

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee May 28, 1992

- Present: Thomas Scott (chair), James Arcand, Denise Eloundou, Judith Garrard, Jamie Hodgson, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, David Lee, Tom Lopez, Malaika McKee, Lois Regnier, Burton Shapiro, Charles Speaks, Charlotte Striebel, Denise Tolbert, Christine VeLure, Jeff Winker, Shirley Zimmerman
- Guests: Martin Conroy (Morris Student Association), Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), President Nils Hasselmo, Sonya Hoheisel, Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate), Maureen Smith (Brief), Garrett Webber (Daily)

1. Allocation of Waseca Student Seat on the Committee

Professor Scott asked that meeting begin with discussion and action on the allocation of the Waseca student seat on the Committee. Following some debate, it was **voted, 11-1, to make the vice chair of the student senate a voting member of the Committee**. It was agreed that there was no intent to change the balance of students and faculty on the Committee, and that if additional campuses were at some point to be added to the University, changes in the allocation of seats would again be necessary. This will require appropriate action by the Senate to amend the bylaws.

2. Reports of the Chairs

Educational Policy: Professor Lehmberg began by expressing appreciation for the support of Committee members for the several policies which the Committee on Educational Policy had brought forward for Senate action. He reported that SCEP had also finished proposed revisions in the Bush Sabbatical program (to enlarge it beyond undergraduate education and to have SCEP appoint the selection committee) and has so advised Academic Affairs.

Issues being left for next year's committee include plus/minus grading, semesters, academic advising, and review of the appointment of faculty in the ROTC programs.

Finance and Planning: Professor Shapiro reported that he, Professor Speaks and Mr. Engstrand had met to develop a list of issues for the Finance and Planning Committee to take up next year; there are 21 items on the list (he enumerated some of them). He told the Committee that it should be aware that space rental is to be implemented July 1, 1993, although everyone acknowledges the system will be imperfect in the beginning.

Student Senate Consultative Committee: Ms. VeLure reported that SSCC had devoted much time to discussion of the allocation of the Waseca seat; it had also taken up the question of semesters versus quarters (views were divided), and placing students on search committees.

She told the Committee that Messrs. Hodgson and Lee and Ms. Tolbert will be continuing members; she thanked the members of the Committee and said it had been a pleasure to work with them for the last two years.

Faculty Consultative Committee: Professor Scott noted that several significant issues had been

dealt with this year, and the primary responsibility for those accomplishments rests with the chairs of the committees. He pointed to the policy on teaching evaluation (which should benefit students AND faculty as well as the teaching mission generally), the academic misconduct policy (a significant improvement over existing policy, even if changes may be needed), the faculty compensation policy (attributable to the Kleiner working group and the Committee on Faculty Affairs, a significant step forward in improving morale), action on the health care proposals (which, unfortunately may need to be revisited), the ad hoc committee on athletics (upon which action can presumably be taken in the Fall). Two other important issues which have received less publicity are the reorganization of the Senate staff and the work of the Select Committee on Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals.

One of the "failures" he learned about, Professor Scott related, was that the Senate part of the governance system seems not to function very well. The committees appear to do a very good job but the Senate does not work well as a deliberative body. He said he has promised Professor Bognanno to spend next year trying to figure out ways to make it work better.

He thanked the Committee members and Committee chairs for their work, and extended a special thanks to the student members of the Committee, who he said were fun to work with and who had demonstrated remarkable leadership.

3. Discussion with President Hasselmo

President Hasselmo, coming in on the end of Professor Scott's remarks, extended his own thanks to the Committee, saying it was a marvelous group to work with in very trying times. It has challenged and also rallied behind the decisions that needed to be made, he said, and has been a source of strength for the University. He extended thanks to the Committee chairs, and observed that a real strength of the University is its active, vigorous, constructive governance system.

The President then touched briefly on the Diversity Forum and the planning process (covered in the preceding FCC minutes). About the planning process, he also noted that there has been in place a process since the 1970s--but that most of the existing plans cover the period through 1993. It is time, he observed, to plan for the post-1993 period. He emphasized that the process should be simple and should capture what has already been done rather than start from scratch; it is time to assess, take stock, and then make changes or supplement that which has already been done. The purpose of reappointing the Planning Council is to help structure the process and refine the strategic issues that need to be addressed.

One task will be the drafting of a vision statement for the University--where it is going and what it should be in the 1990s and into the 21st century. This will not be a simple task, he warned, and will be accomplished by the various groups working together.

Semesters: The President was asked about the rumors that a change to the semester system may be in the works; if a decision is to be made, it was said, it should be made QUICKLY in order that courses being planned for the new core curriculum could be structured for semesters. Much is already being devoted to new courses, it was added. The President promised that any decision would be made as soon as possible; it could perhaps be on the agenda for the first meeting of the Committee in the Fall.

Other planning questions, the President said, would be about the nature of the institution--what are the core functions? All would agree that they include undergraduate and graduate/professional education, research, and public service; the questions are how much time should be devoted to each and the nature, content, and priorities of each. Another question is financing; the University has been driven by current circumstances to a dependence on tuition that has not been carefully considered. There must be an assessment of whether or not the institution can achieve financial stabilization so it is not subject to the vagaries of State financing. Another issue involves the use of appropriate technology for teaching so that faculty and students might have MORE time to work together in interesting ways. Yet another issue involves University human resources--career opportunities within the institution and the recruitment and retention of staff; the University has not done a good job, he said, in career development.

