

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 15, 2003
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Gary Balas, Jean Bauer, Susan Brorson, Charles Campbell, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Arthur Erdman, Marti Hope Gonzales, Candace Kruttschnitt, Judith Martin, Fred Morrison, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks, Carol Wells

Absent: Muriel Bebeau, John Fossum, Marc Jenkins, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak

Guests: President Robert Bruininks, Associate Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter; Professor Dorothy Anderson (Chair, Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity), Betty Hackett (Student Judicial Affairs)

Other: Kate Stuckert (Office of the Vice President and Chief of Staff); Becky Hippert (University Senate office)

[In these minutes: (1) report of the chair (classrooms, committee resolutions, summer meetings); (2) classrooms and undergraduate education; (3) budget consultation and the budget (with the President); (4) report from the Student Academic Integrity committee]

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Feeney convened the meeting at 1:05 and led a discussion on several issues.

-- The Committee listserv had been used by someone outside the Committee to send a message. Professor Feeney said that Committee members should not give the listserv address to others to use; it is intended to be a communication tool for Committee business.

-- The meeting with Committee chairs went well and stimulated discussion of a number of issues, in particular classrooms. President Bruininks was present for the classroom discussion. The Social Concerns Committee has adopted several resolutions on various matters: the Mt. Graham observatory, essential medicines, double-sided printers, and the use of recycled paper. It also considered, but has tabled for now, a resolution concerning divestment from companies doing business with Israel.

-- With respect to the resolutions, committee resolutions do not need to go through this Committee or the Senate Consultative Committee to be reported to the Senate for information. They do need to be brought to this Committee or SCC if endorsement is sought. If they are to be brought to the Senate for action, the Business and Rules Committee must place them on the docket.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Morrison said that it appears the resolutions have an impact on issues that fall under the jurisdiction of other Senate committees. This Committee should exercise its steering authority and direct the resolutions to those other committees for consideration and comment. Professor Ratliff-Crain said that some of the resolutions could lead to policy while others are an expression of committee sentiment; they can be differentiated in that regard. This Committee would not review statements of opinion but it should review statements that will lead to policy changes.

-- There will be two FCC meetings during the summer. If Committee members change their email addresses during the summer or while traveling, they should notify the Senate office of the address to be used.

-- This Committee has the responsibility of nominating faculty to serve on the President's Student Behavior Review Panel, the appellate body for campus committee decisions pursuant to charges that a student has violated the Student Conduct Code. The Committee agreed on the names of individuals it wished to nominate to the President.

2. Classrooms & Undergraduate Education

From the meetings with department chairs/heads, it was evident that the budget cuts will have a significant impact on teaching. The point was made vigorously that the size of general education courses will increase, that lab section sizes will increase, that departments are losing positions, and (from the meeting with committee chairs) that classrooms are not being upgraded on schedule. The Committee needs to discuss the impact of the budget cuts on undergraduate education.

There have been three messages to the President and Provost on this topic, Professor Martin pointed out: the comments from the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee about the slippage in the schedule of upgrading and maintenance of classrooms, a letter from the Academy of Distinguished Teachers, and a letter from the Committee on Educational Policy. The point of the message is that the University must try to maintain what it has achieved. Professor Speaks related that Dr. Maziar has responded to the concerns by appointing a committee to identify funding sources to continue support for classroom renovation. There is no need to reinvent the wheel in this case, Professor Sampson said; the tires simply have no air. He said he hoped the appointment of a committee would not simply be a delay in continuing to improve classrooms because, for example, faculty are now coming to rely on PowerPoint in their classroom lectures and discussion so it is important to maintain the technology needed.

Professor Balas said that the upgrades envisioned ten years ago are not necessarily appropriate today with the advent of wireless technology. It would make more sense to have portable projectors provided from a central source and not wire all the classrooms. And is it necessary to upgrade all the classrooms or would it be possible to keep only some of them the most technologically advanced? Professor Campbell responded that new technologies are being purchased as classrooms are upgraded; the problem is that there are not sufficient resources to maintain the upgraded classrooms when technology fails. The University is falling behind. Has anyone looked at the percentage of time that the high technology in classrooms is actually used? Professors Martin and Sampson said that Mr. Fitzgerald, Director of Classroom Management, undoubtedly can provide the information.

The underlying problem is that the University is at the blackboard level of maintenance, Professor Sampson said: One puts up a blackboard and it lasts for 50 years unless someone throws a brick at it.

That does not work for technology in classrooms. Year after year, committees adopt statements urging better funding for classroom upgrades and the importance of maintenance funding as well.

One interim step might be to include technology as part of the decision about what classroom a course will receive, Professor Campbell suggested. It is also not appropriate to look at this problem in isolation from the larger budget problems of the University.

A related question is whether all classes have to be offered between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., Professor Feeney said. There is a shortage of classroom space with the change to semesters, Professor Sampson said. A more important issue is the policies about classroom use, such as the requirement that a certain percentage of courses in any college be offered after 2:00 in the afternoon, Professor Martin said. Professor Kruttschnitt said, however, that this is very complicated, with substantial tuition increases driving the budget and students needing to work; offering courses later in the day simply means that students will take other courses. Professor Speaks agreed. Some students will not take 8:00 a.m. courses and some faculty refuse to teach them. He will not offer his introductory course at 8:00 because enrollments plummet when he does. Who is in charge of scheduling classrooms, Professor Balas asked? (Ultimately, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.) He wondered if there should be monitoring of classroom assignments because in some cases smaller classes may be scheduled in larger rooms so they are closer to the faculty member's office. Professor Martin responded that Mr. Fitzgerald's office would not usually allow that to happen. She added that in some cases, a course that does not need advanced technology nonetheless may be assigned to a classroom with that capacity only because it is the only available room large enough to accommodate the class.

Professor Campbell reported that IT is offering some Saturday lab sections; they are not the students' first choice but they do fill up. Professor Speaks wondered if any other colleges had Saturday offerings and why there were not more of them. Is this an issue that some Committee could address, Professor Feeney asked?

The classroom technology upgrade schedule was established when the University had more money, Professor Martin said, and before anyone imagined the difficulty of the current budget problems. It may be time for another look at the financing and the schedule. Professor Speaks noted that Mr. Fitzgerald provided a detailed report to the Committee on Finance and Planning earlier in the year and the Committee in turn made a statement to the Provost. Professor Martin said she did not know what the Provost has in mind for funding classroom improvements. Professor Sampson recalled again that the Committee on Educational Policy sent a letter to the President expressing worry that there could be inadvertent developments that will affect undergraduate education, such as reduction or elimination of freshman seminars, increased class sizes, reduced numbers of classes offered, and so on. There is no need for a committee; what is needed is clever leadership at the top. He acknowledged that he was not sure what such clever leadership would do, but it needs to understand the progress that has been made and that there must be a signal that reconciling budget pressures should not sacrifice undergraduate education.

Professor Balas said the administration should be advised to make targeted budget decisions and perhaps not spend money on classroom upgrades at the same rate as in the past. It is not and is already behind schedule, Professors Campbell and Speaks pointed out. The University is also getting into an era when things wear out, just as faculty are learning to use them, Professor Sampson added. But the University is losing faculty and support staff, Professor Balas said, and the Committee should not raise single issues or it creates a patchwork approach to the budget. But this is a serious issue, Professor

Sampson rejoined; with tuition increasing rapidly, students are paying more, and may be getting classrooms that are inferior to what they had in high school. The stakes are high, he said.

Professor Campbell noted that at the committee chairs' meeting, they had also heard a description of what is happening to the library budget, which is a disaster of comparable magnitude.

Should these issues be referred to committee, Professor Feeney inquired again? The Educational Policy Committee must continue to monitor them, Professor Sampson said. The question is not shifting priorities, but a lot of progress has been made and the University must do everything to prevent a decline in quality.

3. Budget Consultation and the Budget

The foregoing discussion, Professor Kruttschnitt said, raises the question about the budget in general. Committee members know nothing about the priorities being set. The President said there would be a lot of consultation but there has been very little. The faculty are very frustrated, something that came through in the notes from the meeting with department chairs. Professor Balas agreed and said the Committee is arguing about budget priorities in a vacuum.

Professor Campbell said he learned of a significant restructuring of the Minnesota Extension Service (MES), driven in part by the budget, in the paper. This is not something the Committee should have learned about in the newspaper. Professor Bauer said that she had been told the day before that there had been consultation with the Board of Regents, within the University, and broadly around the state, but she was not told that there had been any consultation with the faculty. Professor Feeney reported that he and Professor Speaks had been informed of the proposal at the Budget Advisory Committee--but those discussions are closed.

In a related vein, Mr. Pfutzenreuter provided an update on the legislature. Professor Martin asked if the Committee could be provided information on cross-subsidies, about which the President has spoken on several occasions; Mr. Pfutzenreuter suggested that Dr. Zetterberg could provide the data.

The President joined the meeting; Professor Feeney welcomed him and inquired if the manner of release of the information related to the changes in the Minnesota Extension Service was intended. The President said that there were two parts to the budget cuts in MES. In the first phase, when the University had to make cuts because of the rescission, MES was not cut as much as other units. In the second phase, it was cut more; added together, the two cuts were fair, Dr. Bruininks said. Counties are getting less money and federal funding is flat so the MES took a double hit. The timing of the changes was driven by MES and the need to plan. No one should be surprised by the news, he said; there was a plan last year to move in the directions announced and it is necessary because the cuts are substantial. This is a natural evolution accelerated by a decline in federal, state, and county support, Dr. Bruininks said, as well as University cuts. But MES was not treated unfairly in the face of the historic cuts the University faces. The University was not asked by the legislature to cut outreach, the President added, but in the face of the magnitude of the cuts, it must be understood by everyone that MES and the Agricultural Experiment Stations would share in the budget reductions. Many Twin Cities deans have acknowledged that the cuts in these areas have been fair.

Next year will not be any easier, the President pointed out, but he hoped the University would have the luxury of a few months to talk about budget cuts.

The President responded to a query from Professor Feeney by telling him that the budget information would be available to the Committee within the next week to 10 days. The results are public now, he said. They may be public to the deans and internally, Professor Balas responded, but not to the faculty; can he see the cut in his college, IT? Those data are not in the summary sheets yet, the President said, because the deans are still talking about the numbers. May the Committee see the numbers, Professor Feeney asked? The President said it could, and cautioned that it may not like or agree with them. But they can be talked about and the administration can learn from any mistakes; most decisions are correctable through investments, new revenues, or changes in programs, the President observed. This was NOT an easy set of budget decisions to make, he emphasized.

The President and the Committee discussed several elements of the current and pending budgets and upcoming budget decisions, including the relationship between tuition increases and budget cuts.

The Committee also discussed with the President the implications of a "high tuition, high aid" philosophy, which could mean redirection of state funds from the University (and MNSCU) into financial aid for students. For the state to move in that direction would be a major risk for graduate and professional programs (in which 40% of the students at the University are enrolled) and the research infrastructure. The change would mean the University would have to substantially increase the number of non-resident students in order to achieve the necessary revenues--something the University could likely not achieve in the near future. The Committee should discuss this issue, the President urged, because there would be a lot of trade-offs. This is something to worry about and it is a major potential threat to the University.

That program is the foot in the door for vouchers, Professor Ratliff-Crain said. But those who advocate it do not like the term vouchers, Professor Campbell commented.

The Committee spent a few moments examining some tables and graphs the President distributed. Plans call for investments in (1) academic programs of \$4 million (recurring) in 2003-04 and an additional \$8.5 million (recurring) in 2004-05, and (2) in students of \$4 million (recurring) in 2003-04 and an additional \$9.5 million (recurring) in 2004-05.

As a follow-up, Professor Morrison asked Mr. Pfutzenreuter what the base cut on the academic side of the University would be in the first year of the biennium. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said he did not have the number because it will be composed of a reduction in fringe benefit costs, increased tuition revenues, an increased internal IRS tax, and targeted reductions. It would help to have that number, Professor Morrison said, because it will be a much larger number than the \$4 million to be invested in academic programs. (The President and Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed emphatically.) That number would help put in perspective what is being restored. It may be that there will be \$25 million cut across the University from academic programs and \$4 million would be restored. No one says the investments will equal the cuts, the President pointed out; that is the point. By keeping investments in the game, however, the University can make targeted investments to strengthen selected areas.

Professor Morrison said that the Committee is hearing from the department heads, about their own units, that the teaching complement is down, the number of courses will be reduced, and the cuts will

have a severe impact on the ability of departments to deliver instruction. That may be the result of cuts of this size, the President agreed. He said he has repeatedly emphasized to external groups at every opportunity that the University cannot cut its way into the future. One result of the cuts, however, will be that not all qualified students will be admitted.

The President and the Committee discussed how the University might approach its capital request in the future.

With respect to the presentation of budget data to the Committee in the near future, Professor Balas asked if it would be for consultation or "this is what we are going to do"? The President said the numbers are getting pretty firm but the Committee and the administration could have an understanding about what would need to be changed next year. For example, he said, the tuition levels proposed for next year cannot be changed at this point. The numbers will also show deep cuts in central administration--to the point, the President said, that he did not see how it would be possible to take more out. University Services alone will see a reduction of about \$6 million.

The Committee and the President had a discussion about the definition of "central administration" when cuts were being discussed, and whether, for example, Facilities Management is appropriately included in "central administration."

Professor Martin asked what relationship existed between the budget principles enunciated by this Committee earlier in the year and the actual budget cuts being proposed by the administration. The President said there was a high degree of overlap; he at one point had laid them side by side with the administration's proposals and found a significant correlation. He pointed out that some of the "principles" forwarded from the Committee were really tactics, not principles, and that those were largely included under budget strategies.

Professor Erdman commented that some believe the retirement incentives were a little late. The proposal was to improve health care coverage, the President said; colleges can offer terminal leaves or phased retirement for faculty. The deans are reluctant to offer buy-out packages. He said he would welcome ideas. Units have fairly good tools; he said he believed phased retirement was the best deal for the University and the individual. The plans cannot be too rich or there is a risk that a rebate mentality develops, Professor Feeney cautioned. A lot of people have been hurt by the decline in the stock market, the President pointed out. Professor Speaks said he was worried about this one-time plan: Those who are 4-5 years or more from retirement, the plan offers no incentive; for those who were thinking about it anyway, the plan is a bonanza. The plan is not a big advantage to the faculty, the President agreed.

Are the deans doing any targeted reductions in their planning, Professor Feeney asked? Most are, the President said. Colleges are merging departments, conducting internal searches, closing centers, and so on. They are not saying a lot about the plans but the plans for big cuts are getting out.

If the revenue forecast in the fall is bad and another rescission is required, how will the University plan for it, Professor Speaks asked? They are talking about the possibility, the President said, and there are not a lot of simple solutions; it would be very difficult. About 60% of the money for academic units is in CLA, IT, the Medical School, the Extension Service, and the Experiment Stations on the Twin Cities campus. If there were to be a substantial rescission, it is not true that the University could make a lot of

targeted reductions. The President said, however, that he did not expect there would be a substantial rescission.

With more lead time for cuts next year, how does he see faculty governance more involved than in the last few months, Professor Balas asked? There will be more time to talk about the budget and it will be possible to look at modeling as well as core principles, the President said. The faculty want to be part of the painful process, Professor Balas said. The faculty were not involved this year; why not, Professor Campbell asked? The President said he did not agree that the faculty were not involved; they were involved in discussions about core principles, the budget model submitted to the Board of Regents, the 2002-03 rescission, tuition, and many other areas, although they did not talk about the numbers in each of the units, especially with the rescission.

