

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee March 29, 1990

- Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Karin Alexander, W. Andrew Collins, Martin Conroy, Lance Flores, Eric Huang, Gunnar Johnson, Norman Kerr, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, Burton Shapiro, Michael Steffes, Adam Stenberg, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Tim Wolf
- Guests: John Clark (Senate Committee on Educational Policy), Suzanne Fust (Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA), Rod Jorgenson (Student Senate Consultative Committee), Jordan Kushner (Law Student), Darby Laing (UMD Student Association), Florence Littman (Council of Graduate Students), Barbara Muesing (Regents' Office), Pat Mullen (EEO Office), June Nobbe (SODC), Trudy Ohnsorg (GAPSA), Sunday Olateju (GAPSA), Steven Prince (GAPSA), Tom Scott (newly-elected to SCC for 1990-91), Maureen Smith (Brief), Jim Swick (GAPSA), Rabun Taylor (Footnote)

1. By-law Change, SCEP Chair on SCC

Professor Ibele welcomed Professor John Clark, chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), to the meeting for the first item of business. SCEP had unanimously approved an amendment to the Senate by-laws which would remove the chair of SCEP from the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and place him or her instead as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Consultative Committee. Professor Ibele explained that the Committee had found it useful to have the chair of the Finance committee sit ex-officio on the Consultative Committee; the same argument holds with equal force, he suggested, for the Educational Policy committee chair. Professor Shapiro, chair of the Finance committee, also supported the proposal, saying it made more sense than to have the SCEP chair serve on the Finance committee.

The proposed by-law amendment was approved without objection.

There also appeared to be agreement that the Committee would, by informal understanding, implement immediately the by-law change.

2. Uniform Undergraduate Tuition

Professor Ibele next turned the attention of the Committee to the proposal for uniform undergraduate tuition. He pointed out that action by the Board of Regents had been postponed from March to April in order to give the governance system time to discuss the proposal. Professor Ibele also noted that SCEP had convened three special meetings to discuss the proposal; the statement which resulted from the SCEP deliberations was distributed to the Committee.

Professor Ibele said he believed there were two separable issues with respect to the tuition issue: One is whether or not it should be uniform and how it should be phased in and secondly how resources are allocated internally.

Professor Clark commented that there was much in the report of the Tuition Study Group which

SCEP applauded; the focus of SCEP members had been on the impact of the change on certain undergraduates.

Professor Kerr distributed copies of a letter he had sent to the Daily earlier in the week which, he said, illustrated the results of the present policy (where different groups of students in a class he taught paid different tuition rates--different by as much \$100).

Allusion was made to the minutes of the SCEP meetings; it was said that two things were worth noting. First was the (incorrect) assumption that the College of Biological Sciences would have more students and thus require a bigger budget; those students are CLA biology majors who are already taking CBS courses. They might obtain better advice if they were in CBS but the change would have no implications for need for funding. The second point was that the reason CLA tuition is lower is because CLA is inappropriately funded. The Tuition Study Group did not address this latter issue; when the report goes to the Senate a strong statement about funding for CLA must be included. CLA, it was said, is a college where a student receives 4 credits for going to class three hours per week, which automatically makes it cheaper by about one-third. It also has the highest percentage of graduate students doing the teaching. As these practices are eliminated, it was argued, its costs will be similar to those of other colleges. The University must make sure that the funding in CLA "comes up to snuff" as the President's Initiative on Excellence in Undergraduate Education is implemented over the next few years.

Another Committee member suggested that internal funding should parallel the agreement reached between the University and the legislature: If there are shifts in enrollment as a result of the uniform tuition policy, funding for CLA should remain, at a minimum, level--it should not be cut even if its enrollment declines.

It was pointed out that some of the high-cost colleges are high-cost at least in part because they provide very fine services to their students. Other colleges are low-cost because they cannot afford to offer these services at the same level--yet these are exactly the kinds of things to which students in the low-cost colleges would like to have access. The uniform tuition policy will lead to students in low-cost college paying more in order to continue to provide those services in the high-cost programs; students have every right to complain about that. Unless there can be some assurances of equalization, they cannot be blamed and their skepticism is well-founded.

Professor Ibele pointed out to Committee members that the uniform tuition policy will be up for action at the Regents' meetings on April 4 and 5. This means, one Committee member concluded, that the matter will not go to the Senate for discussion; another said the process used illustrated what is wrong with so many of the task forces that are appointed. This task force was appointed outside of the Senate structure, it made a report to the President which was forwarded to the Board of Regents, and the faculty governance system was left "out of the loop" on an issue which is certainly one of educational policy. The report was a good one but did not provide supporting data so that people could understand how task force members reached the conclusions they did. This report perhaps cannot be stopped but the Committee should ask that in the future these reports be provided to the governance structure so that there is sufficient time to review them.

Concern about the fact that services are not equitably provided across all units was emphasized.

In the past this inequity has been partially justified by the different tuition levels; once that differential has been removed all substantive arguments for disparate provision of services disappears. There must be a well-accepted and broadly-articulated commitment to quality of services for students--who will all be paying the same. Professor Clark concurred and pointed out that this issue goes beyond services; it goes also to the manner in which instruction is delivered: without a guarantee that these issues will at least be looked at the leveling of tuition becomes very questionable. SCEP, he reported, generally supports the leveling notion, even though there are no data, but without some attention to the issues brought up at this meeting it would be foolhardy to implement the plan. Another Committee member pointed out that CLA has low costs because it teaches large classes--which does not mean that is the optimal method for teaching those classes; that gets the argument completely backwards.

Another point made was that since the Senate has voted in favor of the 1:1 ratio between credits and contact hours, the elimination of 4 credits for 3 class hours per week has cost consequences. The faculty cannot be expected to do 33% more teaching. If faculty do not increase their teaching, students will have to enroll in more courses, which for CLA students will also mean a significant increase in tuition.

It was suggested that Professor Ibele bring to the Board of Regents, when he makes his comments at the meeting, the concerns of the Committee about the uniform tuition rate. It was clarified that Professor Ibele would not appear until after the tuition change had been taken up by the Board (although this ordering of the agenda was not intentional) but the concerns of the Committee would be communicated to the Regents in advance of the meeting and he would be present at the meeting to respond to questions. Ms. Muesing pointed out that the Regents would likely welcome comments from Professor Ibele if he requested time on the agenda when the report was being discussed.

It appeared that there was a general consensus in favor of uniform undergraduate tuition, with the exception that CLA students oppose it, but the sense of the group was that there are a number of issues involved which have not been adequately dealt with. Another Committee member suggested that a very specific sequencing of events be called for if the proposal is to be implemented; SCEP has raised a number of serious questions which must be addressed. Professor Clark reported that Associate Vice President Foster has been asked by the President to examine the implications of the policy--but it is disappointing that this step has been taken after the fact.

It was suggested to Professor Ibele that his comments to the Regents include a call for equalization not only of services but also of resources for instruction; there should be changes on both sides of the equation so that as tuition increases for some students there be corresponding improvements in the delivery of education to those who will be paying more. If one lags behind, the process should halt.

If the Senate were to take up this issue, it was suggested, there would perhaps not be much new said. What the Senate might focus on is the proper allocation of resources for providing education rather than the fee structure itself. Another added that this becomes a tactical matter: Should use be made of this proposed change in the tuition structure to try to accomplish some educational goals which all on the Committee believe are important? SCEP has made it clear that whether or not these goals will be accomplished is open to doubt. The Senate, it was agreed, could not bring about

accomplishment of the goals, either, but it could reinforce the demand that something be done.