The President also agreed, in response to a question, that the broader educational environment context of the University needs to be more carefully considered as part of the planning process.

Concern was expressed about the emphasis recently placed on the University's economic impact on the State. This was a shrewd tactic, it was said, but one can also make a compelling case that the academic and scholarly activities contribute substantially to the intellectual vitality of the State. The President concurred. The Regents, he said, have said the University needed to be more aggressive in laying out the economic impact, but that can distort the perceptions of its mission. In reconsidering the mission statement, he said, he hopes that the vision statement to be prepared for the planning process can help in balancing the emphases. Part of the difficulty, he related, is getting complex messages delivered and understood; it is to be hoped that the planning process provides an opportunity to present the broader picture.

Professor Scott thanked the President for being as candid with the Committee as he has during the year and for the openness of his administration.

4. Discussion With Associate Dean Sally Jorgenson

Professor Scott next welcomed Dr. Jorgenson to the meeting to discuss the several efforts she has been involved in to enhance diversity. Dr. Jorgenson serves as the chair of a subcommittee of the Diversity Task Force and joined the meeting to talk about the recruitment and retention of students of color.

Originally working with students in the College of Biological Sciences, Dean Jorgenson found she was actually working with undergraduates in all of the life sciences, which is a large group of faculty and students. Problems at the undergraduate level are primarily related to support provided by the University; bright students of color, with 3.5 - 4.0 GPAs in high school, find themselves getting Cs and Ds and Fs in science and math. They do not get the help they need. A system has been set up to help them, but the problems are only beginning to be understood. One of their best students has said students of color should NOT attend the University, and he is leaving.

There are cultural differences that are important, Dr. Jorgenson said, and faculty must be made aware of those small but important differences.

Undergraduates need to be provided more interaction with faculty, and in the sciences, their

labs. As much as possible they must be made to feel connected to the University.

The good news is that the University can attract students of color; it has difficulty retaining them. 20% of the students participating in the recent UROP gathering on campus were of color, up from 8% the year before. It is to be hoped that many of those students will be graduate students at Minnesota. The University has also brought in students of color during the summer; of the 600 applications for this year, 220 are from students of color--and the quality of the applicants is extraordinarily high.

With respect to graduate students, Dr. Jorgenson said, the subcommittee inquired of students of color about recruitment--and was told the University could do nothing to improve recruitment until it did something to repair the problems that exist for students already enrolled. The subcommittee turned its discussion to retention issues and how to support students. Among their recommendations thus far are that there be a meeting each quarter of graduate students of color, which faculty should be encouraged to attend to learn of the problems, and for departments to deal with the mechanics of where one goes when one has a problem or needs support on progress. They do not, Dr. Jorgenson, have a lot of recommendations to make, and she solicited the advice of the Committee.

The faculty are responsible for the climate, she pointed out, but the subcommittee is uncertain what is feasible to do to change things.

It was suggested that the subcommittee also speak with those graduate students of color who have had GOOD experiences--in order to find out what has worked. Perhaps those things could be extended to other programs and students. Exit interviews, both of graduates and those who leave the programs prior to graduation, might also be useful, another Committee member observed.

Some of the concerns expressed by the students of color, one Committee member pointed out, are common to all graduate students, such as the accessibility of faculty members. Dr. Jorgenson agreed; improvements for students of color would improve things for everyone. The pressures on faculty are a problem, she agreed, but the priorities of the institution have to be straightened out--students should come first. There is too much time not spent in direct interaction with students.

Dr. Jorgenson concurred with the suggestion that relying on the Graduate School for her cross-cutting efforts--which clearly go beyond the bounds of any one department--would be appropriate. Vice President Petersen has met with the group and is interested in assisting. It is in graduate and professional programs where the University should be doing its best to recruit and retain students of color, because they will be key to attempts to recruit and retain both faculty and undergraduates of color.

The Committee discussed the follow-up efforts that are made after the summer programs; the problem is that there are insufficient data yet available to draw any conclusions. Dr. Jorgenson agreed that following up on the students would be important. Of the 600 applicants, she reported, she found labs and funding for 110; the greater difficulty is finding faculty members available and willing to work with the students. She said they have turned away applicants with 4.0 GPAs. Committee members suggested she might have more success if she mailed information directly to the faculty, rather than to department heads.

Professor Scott thanked Dr. Jorgenson for her presentation. The Committee then adjourned at 2:30.

**Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee
May 28, 1992**

Present: Thomas Scott (chair), Judith Garrard, Norman Kerr, David Lee, Malaika McKee, Burton Shapiro, Charles Speaks, Denise Tolbert, Christine VeLure, Jeff Winker

Guest: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

Professor Scott convened the meeting at 2:40 for the purpose of deciding on the allocation of student seats on the Steering Committee between MSA and GAPSA (Graduate and Professional Student Assembly).

The Committee debated proposals to retain the existing numbers, four undergraduates and one graduate/professional student, as well as the numbers of students that each student assembly represented. Particular attention was given to how CEE students should be counted, with some arguing for headcount and others arguing for full-year-equivalent. It was pointed out that if headcount were to be used, the number of CEE senators, by parallel argument, should be increased by ten.

After discussion, it was moved and seconded that the Committee continue the rotation pattern established for the last two years (4/1 undergraduates/graduate and 3/2 undergraduate/graduate representation on alternate years) and that therefore GAPSA have two seats for 1992-93. **The motion was approved 5 - 4.**

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand