

## Minutes

### Senate Consultative Committee January 31, 1991

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Thomas Clayton, W. Andrew Collins, Amos Deinard, Kathy Diaz, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, K. Darby Laing, Arik Nissen, Kim Retzlaff, Thomas Scott, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, Jim Swick, Erin Sutter, Tina Tidrick, Shawn Towle, James VanAlstine, Christine VeLure, Shirley Zimmerman

Guests: John Beatty (Social Concerns Committee), Joseph Branin (University Libraries), Geoffrey Gorvin (Footnote), President Nils Hasselmo, Ken Janzen (Regents' Office), June Nobbe (SODC), Douglas Pratt (Senate Library Committee), Thomas Shaughnessy (University Libraries)

#### **1. Review of Senate and Assembly Docket Items**

Professor Ibele called the meeting to order and told the Committee that Dr. Caldecott would be rescheduled for a later meeting in order to allow time for Professor Beatty to present the resolution concerning ROTC from the Social Concerns Committee. He next turned to Professor Collins to review the docket items.

Professor Collins led the Committee through a brief discussion of the several information and actions items for the dockets. The Committee heard from Professor Ibele, Professor Shapiro and Ms. Laing about the resolutions that the Faculty Consultative Committee, Finance and Planning Committee, and the Student Senate Consultative Committee had adopted with respect to the reallocation plan. It also was informed by Professor Clayton about the resolution from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy calling for use of a set of questions in the undergraduate portion of program reviews, intended to implement a Senate resolution adopted last year concerning program reviews.

Professor Shapiro also reported on the action of the Committee on Finance and Planning endorsing the administration recommendation to begin negotiations with DEI/Arkla to provide steam to the Twin Cities campus; the primary reasons were because of the environmental impact and the fact that the cheapest (internal) alternative, if selected, would exhaust the University's bonding authority for many years. Professor Ibele agreed to learn if the costs of the alternatives would have any, or a differential, effect on tuition.

There will be a series of fora on the Twin Cities campus later in February in order to permit commentary on the draft report of the Task Force on Liberal Education: One in St. Paul, two on the East Bank, and one on the West Bank. The Committee asked that there be an executive summary or a separate list of the recommendations.

#### **2. Reports of the Chairs**

Professor Ibele next turned to Mr. Towle for a report from the Student Senate Consultative Committee. He told the Committee that SSCC had discussed the University's mission statement, including a possible future recommendation that the language on Northrop Auditorium be changed to

be more inclusive. One student member of the Committee said it is difficult to comment on the mission statement with all of the reallocation occurring; would the statement have to be changed in a few years if Waseca is closed? Professor Ibele agreed that drafting a statement at the appropriate level of generality and which can obtain the support of everyone is a challenging task.

It was suggested that incorporating the coordinate campus mission statements within the larger statement would be desirable. There was little support for separate mission statements for the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. The mission statement a matter which will be brought back to the Committee in the future.

Professor Clayton reported that the Committee on Educational Policy will soon be discussing the draft report of the Task Force on Liberal Education. SCEP recently has been developing a set of simple, straightforward core questions for teaching evaluation that can be used by any unit on the campus; they would permit comparison across units and could be used in salary and promotion decisions.

One Committee member inquired if it would be possible to have an ex-officio member on the Committee from the Duluth faculty. Professor Collins explained that FCC has, on several occasions, asked if the Duluth faculty wished such representation, because FCC has felt disadvantaged by the lack of a Duluth faculty member. The bargaining agent for the Duluth faculty, however, has consistently indicated it believed it could accomplish more through its own procedures and were uninterested in representation on SCC and FCC. Professor Collins agreed to explore this issue again with the Duluth faculty bargaining agent.

### **3. Change in Library Circulation and Sanction Policies**

Professor Ibele next welcomed Professor Douglas Pratt, Chair of the Senate Library Committee, to discuss the proposed changes in the circulation and sanction policies on the Twin Cities campus.

Committee members spent some time asking questions about various provisions of the proposed policies. There were a number of general statements and inquiries about the libraries; it was agreed that a future date there should be a report made to the Committee on the library system.

One point discussed at some length was whether or not holds should continue to be placed on student records (barring continued registration and graduation) because of unpaid library fines. The Committee finally concluded, despite central administration concerns about the number of holds on student records, that it did not wish to recommend any change in the proposed policy. It decided that students should be reminded, by the rigmarole that they have to go through to pay off the fines, that library materials are to be returned in a timely fashion. It also rejected the suggestion that the holds only apply to graduation on the grounds that there are far too many students who do not reach the point of graduation but who do use (and lose) library materials.

The Committee voted unanimously to forward the proposed policy to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for information.

Professor Ibele thanked Professor Pratt and the Library representatives for preparing and

presenting the policy.

#### **4. Discussion with President Hasselmo**

Professor Ibele turned to the President for any comments he wished to make. The President began by reporting on the Regents' open forum on the reallocation plan as well as on other meetings he has had on the same subject. He said he wanted there to be as many opportunities as possible for members of the University community to discuss the plan.

One question that has arisen about the plan, the President told the Committee, is the degree of specificity it contains. This is a five-year plan, he said, which has considerable specificity for the first two years, including closing of units and major transfers of funds. When it comes to college and campus plans, however, there is a good deal of work to be done. The plan sets directions and lays out steps to be taken and stipulates transfers of funds. Items such as the degree programs to be pruned have not been determined; those decisions will emerge over the next several years after the alternatives are examined by students and faculty. This, he maintained, is not a shortcoming of the plan; it is, rather, the nature of the institution and kind of five-year plan it must have. The specifics of the plans will also emerge in the annual budget plans; for 1991-92 there will be about \$10 - 15 million of reallocation within the University. This is approximately the pace at which the process will occur over the next five years.

Another point the President noted is that the plan is both open for continued discussion as well as an integrated package; does that mean "take it or leave it"? It is not that hard and fast, he said; there are adjustments that can be made. But as the plan is considered, it must be seen as a balance sheet: If one proposes that money is not taken from one place, one should also identify the place where those funds would have been directed. But the plan is not unshakable.

The President also asked that whatever comments are to be made be provided to him no later than February 15 in order that the consultative "loop" can be closed; that will permit the administration to have the benefit of as much review as possible prior to the March Regents meeting. If there remain fundamental questions, of course, they can continue to be reviewed after February 15.

Several questions have been raised by SSCC members, the President was told: (1) about how the \$8.8 million rescission will be factored into the reallocation plan; (2) if the reallocation plan is intended to solidify public opinion and support for the University; (3) about the "arbitrary nature of collegiate deans when they are making their recommendations"; and if there are any mechanisms for "quality control" over the collegiate decisions.

(1) On the \$8.8 million, the President said, the University has consistently said it will use reserves and balances to meet that cash reduction. This will not be easy inasmuch as the interest income from the reserves finances a number of activities. Expenditures are being watched wherever possible, in order to achieve savings, but additional programmatic cuts will not be made.

If there is a permanent cut in the base budget for the next biennium, he said, "the we face the horrendous possibility that we will have to make some additional programmatic cuts" because the administration does not believe that the reallocation plan should be derailed. The needs that have been identified, in the reallocation plan, are so great that the University must find a way to meet them under

almost any circumstances.

(2) The President said he would not create the turmoil, distress, and pain of the reallocation process if it were not for very substantial reasons. It is to be hoped that public opinion can be solidified behind the plan but it is not being advanced in order to influence public opinion. The University is trying to demonstrate responsible management of tax dollars by making necessary but difficult changes--but it "certainly is not a public relations move."

(3) The decisions are made in successive layers, the President said, and in some instances arise from planning that has been going on for several years. The major directions come out of Academic Priorities and campus documents that have been honed during the consultative process. Since the process has been speeded up, and in the specifics, deans and chancellors have had to lead in making decisions and recommendations. The President acknowledged that the extent of consultation varied considerably among colleges, in part due to different traditions and in part due to other circumstances.

The central administration reviews the decisions and recommendations when they come forward; they have, however, been guided extensively by what the deans and chancellors have recommended. This does not mean, he said, that "I buy pigs in a poke if I can avoid it" but he cannot personally review every decision. He must rely on the process, coming out of a consultative process and through the deans and vice presidents, to raise the appropriate questions. There are things which have already been changed, he pointed out, and there will probably be more things changed before the March Regents' meeting.

Since it is an emerging plan, of course, the University can make changes as it goes along. He recently emphasized with the vice presidents, he told the Committee, that if the Regents adopt the plan they--the vice presidents--cannot then sit back because they now have a five-year plan and the institution will run on automatic pilot. On the contrary, the President observed; the agenda has just begun to be defined. The quality of the participation and continuing discussion will have to provide the guarantees that checks on decisions that will be made.

In addition, one Committee member observed, one can compare the unit planning documents with the recommendations in the reallocation plan; to the extent there is substantial correspondence one can have confidence in the reallocation plan.

The President was next asked about KUOM; one Committee member recalled the comments made at the Regents' open forum by the representative of the Urban Coalition about the training he received at KUOM. Where will those training opportunities be obtained if not KUOM? This is another decision, the President said, that has been discussed for a number of years. Closing KUOM has been proposed before and is now again because of the financial circumstances. It is not because KUOM does not provide a useful service; it is because the University's collective judgement is that there are better ways of providing an institutional presence on the airwaves. The University will be on the broadcast medium, in one way or another. But it can accomplish that in ways that are much more cost-effective. There are, moreover, broadcast programs in both Speech-Communication and Journalism, although the President said he did not know the extent to which those programs rely on KUOM. It may be something that the University is losing; the reallocation plan, he reminded the Committee, does mean that certain things will be lost.

Asked if there was legislative pressure to spend down the reserves as a way to deal with rescission, the President said there is not. At this late date in the fiscal year it is not reasonable to resort to other sources except where spending can be avoided. Contractual obligations cannot be broken.

Is he receiving any commitment from the Governor or legislature to protect the base budget, the President was asked. He said he has received no commitments although there has been some encouragement and feedback that reallocation is the right thing to do; this will stand the University in good stead.

A question was posed to the students: Would they be interested in maintaining a student radio station if they had to pay perhaps \$4 per quarter in fees to do so? If so, that might be a reasonable alternative; it would meet central administrative objectives and yet retain a student-run station. There was expression of interest in this possibility, although one suggested that the programming might have to change and some felt it might have to become an FM station were it to be successful. The President also observed that the University is exploring a number of ways its programming can be continued.

Another Committee member next reviewed for the President the concerns about the consultation that ought to take place with faculty members who will be displaced by the reallocation process. "Consultation" should not mean the faculty member is informed by the dean or department chair where he or she will go; it should consist of the exploration of options and the faculty member being given an opportunity to express his or her own wishes on the alternatives and perhaps given a choice. It is not only what they do but also the activities of their colleagues with whom they interact that is important. The question is what should be the format and structure of the discussions that should take place with the faculty member.

The President agreed that this is an important question. He said he hoped that in this environment such discussions would take place as a matter of course. They may not always result in a mutually-agreeable arrangement, he pointed out, but said he would raise the point with Dr. Kuhi and others to be sure that the questions are raised when changes are proposed.

One question that arose in the SSCC meeting, the President was informed, was about the extent of his studies and research before he decided to recommend closing the Waseca campus. The President said that the question of the future of the Waseca campus is one that has been before the University for some time; it has arisen in planning discussions over many years. The realization that Waseca was a program that potentially had to be closed came about as the financial situation worsened during the Fall and as the needs of the University were being reviewed. Enrollment was examined; there are a number of areas in the University where students eager to enroll cannot be accommodated and others where students are not being served well. Waseca, by comparison, was under-enrolled by about 25% in comparison with the target figures for the campus, which started raising questions. Also examined were graduation rates as well as opportunities in the technical colleges. The latter point has come up again and again in conversations with HECB; the University has resisted the development of certain programs at the technical colleges because it was felt they were the responsibility of the Waseca campus. Those programs have gone forward anyway so there has been increasing overlap between Waseca and the technical colleges. These are the considerations that went into the equation,

the President said.

It was only in October, when the administration began to consider other needs and what had to be done to produce the \$21 million that is being transferred among colleges and campuses, that it became clear that major programmatic cuts would be necessary. Waseca, in that context, appeared to be the least viable but relatively independent component of the University; this is where the criteria of centrality, demand, and relative advantage entered. It is then that he made the visit to Waseca to explain the problems and invited the community to explore alternatives. Those discussions continued through early January; it became clear that there was not an acceptable option. Continuing review of the questions, the President said, has made the case for closing the campus stronger rather than weaker.

Will not a halt to recruitment and acceptance of applications serve to strengthen his recommendation, the President was asked. The President said he has told the Chancellor that Waseca may continue to contact students and process applications from those who have an interest in attending--but it must be made clear to those students that there is a recommendation pending to close the campus. Any confusion on this point should now be cleared up.

The President was then told that the Waseca Senate wished to express its gratitude to him because of all his work; while they disagree with his decision, they do not disagree with the need for reallocation.

The President was asked where the savings would be achieved if Waseca is closed. It will not be faculty and staff salaries and benefits, presumably, because they will be retained. The President said it will be the Waseca budget as a whole; over a five-year period, through retirement and attrition, the resources will be freed up--or faculty members will be placed where they can strengthen units and can remain productive members of the University community. But it is clearly a five-year proposition.

Asked about the campus physical plant, the President said that some preliminary contacts have been made and several alternatives considered but the administration will not take any definite actions until and unless the Board approves the reallocation plan. Disposition of the campus will not simply be left to the community, however; the University intends to be as helpful as possible.

The President was again asked a series of questions: about the articles in the newspaper suggesting that the Governor may suggest that tuition cover 50% of instructional costs; about the possibility that discussions concerning instructional and non-instructional costs be discontinued in light of the withdrawal of the biennial request; and about a possible blue-ribbon commission on higher education.

The President said he would not be in favor of any tuition proposal which would make the University inaccessible to students for economic reasons and would find any such adjustment to be unacceptable. There is not a great deal of elasticity in tuition, he said; the State should not solve its financial problems by shifting them to the backs of students. To the extent that there is even a proposal--and there has not yet been one--it would be accompanied by a substantial improvement in the financial aid system. Before he could support such a tuition increase, he said, he would want to see an improvement in the financial aid system. It would not be acceptable to create additional

economic barriers to the University.

The President said that he has no knowledge that the attempts to remove inappropriate items from the instructional budget have been discontinued.

As for the blue-ribbon task force, the President recalled that he had mentioned such a group in his January statement. What he had in mind was a group that would convene and plan for months--not years--and make it politically possible to make changes which are necessary and which could grow from recommendations already made by HECB concerning a restructuring of higher education. The MSPAN reports also contain much information that could serve as the basis for recommendations about priorities in higher education. The group should have strong political clout, be convened for a few weeks, and return to the Governor and legislature and make specific recommendations to implement the necessary changes. The timing is becoming more and more difficult, however, as the legislative session progresses. To make a set of such recommendations to the next legislative session would be too late.

The President was informed of the contents of the resolution of SSCC concerning the reallocation plan, which withheld endorsement pending the release of additional details. The President said he or others would meet with SSCC members to explain the plan in greater detail. The President also urged the students to take whatever time they needed to become knowledgeable and comfortable--to the extent they can--with the plan. As the discussion unfolds, it was also noted, there will be additional information--such as on the system-wide initiatives--which might answer many questions. Each of the system-wide initiatives, the President explained, has behind it long-developing plans; the problem has been the press of time and the volume of information which could reasonably be provided for people to digest. In the case of the unit plans, there will be judgment calls required of the faculty and students.

The President briefly informed the Committee of activities related to the ROTC programs.

Professor Ibele thanked the President for his time.

##### **5. ROTC Resolution from the Social Concerns Committee**

Professor Ibele welcomed Professor Beatty to the Committee to discuss the Social Concerns Committee resolution. Professor Beatty read the motion and comments. He also told the Committee that the resolution was co-sponsored by MSA, which had provided considerable help in the discussion.

Professor Beatty expressed the appreciation of the Social Concerns Committee for the efforts of President Hasselmo but noted that little progress has been made with the Defense Department or with getting the Big Ten to be active on the problem. At the same time the University is celebrating diversity on the campus, it tolerates a violation of its own equal opportunity policies in the ROTC programs.

Some believe this is a federal issue that the University should not be dealing with; others believe that the resolution will prohibit the University from dealing effectively with the federal government. The resolution tries to take a middle position, recognizing that it is a federal issue but

one that affects the way the University governs itself. The goal is to retain ROTC and also to keep the equal opportunity policy as written. Efforts thus far have not been fruitful; it appears that it will be necessary to take a strong stand to convince the Defense Department to change its policy. The deadlines in the resolution should be seen as an inducement to working hard to resolve the issues.

Finally, a continuation of the federal policy serves to legitimate certain views and discrimination against homosexuals and as such should be the object of change.

It was noted, apropos the Persian Gulf conflict, that Afro-Americans have finally achieved acceptance because of the stature of people like Colin Powell, who have risen through the ranks to the leadership. Breaking down stereotypes in this way would presumably occur for gays and lesbians as well if given equal opportunity.

One Committee member expressed reservations about endorsing "the broad benefits" of ROTC, especially given the circumstances in the Persian Gulf and that students are now "in harm's way" in the conflict. The University has contributed to the situation by recognizing ROTC and recommending that students enter it. The benefits, it was said, are not that broad. People should have the choice of ROTC; it is a different issue whether or not the University should go on record recognizing benefits to ROTC. Professor Beatty agreed; the Committee concurred that the wording of the resolution should be amended to speak of more specific benefits.

Professor Beatty was asked how the deadlines in the resolution were chosen. He said there was no formula; it could be three years or it could be four years. It was the sense of the Social Concerns Committee that the time had come and that a closer deadline serves the role of a deadline better than a distant one. Would, he was then asked, promising negotiations be terminated because of the deadlines--or would there be flexibility so that abortion of discussions would not be required? The resolution provides two and one-half years for negotiation.

What provisions would be made for people already in the program, it was asked? The resolution is intended to protect students, Professor Beatty said, by not allowing freshmen to enter the program. The program would exist until its students graduate.

Would it be possible for the University to create a scholarship program, open to all, for people who were interested in a minor in military science? That would, it was said, would permit those who are interested to study military science.

Professor Ibele inquired whether or not the points raised by Professor Krislov (in a letter to the Social Concerns Committee) were addressed. Professor Beatty said that one recommendation had been to work through the Big Ten; since that letter, however, the President has learned that there are only two institutions interested in the question--so there is likely little possibility in assistance from that quarter.

Having this resolution in place, one Committee said, should strengthen the University's hand in trying to persuade others to join it. Adopting it would be the best strategy.

Another Committee member said it was his view that it is only a matter of time before those

who are discriminated against by the present policy will have full rights and privileges in ROTC. His only concern, he said, was to explore every possibility to keep that option open; if it is only a question of time, if the University loses the program it forecloses the opportunity not only for homosexuals but for everyone else as well. This resolution tries to do that and it is thus acceptable.

In response to a question, Professor Beatty said that the support of the coordinate campuses has not been sought.

**It was moved and second to endorse the resolution with the understanding that Professor Beatty would revise the phrase concerning "broad benefits" in accord with Committee sentiments.** The motion was adopted unanimously. It was also moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to place the resolution on the docket of the Senate.

Professor Beatty then informed the Committee of two other issues the Social Concerns Committee is addressing. One is a development of a general policy on social responsibility in investments and transactions. The committee has been involved in these issues for several years but has always dealt with questions on a case-by-case basis. The second is leading an investigation of gay and lesbian concerns on the campus. A third project, just begun, is investigation of speech that constitutes harassment. Professor Ibele mentioned that he had received material on this last subject from Professor Kathleen Price, former SCC member now Law Librarian of Congress, and promised to provide them to Professor Beatty.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand