raised that issue, despite its not being mentioned in our December memo, the committee now wishes to solicit specifically your reaction as to how a change from quarters to semesters would affect your program.

Enclosed, for your information, is a sample calendar for an early-start semester schedule for the 1984-85 academic year. (It is recognized that a change of this magnitude would require at least two years for implementation and possibly longer.) We also specifically solicit comments relative to the summer school schedule if a change to semesters was to be implemented.

Recognizing the importance of this matter to the educational mission of the University, we request that all faculty, students, and other personnel potentially affected be given an opportunity to respond, and your cooperation is requested in circulating this memo to all interested parties.

Because the committee recommendations on the calendar must be made in April, we would appreciate having your response by March 8 at the latest.

Thank you for your cooperation. Responses should be sent to:

Donald Vesley, Chairman (373-5943)
Campus Calendar Committee
W-140 Boynton Health Service
East Bank Campus

Enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Twin Cities Campus
Academic Year 1984-85

(Sample of Semester Calendar)

Fall Semester, 1984 (75 Instruction Days)

Monday, August 27 - Fall Quarter Classes Begin
Monday, September 3 - Labor Day Holiday
Thursday-Friday, November 22-23 - Thanksgiving Holiday
Wednesday, December 12 - Last Day of Instruction
Thursday, December 13 - Study Day
Friday-Thursday, December 14-20 - Final Exams

Spring Semester, 1985 (74 Instruction Days)

Monday, January 14 - Spring Semester Classes Begin
Monday, February 18 - Presidents' Day Holiday
Monday-Friday, March 11-15 - Spring Break
Friday, May 3 - Last Day of Classes
Saturday, May 4 - Study Day
Monday-Saturday, May 6-11 - Final Exams

Summer Session, 1985 (38 Instruction Days)

Monday, June 3 - Summer Session Classes Begin
Thursday, July 4 - Independence Day Holiday
Friday, July 5 - Classes Excused (Possible Floating Holiday,
for FY 85-86)
Friday, July 26 - Last Day of Summer Session

(Note! It is anticipated that summer courses of varying lengths, starting or finishing at different times, may be employed to meet the needs of special groups of students, such as secondary school teachers, etc.)

Floating Holidays, 1984-85

Friday, November 23 - Day After Thanksgiving
Monday, December 24 - Christmas Eve
Monday, December 31 - New Year's Eve
Monday, February 18 - Presidents' Day

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Major Impacts Mentioned in Response to Inquiry About Early-Start Calendar

Total Number of Responses: ~90 - 100

A. Reasons for early start quarter system	# of responses mentioning
1. Improved job opportunities & related factors	16
2. Conformity with primary & secondary schools & with other higher education institutions	8
3. Conformity with athletic (football) schedule	1
4. Move toward uniformity within University units	1
B. Reasons against early start quarter system	
1. Splitting of winter quarter not educationally sound	43
2. Short-break (no working days) between fall and winter quarter	11
3. Loss of September time for meetings, travel, etc.	11
4. Need for administrative changes (altered 'B' appointments, earlier deadlines, etc.)	6
5. Space scheduling problems	3
6. Loss of beneficial field trip time in the spring	2
7. Non-availability of Fairgrounds parking immediately after the State Fair	2
8. Conflict with Jewish holidays	1
9. Placing of spring break too early (still winter in Minn.)	1
10. Financial aid checks for students tied to state or federal fiscal year would be issued too late in school year	1
C. Impacts which do not <u>clearly</u> favor either early start or present system	
1. Timing of, and length of break periods surrounding summer session	13
2. Impact on overseas exchange programs	3

Page 2 - Twin Cities Campus Calendar Committee
Major Impacts Mentioned in Response to Inquiry About Early-Start Calendar

of responses
mentioning

- D. Responses which clearly indicated favoring or not favoring the early start calendar. (Note: many replies listed impacts without indicating support or non-support.)
1. Definite support 23
 2. Seem to favor early start, but only if tied to move toward semester system. (Note: two respondees indicated opposition to semesters.) 27
 3. Definitely opposed to early start (based on early start quarter system mentioned) 19

2/4/82

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

to Senate, for Information

REPORT TO THE SENATE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAM PRIORITIES

(In preparation for this report all Senators are asked to go to their departmental offices, or the MSA office, to read the Program Priorities Statement that was prepared for the Regents. This statement will be available after February 11th. Senators at each coordinate campus are asked to bring one copy of this statement to the Senate meeting. It will serve as a substitute for visual aids employed at the Twin Cities Campus).

The academic units of the University have been engaged in a program planning process that began in 1979. Planning documents, originally prepared by the Colleges in the summer of 1979, were modified late in 1979 and reviewed by central administration during 1980. The President sent a planning memorandum (his response to College plans) to each college late in 1980. Several colleges revised their plans again during the summer of 1981. When it was learned that the University's appropriation from the State would be reduced, the President presented a plan for reducing the budget that involved selected rather than across-the-board cuts. Non-academic support units were assigned deeper cuts while academic units were somewhat protected. It was decided that academic cuts would be made programmatically and that the cuts would be consistent with college plans:

1. The process and the criteria being applied in linking the college plans to decisions about budget reductions will be outlined and evaluated.
2. The current thinking about program priorities across the University will be described.

3. Plans for continuing examination of program priorities and for beginning implementation of these priorities through the 1982-84 budget will be discussed.
4. Questions about all aspects of the process and about the current thinking on program priorities will be welcomed by Senate committees and central administrators present at the meeting.

Patricia B. Swan, Chair,
Senate Finance Committee

Deborah C. Pratt, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA TECHNICAL COLLEGE, WASECA
 STUDENT CONCERNS POLL
 FALL QUARTER, 1981

	Fall	1981
	No.	%
Enrollment	1,101	
Total Response	195	18

01. Number of quarters you have attended UMW?

<u>Qtr. in College</u>	<u>Response:</u>	
1	70	36
2	39	20
3	2	1
4	27	14
5	33	17
6	10	5
7	6	3
8	4	2
9 or more	1	--
* NR	--	--

02. Age Groups

17	--	--
18	57	29
19	79	41
20	31	16
21	10	5
22	10	5
23-30	--	--
31-40	6	3
41+	--	--
*NR	2	1

03. What is your major?

<u>Programmatic Area</u>		
Ag Business	30	15
Ag Industries & Services	24	12
Ag Production	73	38
Animal Health	27	14
Food Industry	--	--
Home & Family	7	4
Horticulture	31	16
Adult Special	3	1

* NR - No Response

Fall 1981
No. %

04.	<u>Number of credits for which you are registered this quarter?</u>	<u>Response:</u>	
	<u>Credits</u>		
	1-3	6	3
	4-6	--	--
	7-9	1	--
	10-12	11	6
	13-15	57	29
	16-18	101	52
	19-21	17	9
	21+	2	1
05.	<u>Sex</u>		
	Male	91	47
	Female	100	51
	*NR	4	2
06.	<u>Marital Status</u>		
	Married	2	1
	Single	187	96
	*NR	6	3
07.	<u>Housing</u>		
	Residence Hall	149	76
	Off Campus	45	23
	*NR	1	--
08.	<u>Noise level in Residence Halls at night distracting?</u>		
	Sometimes	92	47
	Never	78	40
	Always	8	4
	*NR	17	9
09.	<u>Campus lounge facilities adequate?</u>		
	Yes	136	70
	No	52	27
	*NR	7	3
10.	<u>Should there be a limit on the number of students allowed to major in a given program?</u>		
	Yes	71	36
	No	122	63
	*NR	2	1
11.	<u>Are you aware of how your student services fees money is distributed?</u>		
	Yes	38	19
	No	156	80
	*NR	1	--

*NR - No Response

Fall 1981
No. %

12. Were there subject areas in your major that were not offered that should have been?

	<u>Response</u>	
Yes	57	29
No	138	71
*NR	--	--

13. If answer to 12 is Yes, list courses or subjects needed.

14. Do you believe that RA's should be actively promoting personal development and involvement in UMW social and academic activities?

Yes	146	75
No	39	20
*NR	10	5

15. Are you thinking of continuing your education at another college after you graduate from UMW?

Yes	92	47
No	95	49
*NR	8	4

16. Satisfied with benefits received from student services fees?

Yes	58	30
No	118	60
*NR	19	10

17. Is Residence Hall Council effectively representing your rights as a student resident?

Always	32	16
Sometimes	132	67
Never	15	7
*NR	16	8

18. Are you a member of an official student organization at UMW?

Yes	144	74
No	50	26
*NR	1	--

*NR - No Response

Fall 1981
No. %

19. <u>Resources in the LRC adequate for your needs?</u>	<u>Response</u>	
Exceptionally adequate	27	14
Very adequate	77	39
Adequate	84	43
Inadequate	3	2
Very inadequate	4	2
20. <u>When you enrolled at UMW, were you planning to continue your education at another institution after graduation from UMW?</u>		
Yes	65	33
No	128	66
*NR	2	1
21. <u>Satisfied with quality of instruction in required courses?</u>		
Very satisfied	36	18
Satisfied	137	70
Dissatisfied	15	3
Very dissatisfied	6	3
*NR	1	1
22. <u>Satisfied with quality of instruction in electives?</u>		
Very satisfied	26	13
Satisfied	146	75
Dissatisfied	17	9
Very dissatisfied	2	1
*NR	4	2
23. <u>What amount would you be willing to pay to subsidize a UMW yearbook?</u>		
\$5.00	48	25
\$6.00	25	13
\$7.00	36	18
\$8-10.00	50	26
None	33	17
*NR	3	1
24. <u>Does college bulletin accurately describe your academic program at UMW?</u>		
Very accurately	21	11
Accurately	145	74
Inaccurately	19	10
Very inaccurately	7	4
*NR	3	1

*NR

Fall 1981
No. %

25.	<u>Do you understand the purpose and function of the Student Senate?</u>	<u>Response:</u>	
	Extremely well	16	8
	Very well	25	13
	Understand	81	41
	Not too well	48	24
	In the dark	23	13
	*NR	2	1
26.	<u>Satisfied with assistance given by your Instructor/Counselor?</u>		
	Extremely satisfied	44	23
	Very satisfied	44	23
	Satisfied	74	38
	Not satisfied	21	11
	Definitely not satisfied	10	5
	*NR	2	1
27.	<u>Have you attended a Student Senate meeting this quarter?</u>		
	Yes	58	30
	No	134	69
	*NR	3	1
28.	<u>Do you have sufficient input into the development of your academic program?</u>		
	Always	15	8
	Usually	93	48
	Sometimes	62	32
	Never	22	11
	*NR	3	1
29.	<u>How satisfied are you with POP Program?</u>		
	Very satisfied	15	7
	Satisfied	19	10
	Dissatisfied	6	3
	Very Dissatisfied	8	4
	*NR	147	75
30.	<u>Would you prefer to change Instructor/Counselor?</u>		
	Very Definitely	14	7
	Definitely	14	7
	Neutral	48	25
	Would not	54	28
	Definitely would not	62	32
	*NR	3	1

*NR - No Response

		Fall 1981	
		No.	%
31.	<u>Satisfied with tutoring service?</u>	Response:	
	Always	13	7
	Sometimes	48	25
	Never	5	2
	*NR	129	66
32.	<u>Should exterior lighting on campus be improved?</u>		
	Immediately	64	33
	Very soon	40	20
	Soon	26	13
	Not urgent	44	23
	Not necessary	17	9
	*NR	4	2
33.	<u>Should security patrol system be implemented?</u>		
	Immediately	63	32
	Very soon	30	15
	Soon	20	10
	Not urgent	41	21
	Not necessary	38	20
	*NR	3	1
34.	<u>Security Patrol</u>		
	Very willing	30	15
	Willing	64	33
	Uncertain	69	35
	Unwilling	16	8
	Very unwilling	14	7
	*NR	2	1
35.	Other Concerns		
36.	<u>Will 10% surcharge increase in tuition affect your decision to attend UMW?</u>		
	Very definitely	8	4
	Definitely	11	6
	Some	52	27
	Probably Not	47	24
	Definitely Not	74	38
	*NR	3	1

*NR - No Response

Advertising and Display

Grooming courses (3)

Zoology

Automatic Transmissions

More Agricultural Production courses

More Computer courses (2)

Expand Nursery Production

More Psychology

More Communications

Transmission and Gear Box

Saddle Seat

Tax course concerning the horse business

I think they need to have some courses available different quarters. Not so many courses spring quarter being that students go on P.O.P.

More advanced riding courses

More Business Courses

More advanced classes in specific major area

More Design classes

More Art classes

Tropical Agriculture

Physiology of Lactation

Agricultural Finance

More sheep classes - there is only one

Business Management

More Floral Designing

More specific to dairy cattle (1)

Fruit and Vegetable Research

More AI courses

More Commodity Marketing

Specialty areas

More extensive Journalism course

Some Animal Health and Light Horse

Some electives that are only offered summer to be offered fall/winter

Nursery Production

Nursery Operation

Introduction to Accounting

Sex Education

More drawing courses

More parking

Snow removal should be provided

City officials should be more considerate

Waseca is already more expensive than most other colleges, many kids that I know want to transfer to SDSU.

I think that they should lay off on the damage fines. \$10 to clean your already clean room at the end of the quarter is retarded. They are too picky.

We should for sure have a campus security system going - especially in the parking lots.

I would not be able to remain in this college if the tuition is up 25%.

Satisfaction with the quality of required courses has been very dependent upon different instructors. We have some good teachers and I think they need to bring in more of as good a quality.

Need student services building

Tuition increase - I would transfer if that happened.

Need better and more parking for apartments.

We lose too many excellent instructors.

Get a dairy instructor on campus right away instead of those dumb weekend classes.

Some things that are required have nothing to do with other things in a major and shouldn't be required.

There are too few washers and dryers in the Men's on campus housing.

Get rid of the math program or teacher.

Summer freshmen should be able to register before fall freshmen because of required courses.

Need a dairy production teacher

Very dissatisfied that there is no teacher in dairy production.

I don't know what the benefits to the student services fee are (2)

Do not have input into evaluation of good teachers. We lose good teachers due to poor contracts and high administration.

Teachers - losing good ones with no student say. - "This Place Is For Students" They should have some say on teachers - good ones aren't that easy to replace - no one listens.

I think that on money concerns such as financial aids and scholarships, the school gives the students the run-around. I have had my share of it and feel that in a facility such as this, there is no adequate reason for it.

Student services fees - Should publish a budget outline and get more input into its use.

The courses that I need were cancelled and I had to do them independent study or not at all.

I don't think that tuition should be charged for POP.

One way this college could save money is to get people working here that are concerned about students. We could have half the number of employees if they were willing to do their part. Especially financial aids.

I feel there is a bad attitude toward the students in both the financial aids and admissions office. I think the computer scheduling with the computer is not doing its purpose as is, from the stand point of students. In Agri. Prod. too many people in it for the amount of courses offered.

Waseca is already more expensive than most other colleges. Many kids that I know want to transfer to S.D.S.U. because it's cheaper. I was displeased because I couldn't get the classes I wanted for Winter quarter. I don't feel that I'm getting my money's worth out of this school, therefore, I highly doubt that a 25% increase in tuition would be feasible for me.

The movies are terrible - Health Service isn't very helpful.

Some instructors are good. Others don't care how well they teach.

Surveying is a waste of time.

I don't like taking substitute classes because ones I wanted are already filled.