

U Senate Amendments  
Following amendments will be presented for action at meeting March 9. 1. A motion to amend the constitution of the U Senate. Be it Resolved, That Art. 111, Sec. 4c of the Constitution of the University Senate be amended: 1) by striking out the word "School" from the phrase "Graduate School students shall be eligible..."; 2) by substituting the phrase "Continuing Education and Extension Student Extension Division students shall be eligible..."; 3) by striking out the words "five (5) credits at the time of voting", and inserting in its place the words "three (3)". 2. A motion to amend the bylaws of the U Senate. That Senate be amended to add: "(24) Twin Cities Campus Libraries".

# Senate Meeting

## Thursday, March 9, 1972

### 3:15 p.m.

### Nicholson Auditorium

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 219 including the President, 146 members of the faculty and 72 students. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (110) must be present. Amendments to the Constitution require advance publication and 146 affirmative votes. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 110 affirmative votes. Other actions require a simple majority of the members present and voting. The members of the all-University Administrative Committee are ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for Senators may be admitted to meetings of the University Senate and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members of the University Senate, the members of the Senate Consultative Committee, and, in case of a tie, the chairman, shall be entitled to vote.

Any representative may designate any elected alternate from his institute, college,

school, or student constituency as the alternate to serve in his place and stand by written notice to the clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the University Senate.

#### ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be circulated during the meeting. Members will please check their names to indicate their presence. If the roll misses you, please stop after the meeting to check your name. The roll, after adjournment, will be at the rostrum.

An attendance record for nonmembers will also be circulated and will be on the rostrum after the meeting.

A summary of the attendance of members for the current academic year will be included in the June minutes.

Year 1971-72

No. 4

## University of Minnesota

### The Senate Docket

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for consideration.

#### I. MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 1971 Reported for Action

#### II. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE Reported for Action

Affirmative Action Program. Mr. Lukermann reviewed the December 9 memorandum from Mr. Eidenberg, Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, and discussed the plan for designation of vacant positions to be filled by qualified or qualified women or minority applicants. The liaison persons for each major unit to work with the EEO Officer have been identified.

Participation of Collegiately Budgeted Non-Academic Staff in Affairs of Collegiate Units. The Civil Service Committee of the Council for Women's Progress has proposed an addition to the Guidelines for College non-academic employees who are collegiately budgeted. Collegiate constitution guidelines would provide flexibility in this matter and limit participation to those roles where civil service personnel are prepared to be helpful. The motion to forward the recommendation to the Regents was approved.

#### III. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING Reported for Action (Maximum time; 45 minutes)

##### Status of Toward 1985 and Beyond

Following the 2 December 1971 meeting of the University Senate, the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning has continued to explore ways by which the discussions and suggestions for modification and explication of the document could be coordinated and focused. During this interval, the committee has received commentary and recommendations by letter and through discussions with individuals and groups from the University community. These communications, the earlier reactions to the document following its publication in June 1971, and the transcripts of the open hearings held in the fall of 1971 form a valuable background to the deliberations of the committee. After a careful consideration of this material the committee requests that the Senate approve the following steps which the committee proposes:

1. The creation of a planning task force to examine student concerns in higher education over the long-range. The charge to the task force would be as follows:

This task force shall investigate the proposed University mission statement and planning principles as set forth in Toward 1985 and Beyond with regard to their effects on students' academic progress and on students' individual development and communicate its findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning.

Membership on the task force will be open to students, faculty and staff and it is hoped to establish the task force by mid-March. The task force would begin its work at this time and make its final report to the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning by the end of the year.

2. Solicitation of comments and recommendations on the document from the provosts of the coordinate campuses and the heads of the various collegiate units on the Twin Cities campus.

The University's instructional effort is accomplished through programs administered by the various colleges and campuses. The mission statement and planning principles described in Toward 1985 and Beyond hold implications for the campuses and colleges as they develop their own long-range plans. The committee believes it important that a review of the document by appropriate campus and collegiate bodies and the communication of their findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning is an important component in the development of a long-range plan for the University. It would be requested that these findings and recommendations be transmitted to the committee by late spring, 1972.

3. Solicitation of comments from appropriate University Senate and Assembly Committees.

The conduct of an important part of the University's work is accomplished by the Senate and Campus Assemblies, through their various committees. The planning principles described in Toward 1985 and Beyond in some instances bear directly on the duties and responsibilities of these committees. The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning would request the chairmen of these Senate and Assembly Committees to review the document and communicate their findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning by late spring, 1972.

The outcome of the above efforts, when joined to the material already available to the committee, would provide the basis for revising the present report.

The committee wishes to thank those members of the University community who have suggested modifications or additions to the document up to this time. We are especially indebted to those individuals who have conveyed to us in writing their concerns and recommendations. The care and precision with which several of these letters have been executed have materially assisted the committee with a difficult task.

WARREN IBELE  
Chairman

#### IV. JOINT REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING Reported for Action (Maximum time; 45 minutes)

The Governor has requested the University to submit a preliminary budget for the 1973-75 biennium by mid-June, 1972. This request means that collegiate units must immediately begin the budget and planning process, so that central administration will receive proposals in time (April 1) to go over them carefully and prepare a draft list of ranked program support requests for the review and reaction of the Board of Regents. A tentative proposal will be submitted to the Commissioner of Administration by June 15. During July and August a detailed request will be developed which will be submitted to the Regents in September and to the Commissioner of Administration by October 1.

The retrenchment and reallocation process recently completed should have established an information base and a planning procedure for examining program-matically a unit's activities. The goal of that effort was the identification of campus, collegiate, departmental and unit programs, an assessment of their effectiveness, and an appreciation of their relative importance. In this context, the word program is taken to include teaching, research, continuing education and service functions. Though goals or objectives may have shifted since the Fall of 1971, the data base and procedures should provide valuable support in preparing 1973-75 requests. It is very likely, however, that a number of program requests identified by the various units were inadequately funded or could not be funded at all during 1972-73. Such program requests may be prominent components of a unit's plan for the 1973-75 biennium.

Faculty-student participation in University governance can significantly determine educational policy only insofar as these groups take an active role in the budget and planning process. The University is competing with many other bodies for state funds and must justify its request for the additional resources needed to expand some programs, restore or preserve the quality of others, and add such new programs as are judged educationally desirable and necessary. In developing the University's legislative request, some criteria must be used to determine and rank priorities. The process of priority-ranking and justification in developing a budget is inescapable. The issue before the Senate is the degree of faculty-student participation in this process. The University Senate can help maximize this participation by, first, recommending to central administration suitable criteria for ranking program requests and, second, assuring that the final decisions are consistent with these criteria by authorizing a continuing consultation process by appropriate bodies which are accountable to the Senate.

To achieve these purposes, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning recommend adoption of the following criteria and, if they are accepted by the Senate, would undertake to establish with central administration a procedure for review of centrally-determined priority rankings. The committees would report back to the Spring 1972 meeting of the Senate their findings as to the consistency of centrally-established rankings with the criteria recommended by the Senate.

#### CRITERIA

The criteria are to be applied in the light of the missions of all units as redefined in the 1971-72 R & R process. The numbering of these criteria does not reflect any priority ordering.

##### I. Program Restoration

- Programs which have a continuing high collegiate priority but were unfunded or underfunded in reallocation process.
- Capability of unit to utilize effectively the resources it requests to carry out its program.

##### II. Program Maintenance or Strengthening

- New staff requested in response to enrollment pressures or increased service contribution for programs that contribute significantly to collegiate or University mission.

- B. Eminence of program. Centers of excellence should be maintained and supported.
- C. Centrality of weak programs. If program is weak, but central to collegiate or University mission, it should be strengthened.
- D. Societal need. Program reflects University's unique capacities for responding to societal need.
- E. Strengthening of program that reflects University's unique capacities for contributing to new basic knowledge.
- F. New staff needed to supply lack in essential subfield of specialization.
- G. Strengthening of University's capacity to contribute to the individual growth of students, faculty, and staff.

### III. New Programs

- A. Staff required for instruction in new fields of knowledge arising within or across disciplines.
- B. Program remedies a University deficiency in an important sphere of knowledge and will enhance the quality of the teaching and research programs.
- C. Program provides for teaching and research in an area which will interact with and stimulate development of other University programs.
- D. Program is responsive to emerging societal need and is appropriate to scholarly University setting.
- E. Particular program needs arising from special responsibilities of the units.
- F. Programs which contribute new approaches to enhancing students' intellectual and personal development.

Because of the special responsibilities of certain units of the University, all of these considerations may not apply with equal weight.

The above criteria, as accepted or modified by the Senate, will be used by the Senate Committees on Educational Policy and Resources and Planning during consultation about, and review of, the 1973-75 Legislative Request.

**MAY BRODBECK,**  
Chairman,  
Senate Committee on Educational Policy

**WARREN IBELE,**  
Chairman,  
Senate Committee on Resources and Planning

## V. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

### 1. Reported for Action (Maximum time; 10 minutes)

#### A MOTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Be It Resolved, That Art. III, Sec. 4c of the Constitution of the University Senate be amended:

- 1) by striking out the word "School" from the phrase "Graduate School students shall be eligible....."
- 2) by substituting the phrase "Continuing Education and Extension student shall be eligible..." for the phrase "General Extension Division students shall be eligible....."
- 3) by striking out the words "five (5)" from the phrase "and are carrying five (5) credits at the time of voting", and inserting in its place the words "three (3)".

### 2. Reported for Action

#### A MOTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

That Article I, paragraph 1, of the By-Laws of the Senate be amended to add: "(24) Twin Cities Campus Libraries"

These amendments will be presented for action at the meeting of the University Senate, March 9, 1972.

**FRANK J. SORAUF**  
Chairman

## VI. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING AND RELATIONS

### 1. Reported for Action (Maximum time; 30 minutes)

#### ON PLACING OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR GRADING SYSTEMS WITH CAMPUS ASSEMBLIES

For the past thirty years, the Senate has acted on matters relating to grading systems to be used throughout the University, beginning (1943) with action which defined the present system and continuing on through P-N legislation (1967) and the receipt, last spring, of the first report on a revised grading system.

Concurrent with the Senate actions to liberalize grading procedures in the last decade (P-N, 1967, experimental systems, 1967; change definition of Incomplete, 1970), coordinate campuses have grown in number (Morris, Crookston, Waseca) and diversity of educational program. The question of the need for central determination of grading systems has been raised by the Morris Campus Assembly.

The SCASR believes that grading is an integral part of the educational climate of a particular campus and should be tied to the educational objectives of each campus. As with other educational matters concerning but one campus, the responsibility for policy should rest with campus assemblies.

Within a particular campus similar centralization of responsibility for grading policy is essential. Grades are assigned according to the policy of the administrative unit (college, school, institute, department) offering the course. The existence of several grading systems within a campus unit would be confusing to an instructor (if those systems were tied to college of student's registration) or student and those viewing his academic record (if tied to administrative unit offering the course).

The arguments for retaining central (Senate) responsibility are of two kinds: (1) Credentials for students applying for transfer to colleges on different campuses can be reviewed with better understanding of previous achievement if systems are the same, and (2) data handling systems can more easily be generalized to all campuses if similar grading systems are used. Initially, some increased difficulty in analyzing records of transfer students might be expected. Prediction of success after transfer, a criterion used in making decisions about transfer, should improve with experience with students who present new types of records. Data handling problems may well be increased. Nevertheless, the need to fit grading practices to the missions of each campus is viewed by the committee as being of greater importance.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has reviewed and concurs with the following recommendation.

#### Recommendation

In acknowledgement of increasing diversity in educational programs at the several campuses of the University, the Senate, acting under Article III, Section 2, of the Constitution, asserts that responsibility for the determination of grading policy and grading systems resides with campus assemblies. That responsibility applies to review and approval of experimental grading systems as well as the standard system to be used on each campus.

## 2. Reported for Action by Faculty Senate

### TRANSFER RECOGNITION FOR MINNESOTA COLLEGES

As of June 4, 1970, the University of Minnesota discontinued its policy of formal "Transfer Recognition" relationships with other Minnesota colleges and universities as basis for credit transfer. To replace this policy either of the following conditions is an acceptable basis for the transfer of appropriate, satisfactorily completed credit from other Minnesota colleges and universities to the University of Minnesota:

a. If another Minnesota institution now has or subsequently develops any level of official recognition from the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges (NCASSC), that shall be the basis for the appropriate transfer of credit; currently for example, the levels of recognition are "Correspondent Status," "Candidate Status," and "Accreditation Status."

b. If another Minnesota institution does not now have any NCASSC affiliation but does now have a Transfer Recognition relationship with the University, that recognition shall be continued through the 1971-72 academic year. By the end of spring quarter, 1972, the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations shall contact such Minnesota institutions, and, if NCASSC affiliation has not been obtained, and it is judged not to be a reasonable affiliation, shall negotiate one of the following alternatives:

- (1) continued transfer of credit based on successful transfer experience data or other arrangements better suited to this particular situation.
- (2) discontinuance of a regularized overall transfer relationship.

Appropriate work satisfactorily completed taken at institutions outside of Minnesota is considered for transfer if the teaching institution is regionally accredited or if the credit is accepted by an institution analogous to the University of Minnesota in the particular state (e.g. another Big Ten University).

Individual courses or educational experiences taken at institutions not covered by the foregoing provisions may yield credit in transfer for particular individuals via University Credit by Examination procedures.

#### Recommendation

The University of Minnesota reaffirms the actions of the Faculty Senate of 1967 and 1970 in which the "transfer recognition" policy for the acceptance of credits from other institutions in the State of Minnesota is tied very closely to the plans of those other institutions for obtaining affiliation with the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges (NCASSC).

If another Minnesota institution now has or subsequently develops any level of official recognition from the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, that shall be the basis for the appropriate transfer of credit; currently the levels of recognition are "correspondent status," "candidate status," and "accreditation status."

Institutions which do not have North Central affiliation will have a transfer recognition status with the University in the academic year in which they receive correspondent status or in the year they plan to apply for candidate status.

1. The new institution which applies for correspondent status during its first year of operation would have transfer recognition at the time that application is submitted and for as long as that status was retained by the institution on its way to candidate status.

2. Established institutions must apply directly for candidate status. An intention to do so, with documentation of (a) a plan for developing appropriate self-study review and (b) of correspondence with NCASSC which reflects that intention, would receive transfer recognition at the beginning of the year in which applications for candidacy is to occur. That is, transfer recognition would be granted in September—application is usually in the spring.

If correspondence status is terminated without candidate status having been achieved, or if candidate status is not granted after the application has been made, or if accreditation status is withdrawn, the University will withdraw transfer recognition.

Some institutions may be unwilling to enter into negotiations with the North Central Association but look to the University for the transfer recognition. To be considered for transfer recognition outside of North Central affiliation, the University will require that the institution seeking that status submit two (2) initial documents for consideration by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations:

1. The institution must indicate its contact with North Central and must document the requirement made by North Central that is judged by the institution to be one to which it cannot agree.
2. The institution must, by reference to its constitution or other policy documents, show that the North Central request is inconsistent with the policy and objectives of the school.

For those few institutions that the University enters into transfer recognition agreements with, independent of North Central affiliation, a committee will be formed to visit the school and make recommendations to the Senate Committee for approval by the Senate of both the decision to grant transfer recognition and the periodicity of further review. In most cases, a yearly up-date of the self-study prepared for the visiting committee will be required. In such arrangements, the full expenses of the visiting team will be borne by the institution seeking transfer recognition.

**JAMES B. PREUS**  
Chairman

## VII. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE Reported for Information

This is in response to the resolution passed at the December meeting of the University Senate relative to the employment of Mr. McConnell.

The Regents of the University understand your request; however, as the litigation in the matter is still pending, the Regents will have no statements or additional actions until the matter is ultimately concluded.

**ELMER L. ANDERSEN**  
Chairman  
Board of Regents

## VIII. OLD BUSINESS

## IX. NEW BUSINESS

**MARILEE WARD**  
Secretary

The next regular meeting of the University Senate is scheduled for Thursday, May 25, 1972, at 3:30.

## Senate Docket Addition

### X. NECROLOGY

JOE WILLIAM BAIRD  
1904—1960

CLIFTON ALEXANDER  
GAYNE, JR.  
1912—1971

HELEN LUCILE HABERER  
1906—1972

JAMES HALL MATHEWS  
1925—1971

FLORA M. STAPLE  
1891—1971

STEWART C. THOMSON  
1905—1971

FRANZ MONTGOMERY  
1904—1972

Monday, March 6, 1972

*Daily*