Professor Clark reported that SCEP had made this point about financial aid: While there was much talk about it, there was no information provided that the additional financial aid would be available. If the increased aid is not available, there will be a considerable hardship worked on a number of students. The financial aid plans must be explicated and aid assured if the tuition plan is to work the way the study group intended.

Another Committee member observed that this policy will lead to the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. Some departments will be seen to be providing more for the tuition dollar and affording an opportunity for a higher salary once the student graduates. Those units will attract students with a better record. This will leave some departments, in CLA in particular, "on the downward track." There seems to be some data which suggest that enrollments will not change noticeably, although Professor Clark declined to predict what effect the policy might have in this respect. He said that there is really no way to know. The data from other institutions suggest that differentiated versus undifferentiated tuition structures seem to have no effect on enrollments by major.

One Committee member suggested that this should be seen as a very limited measure which does not solve all the problems; it solves only specific problems and should be measured by that standard. There are a variety of other contingencies which must be provided for. Reading of the SCEP minutes, it was concluded, leads one to conclude that the only fact known is that the changing of the tuition structure will result in a change in the tuition structure; all the other effects predicted are undocumented. The report did not address the increases in tuition which arose from Commitment to Focus or its overall impact and the Committee should express considerable skepticism about its recommendations. Another Committee member pointed out that the change would, however, address the problem illustrated by Professor Kerr's letter.

Professor Clark opined that it would be a mistake to "shoot down" this proposal but inquired if contingencies could be attached to it, contingencies along the line outlined earlier. Another proviso suggested was that such task forces, in the future, be considered advisory both to the central administration and the governance system. Professor Clark also observed, in response to other comments, that the presentation of the report to SCEP was entirely accidental--which was frustrating inasmuch as one of the lead justifications for the recommendations was for reasons of educational policy.

Professor Ibele drew an analogy with the report of the task force on mandatory retirement. Experience suggests that the Senate cannot digest, in its entirety, a report of such complexity; a more effective way to proceed is to bring items separately to be taken up and dealt with. The same might be true of this proposal: There are a number of educational policy implications in the report which could be brought to the Senate for discussion, if not vote, on different occasions. The impact, it was contended, should be monitored over the next few years; the Committee has sufficient serious concerns that reports on its implementation should be required to be sure certain groups of students are not adversely affected. Another Committee member pointed out that with the decline in enrollment there will be annual tuition increases of about 9%; that has not been examined by the study group, nor has the mechanism for reviewing instructional cost allocations. There was agreement by another that

the assessment of instructional costs is not very accurate and exaggerates those costs for the purposes of determining the one-third to be charged to students; it is to be hoped that the Regents share this concern. There was also concurrence with the proposition that the study group did not adequately deal with the increased costs of higher education which result from Commitment to Focus.

It was clarified that the changes in tuition proposed by the policy would not result in increased income to the University; the proposal is revenue-neutral.

Professor Ibele, at the suggestion of Ms. Muesing, said he would prepare a written statement of SCC views for distribution to the Board of Regents prior to their discussion of the uniform tuition proposal.

Professor Ibele thanked Professor Clark for his time and comments.

3. By-law Change, Student Senate Chair on SCC

Mr. Conroy introduced a proposed amendment to the Senate by-laws which would place the chair and the vice chair of the Student Senate on SCC as ex-officio non-voting members; the rationale, he explained, was identical to that proposed for the chair of SCEP.

The Committee voted without objection to approve the amendment but with the change that either the chair or the vice chair could serve on SCC, but not both.

4. Representation of Graduate and Professional Students in Governance

Professor Ibele recalled that SCC had set this meeting as the deadline for reporting and for action on the proposal to grant representation to graduate and professional students in governance. Mr. Conroy reported that he had been asked to meet with the graduate and professional students to see if agreement could be reached. A document which had been formulated by the Student Consultative Committee, which had not been discussed with the graduate and professional student, was distributed to Committee members (which proposed one graduate/professional student on SCC and one on the Committee on Committees). He pointed out that he is not a member of MSA.

Professor Ibele drew the attention of Committee members to a memo from Professor Price concerning representation for graduate and professional students in which she urged that they be granted whatever representation they deem appropriate.

Mr. Conroy reported that he had met with representatives of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) to discuss proposed by-law amendments; the point they had made is that in order for graduate and professional student representatives to the Consultative Committee and Committee on Committees to be appointed, GAPSA had to be created as the body which would appoint the representatives and to which the graduate and professional senators would be accountable. With those changes, the graduate and professional students would find the proposal acceptable.

Mr. Prince from GAPSA joined the discussion and distributed a proposal prepared by GAPSA which would give constitutional and by-law recognition to GAPSA and to graduate/professional

representation on the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees; he noted also that they have dropped their request for representation on several other Senate committees.

In the 45-minute discussion which ensued, the following points were made.

- This proposal from GAPSA came from conversations with Mr. Conroy, not with MSA or with the Student Consultative Committee.
- This proposal calls for two graduate/professional representatives on the Consultative Committee (based on numbers of graduate/professional students and undergraduates on the Twin Cities campus), rather than the one representative proposed by the Student Consultative Committee. A proposal which would only call for graduate and professional student representation on the committees, without creating GAPSA as the body to which those representative would be responsible, would be unacceptable, according to Mr. Prince, because MSA would retain control over appointments.
- The proposal from GAPSA would substantially reduce the time demands on graduate/professional students by releasing them from the obligation to attend MSA meetings as well as those of its committees.
- Coordinate campus representation and the faculty/student ratio on committees is not changed by this proposal.
- If representation is based on enrollment, the Twin Cities undergraduates would constitute the large majority; different groups are given representation to provide different views. This proposal sets a precedent for guaranteeing representation to a variety of different groups. However, it was also noted that coordinate campuses are, by conscious decision, guaranteed seats disproportionate to their numbers; the GAPSA proposal would divide the number of Twin Cities positions among two very different groups of students.
- The proposals from the Student Consultative Committee included an amendment identifying four (which would be one additional) seats on the Committee on Committees for students, one for each of the coordinate campuses.
- If there are to be two graduate/professional students on the Consultative Committee, it should be left up to GAPSA to determine the selection of the representatives (as between graduate students and professional students). The professional and graduate students have more in common with each other than they do with undergraduate students.
- There should not be a graduate or professional student on the Faculty Consultative Committee even though those students may teach.

There is one big issue here, said one faculty member of the Committee: There is a group of people, graduate and professional students, who have chosen to come together to form a group but

who cannot do so officially unless the University Senate says they can. All the other issues being discussed are trivial and muddying up the water.

There appeared to be agreement that the numbers of undergraduate and graduate/professional representatives on the Committee should be determined by the numbers of students represented by each of the two student assemblies.

It was moved and seconded to accept the GAPSA proposal to amend the Senate constitution and by-laws with an amendment which would grant specific seats to four coordinate campus students on the Committee on Committees (which would make the student/faculty ratio on it the same as on the Consultative Committee). Asked if this would then require parallel wording for faculty representation from the coordinate campuses, Professor Ibele said it would not.

Professor Scott, chair of the Committee on Committees, said that this would then be the only committee with specific and mandated representation for each of the coordinate campuses and that he would not, as a general policy matter, be comfortable with the amendment. The Committee on Committees has tried very much to represent coordinate campus interests; this proposal would require some thought. The Committee on Committees, however, it was argued, serves as the gateway to all other committees and it is difficult for coordinate campuses to know what is occurring without a representative. Most Committee members seemed to agree that specified representation is appropriate for the Consultative Committee but not for other committees.

On vote taken, the amendment to the motion failed 4-8. On vote taken, the original motion from GAPSA to amend the Senate constitution and bylaws passed 10-1 with the understanding that the specific number of graduate/professional representatives would be based on the relative numbers of students GAPSA and MSA represent.

It was moved and seconded that the changes proposed by GAPSA to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly constitution and by-laws be adopted. On vote taken, the motion passed 5-3.

A point was made, after that vote, that GAPSA document how students are to be selected, because it is understood that sometimes administrators select students. The provisions on selection, Mr. Prince said, are contained in the GAPSA constitution, and all student senators and committee representatives are chosen by election.

Professor Ibele thanked all of those who have been involved in the process for bringing the issue to closure, acting in good faith, and he extended special thanks to Mr. Conroy for his efforts.

5. Calendar of Senate Meetings

Professor Ibele reported that the calendar of Senate meetings, at the request of the coordinate campus students, has been adjusted to avoid breaks and finals periods. The one exception is the second meeting of Spring Quarter, in May, which cannot be set on an earlier date because doing so would not provide Senate committees sufficient time to complete their business and bring items to the Senate.

It was agreed that the sense of the Committee on this matter should be printed inside the cover of the Senate constitution and by-laws so that it serves as a reminder for future years.

6. Conference on Racial and Ethnic Harmony

Professor Ibele recalled the concern which had been expressed by members of the Jewish community on the occasion of the appearance of Dr. Kwame Ture on campus. This is not the only concern which has been expressed to the President; there have also been acts offensive to blacks, to Asians, and to women which have occurred. Both the President and the FCC issued statements on these matters. Professor Ibele noted that these acts are not limited to the University.

The President has asked the Committee to give some attention to these matters. Professor Ibele reported he would be meeting with a group the following day to discuss them. The question is how the University should respond and what the proper forum for airing the issues might be. There has been a proposal to hold a conference or workshops; Dr. Dolores Cross convened a meeting to discuss the possibilities but it had to be disbanded.

One question is scope: Should the focus be on the broad questions of racial and ethnic hostility or should it be directed to specific issues? If the latter, what is the appropriate forum--small workshops or a convocation? The University is trying to decide how the issues should be dealt with. Professor Ibele solicited the views of Committee members.

It was pointed out that FCC had, at its last meeting, concluded that the subject should be referred to the Committee on Social Concerns; Professor Ibele agreed but said he wished to bring it to the full SCC first for discussion.

A request was made that any activities planned include the coordinate campuses but that each campus be permitted to design its own programs.

It was suggested that the Committee go on record supporting activities oriented to the broader issues rather than the narrower question of Black-Jewish relations. Some Committee members concurred with this suggestion; others dissented, arguing that nothing would be accomplished by a catch-all conference trying to look at a long history of racial enmity among various groups. Specific issues need to be addressed, including Mr. Ture's speech. The conference should not be too vague or too diluted; there is no need for another policy statement opposing discrimination.

It was also maintained that the University leadership needed to take a strong stand against racial or ethnic prejudice. Another Committee member pointed out that bias cannot be outlawed; the University can declare it inappropriate, it can use moral suasion, but it cannot stop people from expressing their biases. Others concurred but replied that the University can make its views known and the leadership must make public those views. The point was also made that phrases such as what can be "tolerated" should not be used; the emphasis should be on what the University approves of and what it encourages.

Professor Ibele commented that the President was seeking guidance on what should be the

nature of a conference to be held this Spring; there was no assumption that such a conference would address all of the ills of racial and ethnic conflict. He promised to carry the sentiments of the Committee to the meeting on the following day.

7. Students on Search Committees

Professor Ibele commented that the administrators who create search committees should be provided copies of the report which has been presented to the Committee. The report has been previously adopted by the Committee; what is to be its disposition?

A question was raised about how administrators would interpret the language calling for students on search committees for those positions which have major responsibilities for students; this, it was said, is vague. The students, the Committee was told, would monitor the Form 16s to determine if there were searches conducted which should have had students but which did not.

The Committee adjourned at 12:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota