

Minutes\*

**Senate Consultative Committee  
January 6, 1994  
12:30 - 3:00  
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Judith Garrard (chair), John Adams, Amanda Geist, Love Goel, James Gremmels, Erick Harper, Derek Jensen, Robert Jones, Tom Lopez, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Toni McNaron, Harvey Peterson, Linda Pham, Sandy Pham, Irwin Rubenstein, Anne Sales, Rabun Taylor, Shirley Zimmerman
- Regrets: Mario Bognanno, Lester Drewes, Kenneth Heller
- Absent: Dale Vathauer
- Guests: Associate Dean Marjorie Cowmeadow (Chair, Select Committee), Professor Frank Wood (Chair, Social Concerns Committee), Beth Zemsky (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Program Office)(all for the Report of the Select Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns); Vice President Anne Petersen; Professor Megan Gunnar (SCEP), Associate to the Vice President Linda Ellinger (Arts, Sciences, and Engineering)
- Others: Rich Broderick, Maureen Smith (both University Relations)

[In these minutes: Final Report, Select Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns; Research Strategic Planning Committee; Policy on Advanced Placement Credits]

**1. Select Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns**

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 12:30, amid scattered lunches, and welcomed Associate Dean Cowmeadow, Professor Wood, and Ms. Zemsky to discuss the final report of the Select Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns. Professor Wood observed that the report had originally come to the Senate Committee on Social Concerns; the Select Committee was its subcommittee. He complimented Dean Cowmeadow on the work of the Select Committee and noted that the Social Concerns Committee has a continuing interest in the issue and would follow up on the report.

Dean Cowmeadow then noted that many had contributed to the report, including the two individuals who preceded her as chair of the Select Committee. She briefly outlined the development of the report, including the issuance of an interim report last year at the request of President Hasselmo because of certain events that occurred (hate mail and calls, death threats, feces sent through the mail). She recommended that Committee members read the environmental assessment portion of the report, if nothing else; the Select Committee had been asked by the President and SCC to evaluate the climate for

---

\*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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgender [hereinafter GLBT] individuals--and found it "toxic." The campus is not a safe and secure place for GLBT students. As a result of the incidents, the interim report made five recommendations:

- A GLBT program office (located in 419 Walter Library; Ms. Zemsky is coordinator, hired one month ago).
- Full University benefits and privileges for GLBT families (there has been some progress--done in Rec Sports, resident tuition for partners, child care for employees, full dental coverage; the University and state have fallen short in medical benefits, where reimbursement is provided, which does not cover pre-existing conditions). Asked if a minor child is covered, as is the case with a single parent, Dean Cowmeadow said the child would be if the offspring of the employee--but would not be if the offspring of the employee's partner unless the child were to be legally adopted by the employee. That process has other mine fields. The University policy does help, but the individual must put up the money initially and obtain reimbursement; the amount can be as much as \$1200, which is a burden for many employees.

Open enrollment would work fine for a GLBT employee, Dean Cowmeadow affirmed in response to a question. If she were to marry a male, that spouse would be added without question. If, however, she had a female partner, that individual would have to find a carrier on the open market and coverage would depend on medical history.

- A GLBT studies program (now being considered by the faculty in collegiate units; a faculty issue).
- An educational training program about GLBT concerns; this is something the GLBT office coordinator would take on.
- Update all University printed materials (in process). This review, under a task force chaired by Carol Carrier and Pat Mullen, will look at forms: first it is looking at policies, then forms, and finally bulletins and other materials.

One Committee member inquired if a student would be able to obtain a degree in lesbian studies, for example. Dean Cowmeadow said that would need to be discussed by those doing research in the area. The University has a number of courses that deal, in whole or in part, with GLBT concerns, and faculty involved are discussing them. At some institutions the choice has been made to establish a center, which focuses on research and scholarship, rather than degrees. Anything to do with departments and degrees will have to be evolutionary, she said, because many in the University are not convinced that degrees are the way to go and that a center is more appropriate. Students always have the option of individually-designed degree programs so such studies could be a significant part of a degree for those who wished.

Are there other issues and concerns beyond the five recommendations, asked one Committee member, that the Select Committee decided not to focus on now but that could arise in a few years? Dean Cowmeadow explained how the five recommendations were arrived at and said there was much more that could be done. When the President asked for action, the question was "what is most essential?" These

five begin the journey to help the University as a community grow.

Ms. Zemsky was asked what services the GLBT program office would provide. She reported that the requests she has already received--at a time when she is hard to find--include students with advocacy concerns (e.g., harassment in labs), designing degree programs, insurance, and community resources and counseling referrals. One prospective student inquired about attending the University because of the existence of the office.

Asked if her office would be like other learning resource offices, Ms. Zemsky said she was not sure. It is unlikely that her office would offer tutoring, for example. The first goal is an on-line information referral system (on Gopher); another is a speaker's bureau. Other projects include meeting with constituent groups to obtain views of what the office priorities should be. Later in the meeting, Ms. Zemsky told the Committee that she reports to Associate Vice President Carrier.

In response to a question, Ms. Zemsky said that her focus, the first year, will be on the Twin Cities campus, but that when information is on Gopher, all of the campuses should be aided. Ms. Zemsky affirmed she is working with other information referral systems (such as First Call for Help) and also working with the eight other universities that have such offices. This one is unique, she said, in that the others are all in offices of student affairs and oriented to students; this one is in Academic Affairs with larger responsibilities.

Asked if her office would coordinate with other efforts, such as in housing, Ms. Zemsky said that would be a good idea. Her first year will be devoted to building a structure so the program will be known, and to meeting a lot of people around the campus. She will also do consultation or training, as appropriate, or work with others who are providing training. She said she would also continue to document the campus climate.

Inasmuch as her office is unique, its activities should be publicized to other institutions, said one Committee member. The Select Committee report will be on Gopher, so nationally available, Dean Cowmeadow observed. She and Ms. Zemsky have also attended a national conference on the issues--and such a conference may be held at the University next spring.

It is to be hoped that Ms. Zemsky has time to periodically write up what she is doing for publication, said one Committee member; another emphasized that dissemination would be important not for the eight institutions that have such offices but for the hundreds that do NOT. Ms. Zemsky was urged to find the time to include research and writing as part of the job. Ms. Zemsky thanked Committee members for their suggestions and said she was encouraged by the support it demonstrated. What the University is doing, she said, will be seen as a model for the country.

Professor Garrard thanked the three individuals for joining the meeting and keeping SCC informed.

## **2. Research Strategic Planning Committee**

Professor Garrard then welcomed Vice President Anne Petersen to discuss the Executive Summary of the Research Strategic Planning Committee [hereinafter RSPC] report. Dr. Petersen began by noting that a year ago she appointed a group to look at research issues in the University; initially it focussed on

research and scholarship, but eventually realized it could not separate them from graduate education because the two were so intertwined. The report thus considers research and post-baccalaureate education.

This planning began before U2000 emerged; there then arose the question of whether or not this effort should be merged or integrated into the U2000 process. The committee decided to continue its efforts; it now provides the research and post-baccalaureate education focus of the strategic planning process.

A number of issues emerged as a result of the committee's work, Dr. Petersen said. First, the University has long been among the top research universities in the country, recognized in many ways (it was cited as among the top 20 in a SCIENCE article in 1906). It continues to be in that group, although not everyone in Minnesota is aware of that. There are signs, however, that this is a time of risk for the University (to take the negative view) or a time of opportunity (to take the positive). There are a lot of reports suggesting that the research environment is going to change and that research universities are under fire, so it is important that the University have a clear idea of what it is and where it is going--so that at the end of the transition it remains a top university. (When she was being recruited, Dr. Petersen related, she was persuaded by the President's statement that through tough times, the University must emerge on top.)

The recommendations of the report note the areas where attention must be focussed. The committee also concluded that the process of looking must be continuous--issues of quality, diversity, and support for research and post-baccalaureate education must be a continuing part of planning.

Did the committee, in its deliberations, talk about "right-sizing" graduate programs at the University? inquired one Committee member. It established proposed indicators, but did it gather any information suggesting that smaller programs should be closed or how to make a DECISION--because gathering data does not inevitably lead to a decision. The Johnson Committee review of the Graduate School focussed on quality, Dr. Petersen responded, but there is a question of critical mass. The Graduate School is now asking programs to consider how they are educating graduate students. We hope to focus more on the educational process. We will then annually examine data within the framework of program goals and educational model. One recent report on doctoral programs, by Bowen and Rudenstine [A Secret Success: Master's Degree Education in the United States, a report from an AAU committee chaired by President Hasselmo], suggest that one must have three doctoral graduates per year to continue to have sufficient critical mass. By that criterion, half the doctoral programs at the University may be too small. But the debate about size must also consider the educational model of the program; size is important for the peer cohort model but may be less so with apprentice (single faculty member with one student) model. (One Committee member observed that there is another approach--laissez faire--to which Dr. Petersen replied she hoped not many fell in that category.)

One Committee member recalled being at a faculty meeting, a question at which was about the process of devolving some Graduate School administrative functions to departments. In light of the RSPC criteria being advanced, some faculty asked whether or not there is an enhanced need for a means to ensure that program quality is maintained--as external controls on admissions and performance are modified. The faculty, for instance, have wanted control over admissions, but there is a University interest in maintaining overall quality. How does the devolution of control square with efforts to build

quality?

Dr. Petersen replied that the Graduate School is relinquishing control over admission to graduate faculty status and the admission of students--but the units must have standards and there will be Graduate School review. Units may not, for example, simply admit any student willing to pay tuition. But how will the Graduate School respond or control quality? Dr. Petersen said it is an illusion that controlling admissions means controlling quality; the Graduate School will look at what goes on throughout a department, not rely on one measure. The data will be broadly shared; we hope, Dr. Petersen said, that both the data itself and the scrutiny by Graduate School deans and Policy and Review Councils will encourage quality-supporting efforts.

There is a lag, it was pointed out; improvement or deterioration takes a long time. The University still brags about programs that were strong in the 1950s. Dr. Petersen said that the Graduate School deans and Councils will examine program data annually--something that has not happened previously. Although reputation has significant lag time, other indicators are more responsive to changes in effectiveness. This will be formative evaluation, intended to be an ongoing look at a program. And there need NOT be a 10-year lag, she added, pointing out that one can look at admissions data immediately and at other measures.

One just needs to be assured, Dr. Petersen was told. Faculty who have worked with the Graduate School for a long time understand that knowing it will do something modifies behavior. The Graduate School will be paying attention, she assured the Committee, and there will be calls to units if individual decisions or averages start to look bad. She is saying, she told the Committee, that responsibility for quality rests both with the program and the Graduate School. She added that she was uncomfortable with the practice of programs telling the Graduate School to make their decisions--and the faculty of the program, as a result, not being engaged in the issues.

Responsible programs will stay responsible, it was said, and it isn't clear what will become of irresponsible programs. Nor is it clear what button one must push to make them responsible. The numbers are small, but everyone knows there are some. Dr. Peterson said she hoped that data would quickly and clearly reveal program irresponsibility.

In response to a query, Dr. Petersen said the Graduate School would continue to assist in reviewing records from foreign universities. It is trying to be there to support programs, she said, and does the oversight to ensure quality.

One Committee member then inquired where the teeth in the RSPC report were. How will it be enforced? One rumor that did not appear in the report was that TA funds should be centralized in the Graduate School. It seems that the Graduate School must control resources important to departments if it is to have any influence over them, since it has no hierarchical leverage. The funds it controls now are too small to give it any control. How could things be restructured so the Graduate School would have an incentive system?

Dr. Petersen said she would be delighted to control TA funds; the only alternative is jaw-boning. Responsibility Center Management [hereinafter RCM; see FCC minutes of this same date for a more extended discussion of RCM] might be a terrific way to go, but there would be risks--quality issues are

problematic. If the carrots rest with admitting a lot of students in order to obtain the tuition revenue, quality may decline. There must be something built-in to ensure quality.

One could say, in answer to the question posed about Graduate School control of funds, observed another Committee member, that fellowship dollars should be awarded to units on a block-grant basis for five years--with the requirement that the unit defend its decisions on a competitive basis in year four. Programs would be judged on performance criteria. There must be carrots to improve quality, but they should not be annual. The Graduate School should not control TA dollars, but it should fellowship dollars, and it has not used its control in a strategic way to put programs on alert. The faculty do not own those funds.

The real problem, Dr. Petersen said, is that there are too few of the fellowship funds. The University has \$4 million; Michigan, by comparison, has \$20 million.

One Committee member expressed pleasure at seeing support for strategic initiatives in cross-cutting research and graduate education. What will the timetable for these cluster activities be? Dr. Petersen said that the cluster planning process has been slowed down because the administration is persuaded it must think more carefully about it. The issues will be brought to the table. RCM, if proposed, must have support for interdisciplinary activities built in as well. If the University is to remain in the top 20, maintained one Committee member, it must ensure that there is support for interdisciplinary activities. Dr. Petersen agreed. One mechanism, even under RCM, would be to require units to use X% of their resources on interdisciplinary work--and this would still require review to see that the activities were meaningful. Dr. Petersen said she did not have the answers to many of these questions and would welcome ideas and suggestions.

It is to be hoped, said one Committee member, that the RSPC does not overlook the Morris campus, because research is important for tenure there as well. Students are discovering, when they apply for graduate school, that providing evidence they can do research is helpful. UROP has been very beneficial as a way for faculty to involve undergraduates in research. Dr. Petersen agreed and acknowledged that there is very little in the report on undergraduate research. Her fear, she said, is that the report will only be read by five people--she has been trying to find people who can read it and identify errors. The report explicitly includes Duluth, she noted, and focusses mostly on the Twin Cities, but should also cover Morris, she agreed.

Her office, one Committee member then observed, will be critical when talking about improvement of graduate education--when funds are going more to undergraduate education. This Committee has heard that concern expressed--that research and graduate education will be bled to create undergraduate excellence. If the University is to have both, the Graduate School must insist that all faculty members have graduate students!

Her office must, it was argued, set up a regular procedure to evaluate programs that could include the possibility of elimination. She will be the most hated person on campus if such a procedure is not created--and doing so would be almost unheard of, since program reviews NEVER lead to the elimination of departments.

Dr. Petersen noted that some reviews have called for program elimination but agreed that this

would be a problem. Having program data called for by the report available with the reviews will help. She said she is prepared to move on the recommendation to close small programs; the Graduate School has done so with ones that have not had a graduate student in the last five years--but that's pretty easy. She said that thoughts should be less about closure (although some should be closed) than about combinations, especially where a program is small but very good.

"I do not agree with Bowen and Rudenstine," said one Committee member; there is no absolute number of students that a graduate program should have in order to continue to exist. One should also look at the graduate student experience and subsequent activities of the graduates. But there must be a way to insulate her office from being identified as destroying graduate activities. And the process of review must include peers or it will be overturned.

Dr. Petersen concurred with the last point. What is now in place, she said, is not good enough. The RSPC report suggests combining examination of the data with strengthening of the regular review process so that a decision to change programs can emerge. There have been program closures as a result of reviews, although it would not be true to say that they were handled smoothly.

Dr. Petersen was then asked if her role includes promoting and protecting faculty who want to engage in external collaboration. It was recalled that there had been an administrative attempt in the health sciences to restrict external collaboration. Faculty are concerned, as the University moves to a provost system in the health sciences and a more competitive marketplace, that they not be restricted in working with hospitals and units not affiliated with the University--but appropriate to their research. The role of the Vice President for Research should take precedence over health sciences financial issues.

Dr. Petersen said she felt strongly that her office should protect academic freedom and academic integrity issues. Her office can play a more objective role in protecting academic freedom because it does not have turf interests or financial gain. This is only a potential problem, it was said--no one is arguing that it has happened yet. But academic freedom is academic freedom--faculty should be able to collaborate with anyone they want to.

Is it the sentiment of the Committee, inquired one of its members, to recommend that a review mechanism be developed? The concern is to protect Dr. Petersen's office, it was said; it would be bad for everyone--faculty and graduate students--if her office were under attack. One way to do so, said another, is to have clearly stated and explicit criteria with participation in their development so there is support for the evaluation process. Does the Committee agree "in principle"? it was asked. It may be that Dr. Petersen needs faculty support for even making the suggestion (she affirmed that she would appreciate it).

Dr. Petersen was asked what conversations she has had with the deans about these initiatives. There are too many inconsistencies about where resources are managed, where the work to be done is managed, and the source of the criteria by which performance will be judged. The three elements are often in different places--and they need to be aligned. It is hard to imagine how the devolution of responsibilities to units in CLA, for example, can be effected without a partnership between Drs. Petersen and Davis. Or how it can be effected if unit leadership is unstable (which is often the case), faculty and graduate students are doing their work, and with the college administration not sure what it can manage. It is not clear how the question of reviews can be resolved.

Responsibility Centered Management, Dr. Peterson responded, clarifies where the buck stops: in the units. But RCM has only been tried at one public institution, although in a number of private universities. Under RCM the dean knows clearly where the revenues come from and what the expenses are--and the Graduate School becomes an expense. The dean's first question, in the private institutions, is why they are paying for the Graduate School? One presentation to the Council of Graduate Schools told that the institutions had concluded that the services being provided were of value. But RCM does raise the issue of who has responsibility and authority more sharply, and resources become the locus of authority more than in other systems.

Asked if quality has been a concern where RCM has been adopted, Dr. Petersen said that everyone involved would have to look very closely at the model. The vice presidents are in the discussions, she told the Committee. RCM focuses on dollars and quality will have to be built in. One could argue that the market demands quality, but that is a very long-term influence--one can sell quality for a long time while going downhill. There have to be checks for quality built in because the market takes too long to work.

Dr. Petersen was asked if the fact that some of the applied Master's programs are not under the Graduate School is an issue; she said it is. There are unmet demands for Master's degrees but not enough work has been done on them yet. For them to work effectively, they must complement work on the University College concept so that CEE is working with units as the delivery mechanism. At that point the University should look at demand and determine if it--or another institution--can meet it. There could be instances, she said, when the demand exists, and the University is the appropriate school to meet it--but the faculty will not want to do so. It is not clear what the University will do then.

There has not been a lot of attention to Master's degrees, she told the Committee. Bowen and Rudenstine say that it should not be seen as a way station or a booby prize, but rather as a legitimate degree. The University must recognize and attend to that situation. 70% of the graduate degrees the University awards are Master's. One Committee member observed that when people change careers, Master's programs become their entre to a new profession--and it is important that the University attend to those needs. It is a market but it is also a responsibility.

As for programs not in the Graduate School, Dr. Petersen said, some should be and for some it does not matter--but they must still all be evaluated.

One Committee member at this point cautioned that very little was known about Responsibility Centered Management and that background materials had to be provided if the Committee is to consider it. Professor Rubenstein said that the Finance and Planning Committee would look at it.

One Committee member formally proposed that a mechanism be developed to evaluate programs and to permit action based on the information. Dr. Petersen said she would be happy to do so. And it must, it was said, have teeth to it. Data do not speak for themselves, Dr. Petersen pointed out, but if they are linked to the budget allocation process, it can be said the data will be used to make decisions. How that would work under RCM would have to be thought about.

Professor Garrard thanked Dr. Petersen for joining the Committee.

### **3. Announcements**

Professor Garrard made two announcements. First, there will be an SCC meeting on January 20, noon to 1:00, devoted to a briefing on copyright issues. Stage one will be the briefing and discussion; stage two will be consideration of a resolution SCC might bring to the University Senate.

Second, ORTTA has informed her that they will now post grants and contracts announcements from the Federal Register on a DAILY basis on Gopher [the path on Gopher: University of Minnesota Campus Information-->Department and College Information-->Office of Research and Technology Transfer-->LEGI-SLATE Report for the Federal Register]

### **4. Policy on Advanced Placement Credit**

Professor Garrard next welcomed Professor Gunnar and Dr. Ellinger to the meeting to discuss the recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy that the Senate approve the new policy on advanced placement and international baccalaureate credits.

Dr. Ellinger reviewed the genesis of the policy proposal and said the intent was to simplify and liberalize, if appropriate, the awarding of credits for examinations. The small committee that worked on this looked at what other institutions do as well as at a small cohort of students who were admitted to the University with AP credits. It appeared that those students knew what they needed to.

There are also external factors, Dr. Ellinger told the Committee. One, information from the Admissions Office is that the brightest prospective students are asking questions about the credits they will receive for AP work--and there is anecdotal evidence that they are making choices on the basis of the response they receive. The University's practices are so confusing or punitive that they are leading better students to go elsewhere. Two, there is a legislative interest in shortening the path through college for the best students and have asked for a report on statewide practices.

With all of this, assuming that the University wishes to attract students of high ability, and assuming that only good students take AP courses, and even fewer take the exams (and not all pass), the recommendations for change were made. The most sweeping recommendation is that the score for credit on the AP exams be lowered to 3--the number most used nationally.

Asked if students in the international baccalaureate program also take advantage of the post-secondary options program, Dr. Ellinger said the numbers were too small to be able to tell. A lot of those students are going to private institutions.

One Committee member inquired about the percentage of inner city and rural schools that offer AP credit; some may charge extra for them, making it a hardship for students even though they may save money in college later. That, Dr. Ellinger said, was beyond the scope of the committee's work, although it is a legitimate concern. The committee only considered whether or not the University should give credit for the exams (it concluded it should) and if so, how to simplify the process. Again, anecdotal evidence from transcript reviews suggests the credits come from all over the state, although offerings in smaller communities are perhaps more limited.

The international baccalaureate [IB] program is different from advanced placement in that it is an integrated curriculum of study whereas AP tends to be one or more courses.

Asked if there was any sense that students who took the IB course never got off campus, Dr. Ellinger said she did not know. The impetus for the committee and its report was the state of affairs with respect to AP exams--there was insupportable differential in practice among units in terms of the amount of credit they would give and whether they would grant exemptions rather than credits. This proposal calls for the elimination of exemptions and includes a statement that if the examination tests knowledge substantially similar to a University course, credit for that course should be granted; if not substantially equivalent to a course, then credits in the 1999 or 3999 series should be awarded.

Part of the reason for the problem is a confusion over the goals, said one Committee member. If the goal is to get the bachelor's degree as fast as possible, irrespective of whether or not anything is learned, one would take one approach. Another goal might be for students not to duplicate what they already know through another course. What is the University's philosophy?

Professor Gunnar reported that SCEP discussed these issues at some length--and that, indeed, was the main concern. SCEP concluded that the students should receive credits and not be here as long. SCEP was told that even students who come in with AP credits tend not to leave early. SCEP was also concerned about the prospect of bright students going elsewhere--to reject the change could mean the University was biting off it's nose to spite it's face.

This raises a philosophical issue that has not been tackled by the whole strategic planning process: What is this institution about? Is it about more applied degrees at the undergraduate level so students can get into the workforce as quickly as possible? Or about opening doors to people? Those are the extremes, and it is not clear how to resolve the question, but one hopes the University can be consistent in the meantime.

The University has often imposed hurdles for the sake of hurdles, and the practice shows up in funny places. This change would make the University more user-friendly.

Dr. Ellinger confirmed that the intent of the proposed policy is that if a student comes in with 15 AP credits, he or she could graduate one quarter early. That is, she pointed out, the present policy as well. The credits would count. The highest number of AP credits any student has come in with has been 55. Any opportunity to graduate early, noted one Committee member, also depends on whether or not the student can get into needed courses.

Is there a feedback mechanism to secondary schools? Or is the University simply adjusting to what they do? Dr. Ellinger said that AP is a national program, teachers of AP courses are specially trained, and the exams are national. Academic departments can say they will not give credit for the AP exam--that it is not college level--and the University will accept that decision; it will also tell the national AP organization so they know.

One is struck by how few of the overachievers in the metropolitan schools end up in University classrooms. Why not? They should come here because it is the best school in the state. This policy relates to that issue. Dr. Ellinger agreed that it probably plays a small part, although it is a much larger

issue.

The AP and IB teachers are unique and should be used in recruiting, it was said. Dr. Ellinger said the University does nothing in that regard. There is also the issue of comfort level, coming to a place with 40,000 students versus a place like Carleton with 600 students. But that can be overdone, it was said; some go to small schools and transfer here when they should have been here in the first place--but they don't come here because their teachers haven't been here. There are instances in the University where the connection between the AP teachers and the faculty is very good, Dr. Ellinger said.

It is ironic, observed one Committee member, that those farthest away from their freshman year are doing most of the talking. The Student Senate Consultative Committee should be asked to investigate why some of the brightest students go to other institutions. A lot, said another Committee member, has to do with the student's parents; most students in AP classes have parents who came from an Ivy League school. Part, it was observed by another, is the financial aid package. Asked the percentage of AP students who come to the University, one Committee member said that Senior Vice President Infante has those data.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to place the proposed policy on the February 17, University Senate docket.

Professor Garrard then adjourned the meeting at 2:40.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota