



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

February 2, 1984
Regents Room, Morrill Hall
12:15 - 3:00

TENTATIVE AGENDA

Approx. time

- 12:15 1. Report on International Education: Discussion with President Magrath. (Copies being mailed 1/26 to SCC members)

- 12:45 2. Andersen Commission's draft report. Discussion with Rick Heydinger. (Enclosure: V. P. Keller 1/23 letter to Mr. Heydinger)

- 1:30 3. Assembly and Senate agenda for February 16. With Professor Richard Purple, Chairperson, Business and Rules Committee.

Includes, among other business:

 - Proposed rules change regarding representation in the Senate of Mortuary Science student;
 - Social Concerns' motion on charitable giving.

- 1:50 4. SCC minutes of January 19. (To be sent separately)
5. Report of the Student Co-Chair.
6. Report of the SCC Chair.
7. Report of the Finance Committee Chair.

- 2:00 8. Draft policy statement (distributed prior to January 19 meeting) on Senate committees and administrative task forces: Discussion.

- 2:15 9. The Budget Executive: Discussion with Vice President Keller.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND DISCUSSION WITH
PRESIDENT MAGRATH AND VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

February 2, 1984
Regents Room, Morrill Hall
12:25 - 3:00

Members present: Virginia Fredricks, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Van Hayden, John Howe, Chairperson, Susan Hunstiger, Julie Iverson, Marvin Mattson, Lisa McDonell, Jack Merwin, Mitch Richter, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Scott Singer, W. Donald Spring, Colleen Traxler, John Turner.

Guests: President Magrath, Vice President Keller, Rick Heydinger, Jim Borgestad, Douglas MacFarland, Alice Edwards, John Hughes, Kate Parry, Maureen Smith.

1. Report of the Task Force on the International Character of the University.

Members called the report well-done and very readable and President Magrath said it has had extensive distribution. The report reflects the earlier studies and reports the task force examined. The President said he had not yet discussed the report with the vice presidents and that it would be premature for him to respond now to the document. He looks forward to responses from the Consultative and Educational Policy Committees within one to two months.

Many of the recommendations, he noted, are administrative and do not have costs attached. The curriculum material is exciting and fits with many things currently going on at the University.

Mr. Schulte asked to whom the proposed new assistant vice president for international education would report, given the assignment of the Office of International Programs, or its successor, to the new vice president for planning and academic support activities. He also asked whether there would be a national search for that person. President Magrath said initially the assistant vice would report to the planning vice president; there would be a link to the academic affairs vice president to sign off on certain activity. He has assumed the search would be internal since we have a credible array of faculty and administrators with extensive international experience and connections.

Professor Turner presented a number of concerns and questions which the report raises, which should be considered before going much further in implementation, in order to avoid problems later on. He prefaced his remarks with reference to his own work with foreign scholars and his long commitment to the international dimension of education and scholarship.

- The University is doing some of the new things already, such as increasing the language requirements. The Stassen Report, just released, means we can now open up an aspect of the School of Management that has been rather thin.
- The report gives no indication of how much the University is already actually doing in each of the ten areas.
- What does the "language component" mean, as described in the report?
- International commerce: we probably should do what is recommended, but need it cost \$23,000?
- A lot of responsibilities are assigned to the new vice president;
- There is a need for caution regarding funding implications.
- There is need for caution regarding expanding the Office of International Student Advising (OISA) into academic areas (recruiting, admissions, awards); in fact, much concerning current student exchanges is already done without faculty input. Is there a reason to involve OISA in recruiting graduate students? Faculty, departments are doing well now on their own.
- Standards: Some of our foreign students are among our best and some are among our worst. There are hidden, high academic costs, which we should avoid, in working with the inadequate students.
- Accepting transfers: some of the poor students get in this way, avoiding the normal screening.
- Goals of diversity and achieving a cultural mix: be careful not to get involved with quotas. We need a definition of "intercultural education."
- Basis for faculty rewards: beyond our promotion and tenure criteria of good teaching, good research, and service, the new proposal adds complexity. Should international teaching, research, and service be treated differently?
- Resources: we are shifting resources to something; where are we shifting them from?

Discussion among the faculty and appropriate Senate committees must surely take place, Professor Turner told the meeting. Substantial faculty consensus is needed before implementation.

Vice President Keller noted that the report does what the task force was charged to do-- break out the possibilities into a list of particular recommendations. Having that list, we can now assess each of the recommendations.

Vice President Keller said we would like to move rather rapidly, aiming for some consensus on structure and then developing by the end of Spring Quarter a schedule of items to be addressed earlier and later. We would like to make certain decisions before June 30, the date the interim director of OIP has been promised to be relieved.

President Magrath asked that the Consultative Committee coordinate with the Educational Policy Committee and forward their views to him within a month or two.

President Magrath told SCC that if the ISAO were given new responsibilities, they would be under the jurisdiction of the new vice president.

Professor Spring remarked that people are likely to compare the creation of an assistant vice president for international education with the creation, about eighteen months ago, of an assistant vice presidency with two enormous responsibilities, outreach and undergraduate education.

President Magrath responded that there is already an incredible international component to the University, and the University has long had the position of director of the Office of International Programs (which the new assistant vice presidency would replace). Vice President Keller added that his assistant vice president has a number of other administrators to help him; we could not expect one person to do all that job. In terms of the levels of personnel who report to him, John Wallace is like an associate vice president.

Mr. Singer commented on the expense of the undertakings, with \$250,000 quantified so far. He asked if international education should be pushed, and cited frequent use in the report of the word "every." He noted that criticism is implied of coordination which is not happening and should be happening. The report raises other kinds of policy questions, such as that of housing.

The report suggests a lot of broad, bold initiatives, he said, and he asked whether we need those or rather need just to improve upon what we are already doing.

Professor Howe observed that the report is apparently an undifferentiated list of recommendations collected from all the earlier pertinent reports.

Professor Rubenstein alluded to central administration's information to SCC that recommendations from task force reports will be included in the new institutional planning document. He asked about that schedule. President Magrath said the planning document would be a relatively personal and general statement.

The discussion concluded with Professor Spring's observation that this task force did just what the SCC asked them to do: examine the relevant existing reports and set an agenda for people to consider and work on.

(President Magrath left the meeting at this point for Governor Perpich's tour of Microbiology facilities.)

2. Preview of the report of the Andersen Commission on the Future of Post-secondary Education in Minnesota. Guest: Rick Heydinger.

Mr. Heydinger gave SCC members materials including the likely table of contents for the commission's report, a draft of the preamble, and names of the commission members.

Professor Howe explained that SCC has looked at the list of issues the commission was expected to address, and asks about commission progress and how the SCC might be helpful.

Mr. Heydinger summarized the Commission's work over its 9 or 10 month existence. It held hearings aimed at the consumers of postsecondary education

in the state; provosts of the systems made presentations; Professor Howe gave a well-received presentation on behalf of the University faculty. The University has had its hand in the commission's work, but has not taken an active role in testifying. The staff for the commission consists of one representative from each of the postsecondary education systems in the state. Mr. Heydinger is the University's member.

The commission also held hearings in various areas of the state regarding the future of postsecondary education by region.

In addition, Governor Andersen has been a very active chairman and has traveled widely.

The tone of the report, said Mr. Heydinger, will reflect the assumptions of the members. They are champions of postsecondary education and are not of a mind to recommend closing institutions. They understand the short-term and long-term demographics. Out of their own analogous experience, they believe postsecondary education can build its own future.

One can expect to see in their recommendations strong language urging the governing boards of the respective systems to reevaluate continually their own particular deployment of resources.

Professor Spring spoke of his worry about even inuendos because of the recently demonstrated effects of inuendos about changes (i.e., effect on UMM enrollments). Mr. Heydinger said the commission understands the disfunction of offering hypothetical situations and fixed criteria for proposing closings.

Mr. Heydinger then invited editorial suggestions on the two-page preamble.

Mission Statement for Postsecondary Education. It is the commission's operating assumption that every high school graduate has the right to some sort of postsecondary education, which they see as essential preparation for earning a livelihood in our highly technological society. 83% of Minnesota 5th graders graduate from high school-- one of the highest rates in the nation. 55-57% of Minnesota's high school graduates go on to postsecondary education.

SCC members commented on the implications for entrance requirements of increasing the percentage of graduates continuing their education, and Mr. Heydinger reminded the group that the premise includes the full spectrum of postsecondary education, such as the vocational-technical institutions.

Mr. Singer asked if there was not the implication that high schools could take on some of the burden of preparing students to succeed in our complex society, and Mr. Heydinger concurred that there was that implication. There is a lot of talk, he said, about how the responsibility of remediation might be forced back into the high schools.

Professor Spring commended the commission for its awareness of what young people need, but added his contrasting worry about how well the University of Minnesota does in attracting the top two deciles of students graduating from high school.

Professor Rubenstein asked if there had been any discussion of a system like New York state's of tying in the scores on graduating Regents' exams with the awarding of scholarships to state institutions. Mr. Heydinger said there

was not, and in fact no discussion of testing for graduation. Also there is a sense the state no longer has good data on scores of high school seniors since their testing is now voluntary.

A lot of the recommendations, he said, will concern quality and the need to raise quality, and the research and graduate missions.

The commission will endorse the concept of "average cost funding" which means allocating support based on the cost of the instruction.

He referred to the Iowa program which forces pressure on the high schools to offer advanced placement courses; the pay-off for students and parents is the receipt of paid-up vouchers toward tuition in Iowa's higher education.

Mr. Heydinger said he would need SCC's reactions within a week to ten days. Professor Howe said SCC would not have the time nor the mechanism to coordinate a committee position. He encouraged any and all members to write Mr. Heydinger.

3. Assembly and Senate agenda for February 16. Guest: Professor Richard Purple, Chairperson, Business and Rules Committee.

Professor Purple described Business and Rules' conclusion that Mortuary Science students were entitled to elect a senator and since no unit could be found which would incorporate them for that purpose, Business and Rules is bringing a motion to permit them to elect a senator from Mortuary Science per se.

Senate Committee on Social Concerns will bring an affirmative motion on incorporating the Cooperating Fund Drive into the University's payroll deduction charitable giving structure.

Tribute to Deceased Faculty Members. Professor Purple said the Senate agenda and minutes would continue to include the obituaries of deceased UMD faculty members unless the Consultative Committee thought it could cause political difficulty, UMD's bargaining unit faculty having been legally separated from the Senate. The Consultative Committee urged no change in the practice.

Professor Howe reported two questions have been submitted to the President, one regarding internal retrenchment and reallocation for merit-based salary increases, and one regarding the impact of the University's capital requests for athletics facilities upon other University capital needs.

Professor Howe told SCC he has requested reports to the Senate from several major Senate committees, and has talked preliminarily with the chairpersons of the Faculty Affairs, Educational Policy, and Equal Employment Opportunity for Women committees about their describing briefly their work in progress. SCC members applauded this initiative.

Professor Purple distributed the sets of rules for regular University Senate meetings and for the special tenure code meetings of the Faculty Senate.

4. Reports.

A. Student co-chair. Paul Schulte.

(1) Senate Finance Committee membership. Senate bylaws specify at

least one faculty and one student member from coordinate campuses. There is not presently a student representative from another campus. Charles Farrell would be pleased to serve in that capacity and Student SCC nominates him.

Professor Spring told SCC that the intent of that rule had been to provide representation from two coordinate campuses and to reflect the existence of the four non-Twin Cities campuses. Given that there can now be less coordinate campus participation in Senate business because of the separation from the Senate of the bargaining unit faculties at UMD and UMW, the make-up of the Senate Finance Committee might appropriately be reconsidered at the end of this year.

SCC approved the membership of Mr. Farrell for the remainder of the academic year.

Julie Iverson has resigned from the Finance Committee in order to fill a vacated space on the Senate Planning Committee. Student Consultative Committee has named Paul Schulte to replace her on Finance.

(2) All University Honors Committee. Student SCC has recommended to the President the name of Maribeth Fuerstneau to fill the student vacancy on this committee.

(3) Three Twin Cities Student SCC members visited the Morris and Crookston campuses, learned a lot, and lost their parochialism.

(4) Regents Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs is getting a proposal from Vice President Wilderson to lower student base pay rates on the coordinate campuses by 20%.

(5) UMD is expressing concern over differential support for women's intercollegiate athletics as between the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses.

(6) Student Senate. Mr. Singer. SSCC has established an extended subcommittee on the Student Senate. Members Farrell, Richter, Singer, and Traxler are heading up the four sub-areas.

B. There was no report from the SCC Chair.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Rubenstein reported that the Budget Executive's retrenchment list is not finalized so Vice President Keller will, at Professor Rubenstein's request, discuss today with SFC his thoughts on how to arrive at that list. Presumably SFC will get the list at a later meeting.

5. Draft policy statement regarding Senate committees and administrative task forces.

After a brief discussion (the topic had been addressed at several earlier meetings), Professor Fredricks moved the draft statement, minus the parenthetical phrase at the bottom of the first page, be forwarded to the President. Professor Howe volunteered that he would send a covering letter with it. The motion carried unanimously. (The statement is enclosed with these minutes.)

6. The Structure of the Budget Executive. Guest: Vice President Keller.

The SCC and Vice President Keller had jointly scheduled this item particularly because of the current question of what should be the exact relationship to the Budget Executive of the new Vice President for Planning and Academic Support Activities.

Vice President Keller described the evolution of the Budget Executive. The body was needed since the University President does not choose to work with a University provost or an executive vice president. When the Budget Executive was created, the President initially composed it of the Academic Affairs Vice President as chair, and the Health Science and Finance Vice Presidents.

But early on it was said that the Vice President for Institutional Relations should be "functionally involved," and the other two vice presidents began to attend and participate.

Then, as planning became more important, Vice President Hasselmo argued successfully for the official inclusion of the Vice President for Planning and Administration, and he created for himself the job of serving as Budget Executive Staff.

Vice President Keller thought it inappropriate for the planning vice president to do the staff work; when Vice President Hasselmo left, Dr. Keller involved Management Planning and Information Services (MPIS), whose data the Budget Executive needs anyway for its decisions. David Berg of MPIS has now taken over the staff role.

Currently, three vice presidents again constitute the Budget Executive, as originally. All vice presidents attend, which he thinks is as it should be. Vice President Keller chairs. The discussions are collegial. They don't take votes. The system is functioning as its creators intended it to function: it prepares the budget.

Although the structure is informal, the function is effective. Dr. Keller said he feels more comfortable with a smaller official number and an informal, sufficient structure. Virtually all the budget decisions come to the Budget Executive. Their fit with the plan, with programmatic priorities, is the uppermost consideration.

Professor Spring asked with whom any of the administrative units meet when they interface with the Budget Executive. Vice President Keller replied that it is with him. The President meets on a quarterly basis with the deans; Vice President Keller meets with them monthly and invites other vice presidents to join those meetings. Vice President Vanselow always attends, Vice President Lilly usually, and Vice President Wilderson has begun to attend.

The Budget Executive turns down all appeals to meet with it directly.

Professor Howe said there has been a longstanding concern that there be more than one member of the Budget Executive with a clearly academic perspective. Vice President Keller said if it were a vote-taking body he would be receptive to that concern. But, its functioning is what he is concerned about.

Professor Howe referred to the problem of making University-wide decisions and of necessarily bringing judgments to bear. Vice President Keller said the

planning has generated a set of unarguable values out of which we can remind people when they are not thinking in terms of all-University needs.

Vice President Keller noted that President Magrath uses his vice presidents as a cabinet, which increases collegiality by forcing them to be often talking together.

There was a brief discussion on how to increase the University community's awareness of structure and governance matters, such as via articles in Report or portions of the President's letters to the faculty.

Professor Freier reiterated FCC's earlier expressed wish to see the new vice president defined as a member of the Budget Executive, whatever that means, saying the faculty would feel better knowing that if, for whatever reason, Vice President Keller were no longer there, there would remain at least one other member of the Budget Executive perceived as a strong academic type.

University Libraries. Vice President Keller inquired whether SCC had yet addressed the issue of which vice president's office the Libraries should be assigned to. Professor Howe reported he was scheduled to meet on the following day with Professor Chipman, chairperson of the Senate Library Committee.

Vice President Keller said also under consideration is the question of whether space allocation should be in the new office too. He called that a big issue, having to do with power.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

February 16, 1984

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

You will recall that some weeks ago you met with the Senate Consultative Committee to discuss the use of special administratively appointed task forces and their relationship to the Senate governance structure. At that meeting, we acknowledged the great service provided during recent months by a number of such task forces, but also expressed our concern over the implications for Senate governance of their repeated use. We have now formalized those concerns in the attached Policy Statement, approved by the SCC on February 2, and we're sending it to you for information. If you wish to talk further about it or related matters, we'd of course be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'JH', written over a circular scribble.

John Howe, Chairperson,
Senate Consultative Committee

JH:mp

Enc.

2/2/84

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING
ADMINISTRATIVE TASK FORCES AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The University Senate Consultative Committee recognizes the special virtues of administratively-appointed task forces. They can focus their attention on a single task, can be asked to report within a limited time, and their membership can be tailored to the specific project at hand. Several such task forces have produced important reports in recent months, and others are pending.

At the same time, the increasingly frequent use of administrative task forces raises serious questions about the responsibilities of Senate committees and about the relationship between Central Administration and the Senate in University governance. At times the membership of and charge to such task forces have been set without sufficient faculty consultation. When such task forces have reported, it has often not been clear how Senate committees should deal with task force recommendations. There has seldom been communication between the task forces and Senate committees concerned with related issues.

The Senate Consultative Committee recognizes that there are good and valid reasons for the selective use of administrative task forces, just as there are reasons for Senate committees to work exclusively on many of the issues that fall within their domain.

The SCC, however, also wishes to emphasize that when considering the creation of a special task force, the administration should consult with the SCC concerning the charge and membership of the proposed task force, its relationship to existing Senate committees, and the possibility of using

instead a special subcommittee of the Senate as provided for in Article IV.5 of the Senate constitution. Such subcommittees are better able to bring the perspectives of the Senate governance system to bear upon issues and to integrate policy recommendations into the Senate structure.

When an administrative task force is deemed preferable, it should have overlapping membership with appropriate Senate committees.

The reports of such task forces should be transmitted to the SCC and other appropriate Senate committees shortly following their completion. Information concerning the creation of task forces, and projected action on task force recommendations should be presented to the University Senate.

Approved by Senate Consultative Committee

February 2, 1984



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate
Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

November 21, 1983

To: SCC

From: John Howe

Re: Memo concerning a possible Senate policy on Administrative
Task Forces and the Senate Committee Structure

At the Fall Quarter meeting of the Facilitative Committee, there was extended discussion of the implications for the University Senate and its committees of the frequent use of administratively-appointed task forces. That group recognized the special virtues of such task forces: 1) they can focus on a single task and be expected to report within a limited time, and 2) their membership can be tailored to the specific project at hand. At the same time, members of the Facilitative Committee emphasized that such task forces have not always been properly tied into the Senate committee structure and that their repeated use raises questions about the relationship between central administration and the Senate in University governance.

In light of that conversation, we need to consider this question once again and determine whether we think it desirable to formulate a policy proposal for Senate consideration. Among the specific questions to be considered are the following:

- a) Should major task forces be jointly appointed by the administration and the Senate?
- b) Should task force membership overlap with appropriate Senate committees?
- c) Should such task forces report directly to the Senate as well as to the administration?
- d) Should appropriate Senate committees report to the Senate on the substance and implications of task force reports, including recommendations for Senate action?
- e) Should each task force report contain provision for following up on the implementation of task force reports?

SOME BACKGROUND DOCUMENTATION ON THE QUESTION OF THE USE OF TASK FORCES VS. THE SENATE STRUCTURE

- A. From the Report of the Select Committee on Planning, Decision-Making and Consultation (the Watson Committee), January, 1979

Section C. Consultation, part 3, Recommendations, item iii:

"While not recommending any specific restructuring of the Senate, it does endorse the idea that the Senate should be called upon to examine itself and make its structure and procedure more effective. In particular it should consider reducing the number of standing committees and using short term task forces for specific projects.

- B. From the Report of the Senate Consultative Committee's Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization (a Response to the Watson Report), May 15, 1980, Recommendation 4 of the 26 recommendations unanimously approved by the Senate on that date:

Recommendation 4. Expanded Subcommittees. The Subcommittee recommends that the Handbook be revised to include a section on "Expanded Subcommittees" which would address the question of how the Senate governance system responds to problems and issues of some moment which often come up on short notice and demand quick but careful action. In the past, such problems have been handled in two different ways. They were given to already over-burdened standing committees with the result, on occasion, that action was delayed. Moreover, standing committees often lack required expertise on such matters. The second way of handling such problems (and the way recommended by the Watson Report) has been to create a task force which would have the expertise and which could focus its full attention on that particular problem. The difficulty with task forces, on occasion, has been that they do not always bring to bear upon problems the perspectives of the Senate governance system; their reports emerge full blown without consultation with the larger view provided by the Senate governance system; and some difficulty or delay is regularly encountered in re-integrating their recommendations into the Senate governance system. In other words, the Subcommittee believes that task forces frequently operate at cross-purposes with the objective of improved consultation, coordination, and communication. Accordingly, the Subcommittee recommends that standing committees in whose purview such issues fall should be directed to establish a subcommittee with some overlapping membership from the



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

January 23, 1984

Professor John Howe, Chairman
All-University Senate Consultative Committee
c/o Department of History
614 Social Sciences
West Bank Campus

Dear John:

As I indicated to you on the telephone on Friday, the first draft of the Andersen Commission Report does not appear to deal with a number of issues of particular importance to the University of Minnesota. Since these issues seem important in distinguishing the needs of the University from those of the other systems of higher education, I have called them to the attention of the commission staff through Rick Heydinger. In brief, the areas are the following:

1. Graduate education.
2. Research and its support.
3. Various kinds of outreach.
4. Various resource development needs affecting the four systems differently:
 - a. Equipment--including computers.
 - b. Library collections.
 - c. Travel to professional meetings for scholarly exchange.
5. Graduate student financial aid.

I believe that Rick has raised these questions with the staff and we may reasonably expect the final report will deal with them in some way.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

KHK:trc



date January 12 19 84

to Senate Consultative Committee

from John Howe

The marks in the margin of Rick Heydinger's Memo indicate the areas of possible recommendation that he thinks the commission might most like to hear from us about. Let me suggest that we take those items as an initial agenda for our discussion. In several instances, Rick offered a few additional observations about the items. I'll report on those comments as we move along.



**GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION
ON THE FUTURE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
IN MINNESOTA**

The Commission is in the final stages of preparing its recommendations. Although a number of issues remain to be resolved, most likely the Commission will speak to the following specific areas:

I. Mission Statement for Postsecondary Education

- Quality
- Access
- Diversity

II. Recommendations

A. Students and Their Support

1. High school achievement
2. Participation in postsecondary education
3. Graduate students
4. Tuition structure and tuition planning
5. State grant and scholarship program
6. Academic skill development

B. Support and Differentiation of Educational Programs

1. Differentiation of institutional mission
2. Unique needs of research and graduate education
3. Instructional technologies
4. Marketing postsecondary education
5. Recruiting faculty and administrative staff

C. Organization and Offerings of Postsecondary Education

1. Closure, merger, and reorganization
2. Regional cooperation and planning
3. New programs *eg. Rochester*
4. Projecting program demand

D. Governance and Funding

1. Higher Education Coordinating Board
2. Average cost funding
3. System governance
4. Revenue enhancing mechanisms

Strong Support
- System autonomy
- Avg. cost funding
- of aid sch. program

January 16, 1984

MINNESOTA: A STATE DEDICATED TO LIFELONG LEARNING

We, the citizens of Minnesota, recognize that the success of our communities, our state, our nation, our world, and ultimately ourselves is in large measure determined by our commitment to lifelong learning. This commitment is demonstrated by our personal participation in all types of education and our willingness to bear the fiscal responsibility for supporting the educational enterprise.

Our pioneering ancestors who settled this region demonstrated the importance they assigned to education by setting aside both public and private resources to establish schools, colleges, and universities. Today Minnesota has high quality elementary and secondary schools, regionally accessible undergraduate colleges, and nationally recognized graduate and research programs. As a result, many Minnesota citizens possess advanced vocational skills, mature judgment, competence in communication, an understanding of science and technology, and an appreciation of the humanities. In the absence of other unique resources, commitment to education has given the state a competitive edge which has served us well over the past century. Because of this investment in learning, Minnesotans can proudly say:

No matter how poor the child is born; no matter how lofty the aspirations of that child; it is still education that holds out the possibility that these aspirations may be accomplished in a lifetime.

Today we face a society characterized by accelerating change, economic challenges, and shifting values. Now, more than ever, individual's opportunities for leading fulfilling lives are determined not only by the level of formal education which they receive but also their commitment to lifelong learning. Thus today, we the citizens of Minnesota, renew our commitment to both private and public education as the cornerstone for the development of our people, our organizations, and our society.

We the citizens of Minnesota are committed to a comprehensive system of proprietary schools, area vocational technical institutes, colleges and universities built on the principles of quality, access, and diversity.

Quality is an essential element of education. Minnesota is committed to making the strategic choices necessary to have high quality faculty, well prepared students, top level administrators, and effective curricular programs which will ensure the state's recognition as a world leader in educational excellence.

Access is essential to ensure that all individuals have the opportunity to develop their talents. Minnesota is committed to minimizing the barriers to enrollment, providing regional access to postsecondary education, offering financial aid in support of educational choice, supporting continuing professional training, and encouraging all citizens to participate in education throughout their lives.

Diversity undergirds our democracy and ensures the continual development of our state. Minnesota guarantees this essential characteristic through a comprehensive set of private and public educational programs, and through active programs to recruit a broad mix of faculty and students. Diversity is further maintained by our strong commitment to academic freedom which creates an atmosphere where questioning is encouraged and free minds may be allowed to test the validity of each idea.

* * * *

Minnesota's commitment to lifelong learning can be met only if the responsibility for promoting, organizing, funding, and evaluating education is shared by educators, private organizations, students and citizens in partnership with the State. Therefore:

We, the educators, will continue to offer programs which both educate people for the complexities of life in an advanced society and offer the training necessary to lead an economically productive life.

We, the educators, will continue to meet the needs of business, industry, services, and government for advanced training, new knowledge, and the development of able leaders.

We, the private organizations, recognize the instrumental role we must play in the continuing development of our schools, colleges, and universities.

We, the students, accept the responsibility for meeting a fair share of our own educational costs as an investment in our own futures.

We, the citizens of Minnesota, conclude that the best way to ensure our fundamental needs of security, health, economic well-being, peace, and the pursuit of happiness is a high quality, accessible, diverse system of educational programs.

Having made this commitment to the essential value of education, we require from all systems of education the wise deployment of human and financial resources and the continued application of new technologies in support of the learning process. We require students and faculty to commit themselves to their highest quality performance, recognizing that "excellence" is the most important ingredient of an effective education.

In a world characterized by ever-changing opportunities, lifelong learning offers the best guarantee that Minnesota will continue to develop and thrive as a wholesome environment for future generations.

With pride, we, the constitutional officers and legislators of the State of Minnesota, pledge to pursue and uphold the state's commitment to lifelong learning through postsecondary education of the highest quality.

**GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION
ON THE FUTURE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
IN MINNESOTA**

Elmer L. Andersen, Chair	former Board of Regents and former Governor
Atherton Bean	retired former chair of International Multi-Foods
Cy Carpenter	President of Minnesota Farmer's Union
Nadine Chase	official from the Leech Lake Indian Reservation
Dr. J. P. Grahec	retired, Mayor of Ely
Josephine Nunn	Mayor of Champlain, member of Metro Council
Earl Olsen	Chairman of the Board of Jeannie-O Foods
Robert Sharen	retired Chief Justice, Minnesota Supreme Court
Neil Sherburne	former Board of Regents; retired; 30 years in trade union movement; 23 years in AFL-CIO
Nadine Sugden	homemaker; Mankato State University; Mankato Red Cross and other church and community projects
Willie Mae Wilson	Executive Director of the St. Paul Urban League

JOHN HOWE

Eric SCC
12-15



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

December 2, 1983

TO: C. Peter Magrath, President
Kenneth H. Keller, Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Richard B. Heydinger
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

This was handed out at the most recent meeting of the Andersen Commission. It summarizes the areas on which the Commission will make recommendations. The document purposely avoids indicating on which side of an issue the Commission will come down. If you have suggested additions to this list or concerns, please let me know.

:alp

Enclosure

POSSIBLE AREAS OF RECOMMENDATION

November 15, 1983

Listed below is a FIRST DRAFT of the areas which the Commission may want to highlight in its final report. This list was developed by reviewing the testimony taken at hearings, cataloging the discussion at Commission meetings, and recording issues which have been mentioned during meetings of individual Commission members with interested parties around the State.

This list is intended for discussion purposes only. Because it is an inventory, different items in the list do not carry the same weight. Also, and most importantly, this list has not been endorsed by the Commission in any way. Undoubtedly this list will undergo substantial revision with items being deleted, added, and reorganized.

The descriptions of each item are not intended to imply a recommendation. Instead they are offered to ensure that the same issues are included under each rubric.

A. STUDENTS AND THEIR SUPPORT

1. Participation in Post-Secondary Education

*Ed. District to
prepare this summary*

The number and proportions of various segments of the population which enroll in some form of post high school education. This is not limited to considerations of only recent high school graduates but encompasses all potential post-secondary students regardless of age and previous educational experience (e.g., the recurrent learner).

2. Retaining Resident Students and Recruiting Non-Resident Students

*EC wants
to accomplish this*

The number of residents who leave the State for their post-secondary education. The number and proportion of students which post-secondary education should seek to attract who are not currently official residents of Minnesota. Item includes differentiation by program type.

3. Tuition Rates and Tuition Planning

*to
the
state*

The proportion of costs which are passed on to the student in the form of tuition and other fees. Questions regarding adequate lead times for personal financial planning by students will be addressed here. Also included will be issues regarding tuition reciprocity.

4. State Financial Aid Program

The adequacy of the level of funding and the administration of the state scholarship, grant, and loan programs.

5. Academic Skill Development and Responsibility

The level of skill development expected for persons enrolling in post-secondary education. The wide variety of post-secondary programs naturally leads to different levels of required skills. This item includes an examination of the placement of responsibility for skill development (e.g., Should it be with the student, the most recent program of graduation, or the program of current enrollment?). Included with this item is the articulation of responsibilities between the high schools and all forms of post-secondary education.

B. OPERATIONAL ISSUES FOR POST-SECONDARY PROGRAMS

6. Differentiation of Educational Offerings

The distinction which some institutions make between day and evening classes as well as other delivery and time distinctions. Included is the difference between credit and non-credit courses, degree and non-degree programs, and regular and adjunct faculty.

7. Marketing Post-Secondary Education

The wide variety of public relations programs which may be loosely termed the "marketing" of education. This not only encompasses student recruiting but other programs aimed at building awareness of the resources of post-secondary education and efforts to speak to the needs of economic development.

8. Instructional Technology

The wide variety of instructional technologies ranging from but not limited to telecommunications, computing, video, etc.

9. Recruiting Faculty and Administrative Staff

Includes the current organization, salary scales, and personnel policies in place for faculty and staff as well as an examination of the marketplace for these essential human resources.

10. Measuring Educational Outcomes

The assessment of the quality of the "products" of the educational system (e.g., students graduating). Includes the broad set of indicators which might be used to assess the effectiveness of the variety of educational programs offered in Minnesota.

C. GEOGRAPHY OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

11. Closure, Merger and Reorganization

The "spread" of post-secondary resources across the State and appropriateness of this spread in light of available resources and projected need for educational programs. Includes but is not limited to proposals for developing a four-year program in Rochester, realigning UM-Duluth, and cooperative planning in Southwest Minnesota.

D. GOVERNANCE, PLANNING AND FUNDING - THE STATE PERSPECTIVE

12. Authority of System Governing Boards

The autonomy and authority of system governance including recent legislation to place responsibility for campus futures with each board. Encompasses the formation of the AVTI Board and its future.

13. Higher Education Coordinating Board

The roles which the Coordinating Board plays in the development of Minnesota post-secondary education. Includes the relationship with other state agencies, the higher education systems, and the consumers of education (i.e., students).

14. Strategic Planning

Planning conducted within each system.

15. Regional Planning

The examination and articulation of educational resources in pre-defined regions within the State. Includes possible arrangement of post-secondary education into planning regions which would span existing system boundaries.

16. Cooperation and Articulation of Resources

Examines existing cooperative efforts of all types; closely related to 15 above but focuses more broadly on all forms of cooperation, not simply regional possibilities.

17. Uses of Forecasting and Data Bases in Policy Development

The existing and potential uses for sophisticated data collection efforts, forecasting, and modeling as an aid in the development of statewide educational policy. Compares the current state-of-the-art with developments in Minnesota, both at the state and system level. Includes but is not limited to the pros and cons of enrollment projection methodologies and the development of data bases necessary for a statistical overview of post-secondary education.

18. Average Cost Funding

The recently enacted policy for funding the instructional portion of public post-secondary budgets.

19. Revenue Enhancing Possibilities

Possible alternatives for funding post-secondary education. Includes options for increasing revenues available to the State as well as new financial incentives made available to institutions.

20. Future Program Demand

The availability of information which permits the effective planning of educational programs based on the projected demand for these programs. Includes the need for information on economic development and future job openings.