Professor Campbell observed that the University has had substantial tuition increases the last few years; up until this year, the Finance and Planning Committee and this Committee talked about the proposals thoroughly and they had a full airing before a decision was made. The President said he believed he needed to say something early but perhaps did not talk enough about them--and he also thought that there was not a lot to talk about, given the budget situation.

There will be a lot to talk through once the dust settles, the President said. He said he will be fair and direct and is prepared to take criticism, and will try to consult more next time. He felt he needed to get something out early in order to settle issues for students and legislators: Given the current situation, he felt there would be double-digit tuition increases, because there is no other way the University could have handled the budget situation. He said the University needed to make that clear without being offensive. The President said he would review what has happened and what can be done differently.

Professor Speaks assured the President that he could count on the Committee on Finance and Planning, and this Committee, to go off the record and hold matters in confidence. The substitute process has not worked. The Budget Advisory Committee discussions have been good but selecting four representatives from this and the Finance and Planning Committee to serve as a consulting body did not work. That takes the consultation out of the governance system and puts it into a kitchen cabinet; people are disenfranchised. The President said he did not realize the extent to which issues had not been brought to the committees; he said he was comfortable with the governance system and willing to put in time with it.

Professor Morrison asked about the state's revenue receipts; Mr. Pfutzenreuter said they were roughly on target but that the year-end will be key. Professor Speaks recalled that Professor Stinson, the State Economist, had said the problems are not over at the end of the next biennium. Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed that they are not. The problem is with the Minnesota tax system, the President said; it leads to a roller-coaster effect.

Professor Sampson observed that the University has ended up with more flexibility in deciding how to respond to the budget problems than it might have (had, for example, the legislature mandated specific kinds of expenditures on items of interest to specific legislative districts). That is a significant accomplishment of the University leadership, which has succeeded in maintaining that flexibility. Ironically, however, that accomplishment in turn has increased faculty concern about how the University leadership will use or is using the flexibility.

The President said he thought the situation had been handled well, on balance. He said he was aware of the restlessness and concern internally. He said he wanted to keep the public focus on higher education and budget carefully internally, including seeking private funds and focusing on the needs of graduate and professional education.

The approaches to consultation vary widely, Professor Ratliff-Crain said, and a lot of faculty are frustrated because they do not know what is going on in their own colleges. With tougher cuts coming in the next year, it would help if there were some models about the way consultation in the units was done well.

4. Report from the Student Academic Integrity Committee

Professor Feeney next welcomed Professor Anderson and Ms. Hackett to the meeting for a report from the Student Academic Integrity Committee.

Professor Anderson provided a brief overview of the work of the Committee. It began in spring, 2001, with the report from the Clayton Committee and trying to identify what it should do. The Committee talked a lot about an honor code but decided against recommending one because after reviewing codes from a lot of places, it concluded that such codes work with smaller and more homogeneous student bodies. They decided there needed to be more of a grass-roots effort in the units, and that has been their focus. They have dealt with Orientation, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and other offices on issues of academic integrity. The subject is brought up at the new faculty orientation, in departments, and is now included in Admissions materials. They are getting the word out in a much better way than used to be the case.

The committee and Ms. Hackett have had ongoing discussions with Dr. Donald McCabe at Rutgers University, who has studied academic integrity across the United States in both public and private institutions for decades. They have looked at his materials and revised some of them for the University. They will use his questionnaires with a sample of the University in order to get baseline data on what academic integrity means to students and faculty; they thought they should do that before they try to fix what might not be broken. With more attention to the subject, Professor Anderson reported, there have been more reports of breaches of academic integrity, which helps make faculty more aware of the issue and more likely to deal with a classroom problem. The surveys will help the Committee identify where to direct its efforts.

Ms. Hackett has encouraged the more systematic collection of information to inform the Committee's agenda. They want to use focus groups to get discussions going and in order to build a better base of attention to academic integrity, Professor Anderson said. They were disheartened by the number of seniors who were reported for cheating last year. It is important to start with students at the beginning, but there must also be a burr under juniors and seniors about the continuing value of academic integrity to their future careers.

Once the survey results are in she will be better able to answer the question, Professor Kruttschnitt said, but does she have any idea now whether the prevalence of academic integrity problems is greater or lower than at other institutions? Ms. Hackett said they did not know, which is why they are going to use McCabe's instrument, in order that they can compare results. Students sometimes normalize behavior that faculty and administrators do not see as appropriate. There is some Internet cheating but

approximately 40% of it is still from books and papers. One result of additional work with departments and campuses is that there are more cases, Ms. Hackett said; this year, so far, they have 146 cases, versus the mere 30 cases reported in 2000-01, the year before the Office of Student Academic Integrity was established. The word is getting out and faculty feel supported. They also provide a lot of consultation on cases that do not formally get to her office. In 75-80% of the cases reported, when something has gone awry faculty are communicating directly with the student about the offense--that discussion of a breach of trust can provide as much value and attention as the reporting of the violation itself.

They are also seeing more repeat offenders, Ms. Hackett commented. The numbers are small but they are appearing. These are people who, before, faculty might have given the benefit of the doubt and patted on the head. Is the ante up for these students, Professor Kruttschnitt asked? Two times and they are out, Ms. Hackett said. If they sabotage another student's work, they are expelled after the first incident.

Does she feel that they have adopted uniform penalties, so there are like penalties for like offenses, Professor Speaks asked? Ms. Hackett said the penalties are markedly similar.

They are also seeing tipsters come forward, she told the Committee. They will call her office or tell faculty when other students are boastful about what they have done.

Professor Anderson reported that her college recently reviewed its honor code, which dates from 1915, and she was surprised at how students wanted something with more teeth. As a result of the changes they recommended, there have been a number of cases (compared to perhaps one case in the previous 15 years). The students feel more empowered about calling Ms. Hackett's office or the college office, she said. There is nothing more frustrating for a student that to see cheating and believe that nothing will happen, Professor Ratliff-Crain commented. One tipster reported on what looked like widespread cheating in a major, Ms. Hackett recalled, and there was an investigation by an emeritus faculty member. That led to a major awakening by faculty and students.

Professor Ratliff-Crain said that he was glad to see movement on this issue, because there were a lot of questions in 1999, when the Clayton Committee issued its report. Ms. Hackett said she was very pleased to work with the Committee and to make small deliberate changes but not to create a chasm between faculty and students over the issue.

Is the cheating more graduate or undergraduate, Professor Kruttschnitt asked? Probably more undergraduate, Ms. Hackett said, but they will have the numbers at the end of the year. They are seeing more and more students 25 years and older who may be undergraduates, graduate students, or professional students, and there is a cluster in one graduate major--more than one would expect, and it is disturbing, given the profession that those students are going into.

Nor is the cheating primarily by one sex or the other, Professor Anderson said. This year the charges involve 84 males and 62 females, Ms. Hackett reported; the women are catching up, and especially older women. Ms. Hackett said she would be presenting information to the Council of Undergraduate Deans, the Academic Integrity Committee, and college records custodians so that colleges can do their own analyses.

Is there information on a website so faculty know where to go, Professor Feeney asked? There is, Ms. Hackett said.

Are they convinced the plagiarism is malice-based, Professor Feeney asked? Or is there a chance students did not know they should not copy materials from the web? It is both, Professor Anderson and Ms. Hackett replied. There is a third reason, Professor Ratliff-Crain offered: pressure on students. They have more to lose. One part of the effort to collect information should include asking what led students to cheat. That will help get to issues of prevention. Some students need the additional degree for a salary raise, Ms. Hackett agreed. She said she wants to emphasize the certainty of consequences for high-risk behavior, and there is more information about course expectations, which makes it easier to hold students accountable.

Professor Clayton said he found the discussion at this meeting very gratifying. At the end of the period when the Clayton Committee finished its work, they had no way of knowing where things would go. It appears the recommendations are being implemented with great sensitivity and intelligence.

Professor Feeney thanked Professor Anderson and Ms. Hackett for joining the meeting and then adjourned it at 3:40.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota