



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
411 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Tel. (612)376-2479

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

February 20, 1986
Regents' Room, Morrill Hall
12:05 - 2:00

AGENDA

Approx. time

- 12:05 1. Minutes of January 16 (distributed previously).
2. Reports:
- A. Senate Finance Committee. Prof. Merwin;
 - B. Governance Committee. Ms. Hanson;
 - C. C_tF Coordinating Committee. Prof. Berscheid;
 - D. Student SCC Chair. Mr. Pratt;
 - E. SCC Chair. Prof. Stuthman.
- 12:20 3. Self-Study Report (Enclosed to members: draft of executive summary). Professor Rubenstein.
- 12:35 4. Senate and Assembly agenda for February: Motions to make campus student body presidents ex officio members. Mr. Pratt.
- 12:45 5. Discussion with President Keller.
- A. University television publicity at athletic event half-times: presentation by Associate Vice President George Robb.
 - B. The University's identity/logo project: Mr. Robb.
 - C. Outline of charge to and composition of task force on the athletics program.
 - D. Allocation of unbudgeted surpluses from University operations such as the bookstores.
- 1:00

(Note: C_tF forum follows at 2:15 in 25 Law.)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone: (612)376-2479

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

February 20, 1986
12:05 - 2:10
Regents' Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Ellen Berscheid, Patrick Durbin, Patricia Gearrick, Richard Goldstein, Sue Gruenes, Linda Hanson, Ronald Kubik, Jack Merwin, Tim Pratt, Irwin Rubenstein, Roy St. Laurent, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Bruce Williamson.

Guests: Scott Elton, President Kenneth Keller, Sue Klemond (Daily), Mary Jane Plunkett, Wanda Reinke (member-elect from UMW), George Robb, Maureen Smith.

1. Minutes of January 16: Correction reported to page 6, item 4.D.(1): "Jeff Moser has resigned as Student Senate chair... Vice chair Jill Gaudette becomes the new chair."

2. Reports.

A. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Merwin. Because of a scheduling mishap, a portion of the SFC met on February 5 with President Keller and the full SFC met at the usual time on February 6 with Richard Heydinger. The retrenchment plan was discussed both days and in addition on the 5th the Twin Cities Libraries' acquisitions budget issue was addressed. An understanding was reached which left the Library Committee willing to withdraw, at least temporarily, its resolution to the Senate.

On March 6 the Finance Committee expects to discuss the structure of grant overhead charges, the faculty salary improvement schedule, and the financing of interdisciplinary programs.

B. Governance Committee. Ms. Hanson. The committee has met twice since last reporting on January 16. Committee is considering:

- governance bodies' rules and meeting schedules;
- communication among governance bodies;
- how the University community uses the governance structure it has.

Committee has written to coordinate campus senators regarding whether they would wish to attend Senate meetings in person. Mr. Williams voiced his support for bringing coordinate campus senators, at least occasionally, to

the site of University Senate meetings. Professor Rubenstein suggested thought might be given, if it has not yet been, to upgrading the nature of the hook-ups to the coordinate campuses, such as by using closed circuit television.

Mr. St. Laurent reported that Professor John Turner had spoken to the committee on the role of the Faculty Senate. He had noted that the Faculty Consultative Committee has the authority to call more frequent meetings of the Faculty Senate and use it for those faculty purposes Professors Swan and Turner had in mind when they proposed removing most student membership from the University Senate. Mr. St. Laurent said that the student members of the Governance Committee felt such increased activity by the Faculty Senate would be appropriate.

C. Commitment to Focus Coordinating Committee. Professor Berscheid. The committee was to meet next on the following day (February 21) to discuss the report from the Special Committee on Preparation Standards and to receive the UMD response to CtF proposals. At its last meeting the committee had considered the responses from Continuing Education and Extension and the Morris Campus. CtF had suggested Morris institute a core curriculum, but the origins and reasons for this proposal appeared unclear to the Coordinating Committee. At the previous meeting the committee had considered the response from the Dental School regarding ending the dental hygiene program; the School's initial proposal was to replace the certificate program with a baccalaureate program; the question is not yet resolved.

D. Student SCC. Mr. Pratt announced that he is resigning as chair of the SSCC as of the end of Winter Quarter to run for the student body presidency. Mr. St. Laurent will become SSCC chair and Mr. Pratt will become vice chair.

E. SCC Chair. Professor Stuthman. Search process for Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The SCC chair wrote to President Keller the Consultative Committee's recommendation that SCC interview the final candidates and that a second group, consisting of the chairs of the Senate committees and of the standing committees of the Senate also conduct interviews. President Keller had then suggested that instead the Faculty Consultative Committee and the committee chairs meet as one group to interview, and that the Student SCC meet to interview as a second group.

Student SCC members requested that other student leaders (such as the Twin Cities Campus student body president) join them for the interviews. The faculty members found this an agreeable suggestion.

Professor Stuthman said files containing the curriculum vitae of each candidate would be made available to all interviewers in the hour preceding each interview.

Professor Stuthman has been named to serve on the Athletics Programs Task Force. He invites and encourages suggestions and comments to him from the SCC members.

F. Self-Study Committee. Professor Rubenstein called attention to the draft of the report's executive summary, already sent to SCC members, and said senators would receive copies in the Senate and Assembly meeting that afternoon.

On March 3 an officer from the North Central Association is scheduled to meet with the Self-Study Committee and with President Keller regarding the organization of the April site visit. Professor Rubenstein invited the SCC's suggestions on the executive summary, especially on the issues identified for attention.

Professor Sorauf called attention to the report's figures that one-third of the University's faculty received their Ph.D.'s from Minnesota and that 50% of the graduate students are Minnesotans, and said the statistics show we are not the national university we think we are. Recently publicized figures of a low graduate rate should add to our concern, he said.

Several members said a great deal more information is needed regarding graduation rates. Not enough is known now to interpret the few figures published.

Professor Merwin voiced the hope that the self-study of the University's planning process really digs into the problems of that process and how it can be improved, and addresses the question of how to monitor implementation after plans are laid down.

4. Senate and Assembly agenda for the February 20 meetings: Motion to make the student body presidents ex officio members of the Senate.

Mr. Pratt introduced the motion to the SCC; he stressed that as legitimate elected student body leaders these people should be able to speak in the Senate to represent student interests.

Mr. Pratt moved that the Consultative Committee endorse the motion. His motion carried unanimously.

5. University Relations. Guests: George Robb, Associate Vice President for Institutional Relations, and Scott Elton, University Relations public relations representative.

A. Broadcasting of University videotapes during halftime spots of televised games.

Mr. Robb gave committee members a sheet of background information on the halftime television spots. He noted that the University as an institution has no regular budget for television use. What University Relations does is nearly always on soft money. Some units raise or budget some funds for their own use. The University as a whole tries to pull material from existing tapes of "Matrix" and those of the Orientation Office.

Mr. Scott played for SCC the 60-second and the 30-second versions of the five tapes used during the University's nationally televised football and basketball games. Mr. Robb said that in choosing the concepts to communicate, the staff had relied largely on Commitment to Focus and the capital campaign case statement. Additional tapes are in the planning stage for next year's football and basketball seasons. Some of the existing tapes will be broadcast in local programming as public-service announcements.

Professor Merwin asked whether the tapes are aimed at any particular audience or purpose such as recruiting. Mr. Robb said the audience has not been specified. The tapes have been aimed at a national audience knowing that Gopher fans were likely to be tuned in. In his view the University needs to spend some money in this area and explore the possibilities of television.

B. The University Communications Committee. Mr. Robb distributed copies of the UCC's Assignments and Progress Report, dated January 15, 1986. The committee is new. He called the size workable (14 members) and said the members are people who can represent the University and who have some influence in the administration. The first part of the committee's charge is to "Advise the University administration on communication planning, policies, and programs." Mr. Robb said he would be glad to keep in touch with SCC about the work of this committee.

Professor Stuthman inquired whether thought is being given as to how the University might use cable television. Mr. Robb said that is being given a lot of thought. The problem, he said, is getting access with good quality programming. The University will have some pilots ready in about a month. He noted that two cable channels are showing "Campus Close-Up," a series of half-hour interviews; the interviewer is from the Minnesota Extension Service.

Professor Merwin asked if recruiters can carry videotapes with them. Mr. Robb said one is being produced through John Wallace's office. However, he added, there is scant evidence of success from these, at least as a school library resource.

Professor Rubenstein asked if it were beyond question to hire a professional firm to create tapes for the University. Mr. Robb commented that considerable talent is available in the Twin Cities and within the University. In the first tape-making, he said, the production firm is donating a considerable part of its services. In response to another question he said the Carlson Companies public relations branch has made one tape for the University to use in connection with the capital campaign.

C. The University's identity and logo project. Mr. Robb observed at the outset that the timing on this expenditure was unfortunate; the project was planned before the state called for retrenchments. In the long run, however, he estimated it would save more money than it costs.

One example of the need for improvement is in unit newsletters whose quality of content and design varies tremendously. Mr. Robb circulated two books displaying a variety of institutional design samples (letterhead, signage, etc). The project underway deals with the U's whole visual system of communication including, for example, the logo, the U's "signature," and the use of the seal. A project goal is to achieve something which can be enforced throughout the University.

Professor Sorauf said the SCC would like assurances it would be consulted, not merely briefed, before a new logo is chosen.

Professor Berscheid inquired who had determined there was something wrong with the old logo and on what basis. She was critical of the expenditure, which she calculated would be well over \$100,000, and inquired whether the project is being reconsidered now that the University faces steep retrenchment.

Mr. Robb identified several problems with the old logo: ten to twenty percent of the time the logo is used off campus it is inverted; it photocopies badly; it doesn't stand very well by itself. He said there would be some implementation cost, but implied it would not be greatly in excess of what would be needed to restock normal supplies, particularly stationery. A new design will be phased in. University Relations assumes people will first use up their current supply. He said there would be decentralized savings: all units would start with the communications manual and all would save on design costs.

There will be new signs, especially to identify campus entrances. One sign will go on the West Bank bridgehead to inform people they are entering the University of Minnesota campus.

President Keller, who had joined the meeting in the course of this discussion, said he thought the University suffered from not having University identity attached to each of its individual programs, and also from the inhospitability of the first on-campus roadsigns a visitor sees, which are typically parking prohibitions.

DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

6. Task Force on Athletics Programs.

President Keller distributed copies of the February 14 charge letter which shows the task force membership. He has stated in the letter what he regards as the purposes of intercollegiate athletics. He said he does regard the revenue-producing sports as entertainment, which is a legitimate enterprise if it does not conflict with athletes' personal development. The University's bargain with its athletes exists only when the program serves the purposes both of promoting the personal and physical development of student-athletes and of providing them with an education. When the larger educational purposes of the University lose out, the bargain no longer holds.

The task force is to start from this premise. He has directed the task force at operational issues. It is to report back to the president by May 15 setting forth an agenda for the coming years and giving the president some idea of what proposals to take to the Council of Ten (the presidents of the Big Ten).

The work of the task force is aimed at accomplishing a goal. It is not appropriate, he said, for the president now to remain deeply involved in the day-to-day operations of the athletics departments.

Asked if the task force report would be public, President Keller said it would be and that its meetings would be open except insofar as personnel were discussed.

SCC members and the president welcomed the resolution submitted by a senator for the day's Senate meeting, which affirms support for public statements made by President Keller following the January arrest of three U of M basketball players in Madison, Wisconsin. All agreed it would be advisable to arrange with the author to refer in the motion to the press conference comments generally rather than attempt a single sentence summary.

Ms. Gearrick asked whether the report of the task force would affect selection of a new head basketball coach. The president indicated there would not be a direct effect because that selection will probably be made before the final report of the task force is ready.

7. Allocation of unbudgeted surpluses from University operations.

President Keller asked for the SCC's guidance on this subject. The ensuing discussion revealed fundamentally different approaches to the question on the part of the president and on the part of committee members.

The bookstores and campus parking are the most prominent of the enterprises and there are several other small operations. President Keller noted that the Bookstores Advisory Committee has the responsibility to advise on how to use the surpluses which inevitably result when an operation is required to avoid a deficit. But the decisions on use of the profits do not necessarily reflect all-University priorities. It is his thinking that the disposition should pass through an all-University clearinghouse. While the surpluses may be being spent for good purposes they are not necessarily the best purposes to which the funds could be put.

The bookstores have generated far and away the largest surpluses. President Keller reminded SCC that the deep discount policy instituted last year for the purchase of computers had generated large sales and consequently a sizable profit. But, it is relevant that central administration funded the bookstores' information and training sessions on software.

Professor Goldstein asked if there was any reason the University's bookstores do not give a faculty and student discount. President Keller said he could not give an exact answer, but that the bookstores are not trying to make a profit. Having a little margin does enable the store to stock items on which it will not make any money.

Professor Sorauf defined the question as one of a user charge for service, and said the general principle should prevail here, which is that when one overcharges a customer, one returns the excess to the customer. That return could be directly in the form of dividends or future discounts, or indirectly in improved services (e.g., an up-to-date inventorying system or a more extensive book stock).

President Keller mentioned that one plan the administration is considering is to cut the profit margin from 2% to 1% and use that 1%, after consultation, for flexible purposes.

Mr. St. Laurent voiced his agreement that, given the large expense to students for their books, the most appropriate place to return profits was to the purchasers.

President Keller asked whether there should not at least be a decision centrally and consultatively on how to use the dollars generated--whether back out through the generating system or elsewhere in the University--a decision which should be based on the question of where the funds might be of the most value to students and faculty.

SCC
2/20/86
page 7

Professor Goldstein stated that bookstores and parking are more expensive at this University than at most other universities. He said it would be mistaken and improper to put profits into central funds. Professor Berscheid seconded this view. She said profits put into central funds would constitute a cruel tax and that books and parking, being necessities, should not be taxed.

On this note, the meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

411 Borlaug Hall

1991 Buford Circle

St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Tel. (612)376-2479

February 13, 1986

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Subject: Agenda for February 20 SCC
discussions with you

Dear Ken:

I am writing on behalf of Deon Stuthman, who is out of town until the 14th. The Senate Consultative Committee is glad for the opportunity to hear about and discuss with you several important questions in the February 20 meeting. Because of the Senate C&F forum at 2:15, we have arranged to move up your time with SCC to 12:45 to 2:00.

The topics Rick Heydinger forwarded to us largely overlap what we too wanted on the agenda. Here, as I understand it, is what we will try to cover (the order can be rearranged):

- Task force on the athletics program;
- George Robb's presentation of the videotapes broadcast during half times of our athletic contests;
- George Robb's presentation on the University's identity/logo project;
- Allocation of unbudgeted surpluses from University operations such as the bookstores.

Because of the length of this list for the time available, we've proposed shifting the legislative update to the FCC session in the morning, and we hope the student members will be able to sit in on that. We look forward to having in both sessions a good interchange which will be based on up-to-date information.

Cordially,

Irwin Rubenstein, Associate Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

IR:mbp
c: Richard Heydinger
SCC

Encl.: SCC agenda

UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Assignments and Progress Report

January 15, 1986

Membership

Jim Berge

Rick Heydinger and Jerry Kline President's Office
 Kathie Price and John Wallace Academic Affairs
 Brian Gorman and Steve Roszell Finance and Operations
 Sally Howard Health Sciences
 Shirley Hunt and Dick Holloway Agriculture, Forestry, & Home Economics
 Paul Blake Student Affairs
 Barbara Muesing Board of Regents Office
 Bonita Sindelir University Attorney
 Tom Yuzer Coordinate Campuses
 George Robb (Chairman) Institutional Relations

Committee Charge

Advise the University administration on communication planning, policies, and programs.

For institutional communications, develop a comprehensive plan for internal and external publications, broadcast materials, and face-to-face events. Communication plans should be consistent with, and supportive of, institutional program plans.

For campus, collegiate, departmental, and program communications, provide the planning, policies, and professional assistance that is needed to improve quality, cost-effectiveness, and consistency with institutional communications.

Current Assignments

Television: Advise the President on FY86 funding of "Matrix." The committee reluctantly advised against continuing the program. While consistently a high quality program, it has not been able to develop the audience it deserves. The committee concluded that there are better investments for our limited budgets at this time.

Produce half-time spots for televised athletic events and public service announcements to make available to the TV networks and stations. Ten half-time spots have been completed for the basketball season. Five are 60-second spots, introduced and narrated by President Keller, that may be used with locally broadcast games. Five are 30-second variations that will be used by the national network carrying Minnesota games. Other spots and PSAs are being planned.

Develop new plans for television programming, including broadcast, cable, and videotape distribution. Media Resources staff have presented several ideas that are being considered by the committee.

Communications Planning Document: Considerable work has been done within University Relations over the past few years, but current planning documents are not as comprehensive as the committee's new charge. In a nutshell, our planning activities are far superior to our planning documents, but the documents should catch up within a few months.

Visual Identity Project: The committee published a request for proposals for the development of a comprehensive visual identity program. This will include researching and developing an institution-wide "identity mark" (logo, signature, or whatever), a complete and sensible set of rules and guidelines for its use, and assistance in implementing the system and training the staff. A design firm has been selected, a contract is being prepared, and the project will be publicly announced January 22.

Communications Manual: Developed as a definitive and comprehensive collection of policies, guidelines, information on production services and prices, helpful advice, and "everything else a new communications staffer ought to be able to find, but currently cannot," this manual is in final draft stage, but it will not be published until it can be combined with the Visual Identity Manual and the revised University Style Manual.

Review of Special Events: Staff work started immediately, reviewing such events as the State Fair exhibit, the tour program, commencement ceremonies, building dedications, and other kinds of events. The inauguration produced something of an intermission, and staff work on this review has now resumed.

KUOM: The committee has no specific assignment yet. Considerable study of KUOM has been completed by others, program changes have been made, and application has been made for an expanded FCC license. It seems likely that the committee will be asked to advise on future steps.

Advertising: Graphic design aspects will be covered in the visual identity project, but the committee will also be reviewing policies and strategies for advertising by the University, as well as policies on advertising on campus and in University communications by outside sponsors. In the policy area, we have a rich folklore, with much less in writing than most would assume.

Fund Raising: The committee is coordinating the development of communications to raise matching funds for the Permanent University Fund. This involves the full range of publications, news, advertising, and events at the institutional, campus, and collegiate levels.

Professional Development: This is really part of the communications plan, but the committee is discussing the need for staff development and finding better ways to help people whose communications assignments don't match their skills and aptitudes.

University Production Services: For the whole range of communication activities, the University has a variety of internal production units. We are also located in a community that is particularly rich in commercial services. The competitive relationships among our own facilities, as well as those between our units and the commercial services, will be fully reviewed by the committee.

Faculty/Staff Information Bulletins: These biennial bulletins were dropped in the budget cutting process. Since then, we have relied on occasional publication of specific information and policies by many different offices as needs arise.

As a result, we have no organized material to give to new faculty and staff, we have no up-dated reference source for current employees, and we have occasional problems with documents that are difficult to understand because the sources of this information do not have communications staff who can "translate" complex information for those who don't specialize in the areas involved. Separate bulletins for faculty and civil service staff are under development, with the University Relations staff on all campuses working out appropriate ways to produce system-wide and campus-specific materials that can be up-dated regularly at minimum expense.

Meeting Schedule and Publicity: The committee meets once a month. The first five meetings have involved a good deal of organizational work, plus several assignments that required immediate attention and resolution. During this time, the committee has also been developing as full a list as possible of the University staff most directly involved in communications, and there will be a regular mechanism for keeping that group informed of the committee's work and making use of their skills and insights.

Postscript: Any observer of current communications from and within the University can find problems needing solutions; that should not cloud the fact that the University already benefits from some extraordinarily good communication produced by highly talented folks. A major part of the committee's assignment is to provide the central guidance and help good staff deserve -- and then get out of their way.

February 20, 1986

BACKGROUND INFORMATION -- HALFTIME TELEVISION SPOTS

1. Historically, the U of M has usually not had a regular budget for the production of halftime spots. In most years, spots have been developed from available footage, usually from "Matrix," at costs ranging from \$300 to \$800 per spot. Many have also been used as public service announcements.
2. For the 1986 season, we were asked by the Lorimar Sports Network for five 30-second spots for the nationally televised games. The Big Ten Conference subsequently informed us that these should be 60-second spots, and that is what Media Resources produced. Just when these were to be delivered, the order changed back to 30-second spots.
3. We already had the 60-second versions done. These were edited down to the 30-second variety at the last minute, so we now have five of each. The longer versions are clearly preferable.
4. Source material came from "Matrix" and a set of videotapes produced for the Orientation Office. For the most part, the staff relied on Commitment to Focus and an almost final draft of the capital campaign case statement for the concepts to communicate.
5. The 60-second versions have been provided to KMSP for locally televised games. They said they'd run them if they have public service announcement time available; they are under no contractual obligation to run them. The longer spots may distributed to other stations for public service announcement time.
6. Planning for halftime spots for both football and basketball next year is underway, but no decisions have yet been made about content or budgets.
7. The communications committee will be fully involved in the planning of halftime spots, public service announcements, and television programming on either broadcast channels or cablesystems.

'UM' logo will be replaced for efficiency, image

By John R. Engen

The familiar "UM" logo that now makes its appearance on signs and letterheads all over campus will soon be gone as part of the University's effort to improve its public image.

The new program will create a standardized symbol and a set of guidelines for departments to follow when communicating with the public, said George Robb, chair of the recently formed University Communication Committee and associate vice president of Institutional Relations.



Tim Larsen, president of Larsen Design Offices, said a major component of the new program will be the replacement of the current "UM" logo, which is too "corporate" in appearance. The new symbol may either be a logo or a signature with "University of Minnesota" written in a certain type-

face, he said.

A signature would eliminate some confusion caused by "U of M's" in other places like Michigan and Missouri, Robb said.

"We want to come up with something that departments will be happy to have on their stationery, and students will be proud to wear on their shirts," said Larsen, whose firm was chosen over six other applicants for the project.

Sally Howard, director of Health Sciences Public Relations and a Communication Committee mem-

ber, said the new signature must also be more identifiable. "The feeling is, let's look at a symbol that, if someone sees it in Hoboken, New Jersey, they'd say, 'that's the University of Minnesota.' "

Larsen agreed. "Now, when someone at home gets a University extension catalog, something from Northrop and something from the Humphrey Institute, they may not realize they're all the University," he said.

Robb anticipates some resistance to the new program at first. "It will be difficult, because there are so many

different units within the University that have logos they really like and will want to hang on to," he said.

"The real trick will be to set up a program that can be used throughout the whole system, but will also allow some flexibility at the local level," Robb said.

Robert Manthey, manager of the University's printing department, estimates that at least 100 different logos are in circulation right now. "It's going to be interesting to see how the various departments react

to being told they can't use their own logos," he said.

"I'm concerned that I will get put in a position where I'm dictating to departments what they can or can't do," Manthey said. "We don't want that, because we like to treat them as customers."

Though Larsen said there "is a probability that some of those symbols will be attacked," he stressed that his firm is still in the research stage, and nothing definite has been decided.

Robb said the new program is being designed now with a goal of coinciding with the arrival of the new University-wide phone system that will be phased-in during spring quarter. At that time all University phones will receive new numbers.

"We're going to try to have the symbol ready in time for the new stationery that people will have to order with their new numbers on it," he said.

Robb said, however, that it may not be done in time. "If we have it ready, that will be fine, but we don't want to rush things," he said.

Robb said he expects to have the entire program in place by sometime in August or September.

Though the program's short-term cost will probably be around \$100,000, Robb expects substantial University-wide savings because of the standardization.

"The way things work now," he said, "if different units have something to publish, they will go to a designer who basically starts with a blank sheet." The new program's guidelines will eliminate much of the current system's inefficiency.

Daily 2-6-84

File sec 5/1



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 24, 1986

Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair
University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall
St. Paul Campus

Dear Deon:

I find I have not responded formally to your letter of February 28, 1986, outlining your understanding on the approach we would take to interviewing the final candidates for the position of Academic Vice President and Provost. Your understanding conforms to mine that we would have two interviews, one with the Faculty Consultative Committee group joined by the chairs of the Senate committees and the standing committees of the Senate and the other comprising the student members of the Senate Consultative Committee. I do not mind the addition of certain other student leaders, but I would like to limit that number to three or four. Would you convey this to Tim Pratt? Many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:kb



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone: (612) 376-2479

February 28, 1986

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

Re: Academic Vice President & Provost
Search

Dear Ken:

Based on my understanding of our conversation in mid-February, I believe we agreed that two governance groups would interview the final candidates for the position of Academic Vice President and Provost. One group would consist of the Faculty Consultative Committee members joined by the chairs of the Senate committees and the standing committees of the Senate; the other group would include the student members of the Senate Consultative Committee.

When I reported this plan to the SCC in our February 20 meeting, the student members requested that a small number of other student leaders, such as the Twin Cities student body president, be included in their interviewing group as well. The full Consultative Committee indicated its support for that request. I hereby forward that request.

Cordially,

Deon D. Stuthman, Chair,
Senate and Faculty Consultative
Committees

DDS:mp

Encl: Excerpt from SCC minutes of February 20, 1986

c: Keith McFarland, Search Committee Chair
Tim Pratt, Student SCC Chair



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

February 14, 1986

TO: Stephen S. Dunham, Chair; Vice President and General Counsel,
University of Minnesota
Michael Baizerman, Professor, Center for Youth Development and
Research, University of Minnesota
Bradley Carlson, Student, University of Minnesota
Julieann Carson, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts,
University of Minnesota
John P. Clark, Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota
Harry Davis, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources,
Minneapolis Star and Tribune
Elayne M. Donahue, Assistant Athletic Director, Athletic Academic
Counseling, University of Minnesota
Carl Eller, Executive Director, Triumph Life Systems, Inc.;
NFL Consultant on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
John Gutekunst, Head Football Coach, Men's Intercollegiate
Athletics, University of Minnesota
Jo-Ida Hansen, Professor and Director, Center for Interest
Measurement Research, Faculty Representative, University of
Minnesota
Ellen K. Hanson, Women's Basketball Head Coach, Women's
Intercollegiate Athletics, University of Minnesota
Richard B. Heydinger, Senior Assistant to the President,
University of Minnesota
Reverend Earl Miller, Pilgrim Baptist Church
B. L. Mirkin, Professor, Department of Pharmacology, University
of Minnesota
Al Nuss, Product Sales Manager, Pillsbury Company
Ember D. Reichgott, Minnesota State Senator, District 46
William Spoor, Chairman-Emeritus, Pillsbury Company
Robert A. Stein, Dean, Law School, University of Minnesota
Deon Stuthman, Professor, Agronomy and Plant Genetics; Chair,
University of Minnesota Senate Consultative Committee
William Thomas, Associate Vice President, Finance; Director of
Personnel, University of Minnesota
Jean West, President, Carleton J. West Publications
Michael Wright, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer,
Super Valu Stores, Inc.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a result of the serious incident in Madison and the Big Ten report on male athlete graduation rates, over the past few weeks a great deal of attention has been focused on the University of Minnesota's men's basketball program and on its intercollegiate athletics

programs. The incident and the report raise a number of questions and concerns, of which the most important appear to me to be the following:

1. the growing concern about sexual violence in our society;
2. the role and organization of intercollegiate athletics in a major public research university;
3. the operation of the men's basketball program at the University of Minnesota.

I have spent a good deal of time reflecting on the most appropriate response for the University to make to each of these issues. The public awareness generated by this sad situation provides an opportune moment to bring about constructive change. On the issue of sexual violence, it is clear that the University cannot completely solve what is society's problem, but it has an obligation to combat it forcefully and effectively within its own community. Indeed, we have an obligation to set a standard for society in our own actions. We must respond to the victims of such occurrences, and we must use our resources to aid in the prevention of sexual violence. To effect this response, we are in the process of taking a number of actions that will consolidate, reorganize and augment existing resources at the University so that we can improve the physical environment of the campus, better respond to the victims of sexual violence, and institute an effective program of prevention.

It is with respect to the other two issues dealing with intercollegiate athletics that I write to you. Specifically, I am inviting you to participate in a task force to develop an agenda for change and improvements, as appropriate, in our intercollegiate athletics programs. To ensure that the task force understands its mandate, it is important to be clear about the perspective with which I approach this effort.

ROLE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Major public universities in the United States respond in a variety of ways to the needs and desires of the people. However, if they are to be great universities, their activities must be consistent with their roles as institutions devoted primarily to education and scholarship.

Intercollegiate athletics, particularly in the spectator sports, provides the public with entertainment inherent in highly skillful and exciting competition. It is reasonable and appropriate for universities to sponsor intercollegiate athletic events if, but only if, the more central goals of the University are met by these activities. Two important opportunities exist for universities to serve their central mission through intercollegiate athletics. The first is the promotion of the personal and physical development of student-athletes, and the second is the education of student-athletes who might not otherwise have an opportunity to obtain such an education. However, it must be

noted that personal and physical development can take place even where the competition is not at the level usually associated with nationally ranked teams. Moreover, the atmosphere and pressure created by the demand to provide entertainment to those no more than peripherally interested in the central missions of the University may interfere with both the personal development and education of student-athletes.

In light of these considerations, it seems appropriate for the University of Minnesota to maintain competitive intercollegiate athletic programs as long as it can ensure that these programs are consistent with and supportive of the personal development and education of each student-athlete. This clearly implies that the University must have sufficient control over the programs to be able to modify them to better meet the needs of student-athletes. It also implies that the primary standard by which a program should be judged is its contribution to the personal development of the athletes. Clearly, competitiveness and team success, while not unimportant, must be of lower priority.

Finally, because athletic events and athletes represent the University in a most visible way, the events themselves and the athletes' patterns of behavior must reflect and perpetuate the values of the institution. Certainly, these include a respect for human dignity and a high standard of integrity.

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

Clearly, the recent events suggest that at least some of Minnesota's intercollegiate athletics programs do not properly reflect the relative priorities discussed above. It is important for us to remedy that situation but, of course, the shortcomings are not unique to Minnesota and the problems cannot be solved entirely by this University.

Please review available data, reports, and relevant writings and conduct hearings as you deem appropriate to develop recommendations on actions we can take to bring intercollegiate athletics into conformity with the model and role outlined in the previous section. Some of your recommendations may propose changes in our men's basketball program; some may deal more generally with intercollegiate athletics at Minnesota; and some may focus on recommendations for the Big Ten or NCAA. It would be useful if you would indicate which actions you believe can be taken unilaterally by Minnesota and which would require the cooperative response of the Big Ten, the WCHA, or an even larger group. While these distinctions may be dictated by practicality, I do not believe we should overlook ways in which Minnesota or the Big Ten can take a leadership role in change.

Among the specific issues that I would like you to address are the following:

1. Recruiting practices. Do we effectively assess prospective students in terms of academic potential and interest, potential for personal development, stability, and integrity as well as athletic ability? Are there better approaches to recruiting? Should we set higher academic standards for our recruits?

2. The athlete as student. How can we insure our success in having student-athletes earn a degree? Is freshman participation in intercollegiate athletics consistent with good academic performance? What changes should we consider? Do we provide sufficient opportunity and encourage the integration of the student-athlete into the academic community? Do we provide sufficient academic support and personal support for student-athletes? Do we provide the proper range of curricular programs for them and advise them properly in choosing programs and colleges? What positive or negative role do athletic dormitories play, and what changes might we make in our policies and practices?
3. The personal development of athletes. How can we ensure that student-athletes develop the ability to cope with the special pressures of highly visible athletic competition? How should we help them to deal with stress? Are drugs, alcohol, and gambling particularly serious problems in the context of intercollegiate athletics and, if so, what special steps should be taken to help athletes deal with them?
4. Selection and evaluation of coaches. Do our practices in selecting and evaluating coaches help us to achieve our stated goals in intercollegiate athletics? How should we deal with the problem of evaluating coaches on win-loss records? Should we set goals for coaches in terms of graduation rates? Should coaches be given extended or continuing appointments? Are we sufficiently clear in our expectations of coaches?
5. Intercollegiate athletics finances. Are there practical changes in the financing of intercollegiate athletics that would help us to control our athletic programs and have them conform to our model of appropriate programs? Can or should the level of expenditures for intercollegiate athletics be reduced to ease the dependence on high income? Can or should scholarship aid be put on a different basis? Are the constraints on numbers of sports programs that must be maintained limiting our financial stability?
6. Organization of intercollegiate athletics. Is the present organizational structure and mode of operation within our athletic departments optimal for achieving our goals?
7. Relationships with off-campus interest groups. Are there ways in which our relationships with the media, boosters, and season ticket holders could be altered to aid us in achieving our programmatic goals?

February 14, 1986

Page 5

This list is not intended to limit your consideration of issues nor should you assume that each question posed must be answered. My hope is that the list will serve as a general guide. While each question must be viewed in a philosophical context, we look to you to deal with operational issues in setting an agenda for change.

Vice President Stephen S. Dunham has agreed to chair the task force and Mr. Gary Engstrand will provide staff support. Members of Mr. Dunham's staff will contact you to arrange the first meeting; we also will gather and distribute to you appropriate background material.

I hope that you will be able to present a report by May 15, 1986. Since the Council of Ten (the presidents of the Big Ten institutions) will be meeting on June 2, 1986, I would like to discuss with them those suggestions that would require conference action.

We expect to initiate a search for a permanent basketball coach at the end of the basketball season. If you would like to meet with me sometime in early March to discuss that search and to advise me on particular issues to keep in mind as we conduct it, I would be happy to arrange it.

I am deeply appreciative of your willingness to participate in the work of the task force.

Sincerely yours,



Kenneth H. Keller
President

KHK:kb

c: University Vice Presidents
Ms. Barbara J. Muesing, Secretary of the Board of Regents
The Board of Regents

University Senate meeting, Feb. 20, 1986

ITEM OF NEW BUSINESS - A resolution of support

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following resolution:

The University Senate supports the position taken by President Keller with regard to the charges of alleged sexual misconduct brought against certain University of Minnesota athletes in Madison, Wisconsin.

In essence, the President stated that the overriding consideration in this matter must be the well-being of the victim, and the well-being and reputation of the University.

The University community shares in the need to sustain that reputation with responsible, mature behavior that reflects respect and concern for others.

This message, conveyed by President Keller, is strongly endorsed by the University Senate as an expression of the position and purpose of the University of Minnesota.

NORMAN GARMEZY
Senator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SELF-STUDY REPORT

North Central Association Accreditation Review
April 1986

This Self-Study Report comprises an important part of the decennial accreditation review of the Twin Cities campus by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education). The University has been accredited by the North Central Association continuously since 1913. In October 1984, then President Magrath appointed the present North Central Association Accreditation Advisory Committee to prepare for the on-site team visit in April 1986, and charged them with the task of conducting an institutional self-study that goes beyond meeting the official requirements for accreditation. The Advisory Committee was directed to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Twin Cities campus with special emphasis on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. These three areas were selected because of the unique character of this institution in the State and because of the special planning efforts since the last review in 1976.

When Kenneth Keller assumed the presidency of the institution in 1985, he proposed an overall framework for the University's future called A Commitment to Focus, based on previous planning, which was subsequently endorsed by the Board of Regents. The North Central Association Advisory Committee believes that its report, "A University at the Crossroads: Self-Study Report for the 1986 North Central Association Accreditation Review," complements A Commitment to Focus by outlining the current status of programs, faculty, services and facilities, and by suggesting enhancements necessary if the goals articulated in A Commitment to Focus are to be realized. In addition, the committee believes that the Self-Study Report will provide a basis for assessing the success, ten years hence, of the University's efforts toward becoming one of the top five public institutions in the country, an avowed goal articulated by President Keller.

When the eight-member Review Team from the North Central Association visits the Twin Cities campus April 14-16, 1986, they will find an institution in the midst of significant change, deeply involved in discussions and activities related to issues such as: increased and unified entrance standards for undergraduates; greater coordination among the many units that provide undergraduate instruction; a new fund-raising initiative to expand the number of endowed chairs; and renewed efforts to recruit minority students and faculty.

At a time when the University is looking forward, the accreditation self-study must provide a view of the University's present status as well as describe the changes that have taken place since the last review. As the Self-Study Report suggests, the University of Minnesota, like other institutions of higher education in 1986, finds itself at the crossroads. The University grew dramatically in the 1960s and early 1970s, reflecting a national trend in increased enrollments in higher education. New programs also were added in response to pressures to resolve societal problems. Large numbers of new faculty were hired to meet the instructional needs and to develop these new programs of study. Now, faced with the prospect of decreasing enrollments and shrinking financial support, the University has decided to take this opportunity to become a more clearly focused institution, engaging in activities for which, as the only comprehensive Ph.D.-granting institution in the State, it is more clearly fitted, and to leave other activities to the many two- and four-year postsecondary institutions in the State.

SELF-STUDY PROCESS

The Advisory Committee has based the Self-Study Report on the following sources: six internal task force reports prepared in the last four years (See Appendix E); national trends in the funding of university research; the compilation of assessment efforts on various topics (e.g., program support and expenditures at the University versus

other Big Ten public universities); recently collected data from departments on issues ranging from visiting professorships to special incentives for faculty development; summaries of academic personnel records of relevant faculty characteristics (e.g., institutions from which faculty received their doctorates); characteristics of undergraduate, professional, and graduate students on the Twin Cities campus; summaries of evaluative studies of University faculty (e.g., sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences) and students (e.g., Former Student Survey Project); special focus group discussions with students and faculty; and the experience and opinions of University faculty and administrators on topics ranging from the libraries to the availability of secretarial support for research and instruction.

CONTENT OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The resulting Self-Study Report contains three sections. The first section includes an introduction and institutional overview, a summary of the University's responses to the last accreditation review, and a description of significant changes since the 1976 review, among other general topics. The second section provides the University's response to the criteria for accreditation mandated by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools: the general institutional requirements and the evaluative criteria. The third section provides a detailed framework for describing the unique character of the University: its comprehensiveness; the planning process; the undergraduate education mission; the professional education programs; the faculty, resources, and programs that make it a prestigious research institution; and the structure and programs that support the University's graduate education mission.

The three areas in this section that receive special emphasis are the sections on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. The discussion of planning includes a summary of the major planning activities of the past decade and a discussion of current planning issues.

The section on undergraduate education includes the following topics: enrollment trends; high school and University connections; recruitment of undergraduates; high ability students; minority students; demographic changes; changes of colleges and registration patterns; retention and graduation rates; quality of learning environments; advising; physical surroundings; employment opportunities; extracurricular activities; programs that improve undergraduate education; evaluations by undergraduates; and events affecting undergraduate education.

The section on faculty research, the most detailed of the three areas chosen for special emphasis, includes five topics: 1) faculty characteristics relevant to the University's research mission; 2) faculty workload issues that affect time available to do research; 3) outside financial support for faculty research; 4) University programs that facilitate faculty research; and 5) services that support faculty research (e.g., libraries, equipment, physical facilities).

The final section on graduate education is closely linked to the section on faculty research and includes the following topics: organization of the Graduate School; graduate faculty; programs of study available; Graduate School curricula and degrees awarded; policies and procedures of the Graduate School; recruitment activities and resulting applicants; special programs and services; employment opportunities; demographic characteristics including statistics on doctoral graduates; graduate student evaluations; reviews of graduate programs; and descriptions of several highly rated graduate programs.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In spite of serious financial constraints during the past decade, numerous significant changes have made the Twin Cities campus a more vital, better institution. Although the many new buildings on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses are the most visible changes, other less obvious changes are

beginning to reshape the institution. Changes in the University's governance and personnel policies, such as the new Senate constitution in 1982 and a new tenure code in 1985, have been widely debated and subsequently endorsed. The University's planning process and other forces of change have affected faculty research and graduate, undergraduate and professional education.

In the area of planning, significant accomplishments include: the linking of budgeting and planning that began in 1979; initiating an early retirement program for faculty to reduce the number of tenured faculty, and the closing of units (e.g., the Library School) based on programmatic plans. Planning has had a significant impact on the University during the last decade.

The past decade includes numerous University initiatives to remove barriers to faculty research and to develop new programs to facilitate faculty research efforts. Among the accomplishments during the past decade are the following: the initiation of the Bush Sabbatical Program in 1981 to fund faculty sabbatical projects that list faculty research with undergraduate education; the use of special retention funds, beginning in 1983, to prevent the loss of the University's best research faculty; the initiatives taken to increase all faculty salaries to compensate for inflation losses; the actions taken in 1984 to enable the University to use the permanent endowment fund, together with funds from the Capital Campaign, to increase the number of endowed chairs; the increased use of indirect cost-recovery funds from sponsored research to facilitate faculty research (e.g., more funds to help with equipment needs); an improved patent office, now part of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer; several new research institutes and centers (e.g., Institute for Human Genetics, Supercomputer Institute, Center for Advanced Feminist Studies; a \$7.5 million grant from IBM, called Project Woksape to expand the use of microcomputer work stations; and improvements in services that support faculty research, including University Libraries (e.g., increased allocations for book purchases, the beginning of automation, and the

change to the Library of Congress classification system) and the Computer Center (e.g., the microcomputer purchase program.) Most of the above changes have had a significant positive effect on graduate education, and some (e.g., the Bush Sabbatical Program and Project Woksape) have positively affected undergraduate education as well.

Other initiatives taken during the last decade have improved the University's competitiveness in recruiting highly qualified graduate students and in providing them with high quality educational experiences. Among these initiatives are the following: increased recruitment funds, including greater attention to departmental publicity to recruit graduate students; increased funding for the Graduate School Fellowship Program and the Dissertation Fellowship Program; an improved tuition structure that makes the University more attractive to out-of-state students; the 1985 tuition waiver program for graduate students employed 25 percent time or more; and streamlined PhD policies and procedures. Additional changes will occur as the recommendations in the report of the 1984 Task Force on the Quality of Graduate Education and Faculty Research are implemented.

During the past decade, the University's obligation to provide high quality undergraduate education received new attention. The two major related forces were the appointment of the Task Force on the Student Experience in 1983 and the creation of a new central officer in 1982, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education and University Outreach. The final report of the Task Force contained over 250 specific action steps to improve the quality of undergraduate education, approximately 15 percent of which have been implemented.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED

The Advisory Committee's analysis of planning activities during the last decade underscores the importance of formal planning processes in establishing

clearly articulated institutional goals and in developing strategies for achieving those goals. The success of that effort relies on University leadership that presents a vision for the University, such as that outlined in A Commitment to Focus, a vision that is shared widely among faculty on campus. That vision must be translated, however, by departmental units into the pursuit of excellence in each of their disciplines. The Advisory Committee's analysis of high quality University departments, not just excellent in research productivity but excellent in undergraduate and graduate instruction as well, underscores the key importance of departmental administrators in helping to create an environment in which excellence is expected and reinforced. Related planning concerns centered on the time required for overall institutional planning and the current absence of central administrators devoted solely to planning, the possible need for a planning advisory group, the role of the Management Committee (consisting of the University President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Finance and Operations) in planning and budgeting, and the absence of sufficient interface between program reviews and central planning and budgeting.

A second concern is the University's tendency to be less diverse in its student and faculty populations than other large research universities. This particular concern was noted in the two previous North Central Reviews: the 1966 Review Team stated that students would benefit from association with more high-quality outsiders. However, in spite of attempts by the University to recruit students from outside the State, currently 83 percent of the undergraduates and 50 percent of graduate students are from the State of Minnesota. A similar tendency is evidenced in statistics on institutions from which faculty received their doctorates: 29 percent of the PhD holders on the Twin Cities campus received their doctorates from the University of Minnesota.

A third theme revolves around setting standards that will enable the University to improve educational quality: strengthening the process of evaluating probationary faculty; increasing the recruiting efforts for the very best students and faculty; and being more effective in retaining the best and most productive faculty.

An additional issue centers on changes in University funding over the past decade, some of which were the direct result of the State's financial status. Although the University is trying to protect academic programs as much as possible from serious long-term damage, problems still exist in available funding. Expenditures per Full Year Equivalent (FYE) student fell from \$4,344 in 1976-77 to \$3,769 in 1983-84 in constant 1984 dollars, a decline of 13 percent. Also relevant are comparisons between this University and other Big Ten public institutions that indicated Minnesota's support per ranked faculty was seventh out of eight; the amount the University spends is \$7,651 compared to \$18,368 and \$13,379 for the top two schools. The University of Minnesota ranked at the bottom of the list in expenditures for instructional equipment, with \$11.67 per FYE student compared to \$30.93 for the next-to-bottom institution.

How to enhance faculty members' research and scholarship without relinquishing the University's important undergraduate instruction mission is a fifth issue. The reality, that the University is the only public institution in a metropolitan area with a population of slightly over 2 million, dictates that the University must continue its heavy involvement in undergraduate education. Although the University of Minnesota hopes to become a more highly ranked graduate institution and to lower somewhat the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students it must do so by developing and expanding programs that simultaneously benefit faculty research (and, therefore, graduate education) and undergraduate education. More programs that achieve these dual purposes, such as the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program suggested by the Task Force on

the Student Experience, are needed to link faculty research with undergraduate education.

Another issue relates to the various personnel and human resource issues that affect faculty quality, productivity and morale. A comprehensive system involves four processes: hiring promising faculty or those with proven track records; retaining the best faculty; providing resources and opportunities to keep faculty current, and developing procedures and options for counseling unproductive faculty. The University has made progress in its hiring practices and has initiated new steps to keep faculty. Members of the Advisory Committee expressed concerns about the perceived high percentages of probationary faculty who receive tenure at the University compared to percentages at institutions we aspire to be like. The University also has several programs available to keep faculty current, although some of these options (e.g., sabbaticals) are underused. The University's sabbatical and single quarter leave programs provide development opportunities that are not always provided elsewhere. There have been few attempts, however, to develop programs for retraining or stimulating faculty who have become less productive. In regard to this last issue, no systems are available, for example, to identify faculty who should no longer have graduate faculty status. Another issue that concerns graduate faculty is a system of dual certification that requires faculty to apply for graduate status.

Employment related concerns for undergraduate and graduate students is also an issue, the nature of which differs for the two groups. For undergraduate students, the primary concern is the high percentage of undergraduates who work, out of necessity, a significant number of hours in jobs that have no educational value. For some students, work comes first and school comes second; for some students high pay rates for campus jobs are an incentive for them to attend the University. The concern for graduate students involves the low level of financial support for graduate students which forces many to seek non-University employment that is detrimental to their graduate study.

The general conditions of physical facilities on the Twin Cities campus is a serious concern, in spite of recent additions to the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. The University has excellent facilities in some areas, but is decades behind in facilities in other areas, especially modern classrooms and laboratories for both undergraduate and graduate students. Extensive refurbishing is necessary if the University is to keep up with the technologies available to enhance research and teaching activities.

The final issue, support for faculty members' research and instruction, especially library resources, computer facilities and resources and laboratory equipment, involves two related points. The first point, one supported by comparative data as well as the sense of the faculty, is that the University's resources in these areas do not compare well with those at institutions we hope to emulate. The second point is the widespread opinion among faculty that the support services that are provided are not effectively implemented. The important issue here is that the University has no ongoing system to monitor the effectiveness of services (e.g., libraries and computing facilities) that are intended to support faculty research and teaching.

-- -- -- -- -- -- --

The Advisory Committee hopes that this Self-Study Report will generate discussion within the University community and with the Review Team of ways in which to further the pursuit of excellence outlined in A Commitment to Focus.

1/27/86 to FCC:

Tim Pratt has sent this text to the SCC office with a note saying,

"Here is a copy of the Amendments that will go to Business & Rules and will be on the agenda for the 20th."



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Student Senate
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2414

Whereas student body presidents as legitimate representatives of their whole student bodies do not now have formal input into University policy making.

And whereas the ~~central administrators~~ ^{Council of Academic Officers} of the University serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

Therefore be it resolved the student body presidents of the University of Minnesota Campuses serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

Be it further resolved their terms begin July 1 of the year they are elected.

Be it further resolved if a president fails to complete his/her term, his/her successor shall finish the term.

Whereas the student body president of the Twin Cities Campus^s as a legitimate representative of the whole student body does not now have formal input into Twin Cities Campus policy making.

Therefore be it resolved the student body president of the Twin Cities Campuses serve as an ex officio nonvoting member of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

Be it further resolved his/her term begins July 1 of the year in which he/she is elected.

Be it further resolved if a president fails to complete his/her term, his/her successor shall finish the term.