

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee October 6, 1988

Present: Mark Brenner (chair), Tim Erickson, Paula Faraci, Eric Huang, Warren Ibele, Katie Jodl, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Jim Schoon, Burton Shapiro, Carrie Simenson, Michael Steffes, Nancy Surprenant, James VanAlstine

Guests: John Bradford, Shirley Clark, Dolores Cross, John Fossum, Gayle Grika (Footnote), June Perkins, Douglas Pratt, Tom Scott, Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Discussion with Associate Provost and Associate Vice President Dolores Cross

Professor Brenner welcomed Dr. Dolores Cross to the meeting and explained that the Committee would like to hear about her plans and expectations.

Dr. Cross began by saying that she expects to work with the Consultative Committee and will honor the consultative traditions of the University. She related that she had been told in her interview that she would be responsible for coordinating the improvement and enhancement of minority programs at the University--but that when she arrived, no one knew what the programs were or what she was to coordinate. As a consequence, her office retained the firm of Arthur Anderson to do an inventory and profile on all minority programs.

With the Arthur Andersen report complete, she reconvened the Taborn Committee to present the report to it and to receive critiques; she also met with minority groups to ascertain their expectations and concerns.

She has also met with the deans; she expects that plans to recruit, develop, and retain minority students will be established by the colleges. Her office will do what it can to assist in the way of providing information and support to them; she might, for instance, seek incentive funding. The goal will be to increase the number of minority students and faculty. She will also work with the deans to develop guidelines to use in minority faculty hires; she has about \$400,000 committed for minority faculty hires which can be loaned to departments in the expectation that they would eventually pick up the item. She also wishes to affect the networks which help to implement the strategies both inside and outside of the University, such as trying to create a situation where minority students in the metropolitan area planning for college will see the University as a positive place.

She acknowledged that she cannot do this alone; success will require communication and commitment. She said she wants to take on the challenge and be a part of the success. In the year 2000 one-third of the students in the country will be students of color; to maintain its position in the world, the US must have an educated work force and cannot have large alienated groups. The numbers of minorities in Minnesota are small, she said, but one-half of the public school students in Minneapolis are minorities; there are a lot of high-ability minorities, and minority students generally, who do not choose to come to Minnesota. One question is how that can be changed. Her worst fear, she said, is that in five years the goals of Commitment to Focus will be achieved--the University will be more selective and smaller--but there will be far fewer minority students than in 1988.

Points raised by Committee members in discussion with Dr. Cross were these:

- To whom should Dr. Cross go in the future if she wished to have the Senate address minority issues? There is always SCC, and no one seemed to think another committee would be a good idea.
- One high priority should be to hire outstanding minority faculty, which has a multiplier effect in the attraction of minority students. And there needs to be a critical mass of minority faculty.
- It was suggested that the University might seek to bring students back for post-graduate education (catching them the second time around even if they were missed the first time). Dr. Cross added that another idea was to reach out to minority adults in the professions and seek to draw them into teaching, to "retrack" them for a faculty position. Faculty from the historically black colleges could be brought to the University during their sabbatical years to make them familiar with the institution; word would spread that this is an attractive place.
- There is a crisis in minority faculty hiring coming, with the decrease in the number of black PhDs in the pipeline; American Indians are even more under-represented. UMD has an innovative program that the Twin Cities could learn from.
- There are fewer minorities at Minnesota than at similar institutions in surrounding states; the number of minorities attending post-secondary institutions in Minnesota is increasing but many are going to vocational schools. There is now 1/2 the number of minorities at the graduate level compared to 10 years ago. Part of the problem could be the financial aid burdens which must be borne; poor people in general are not getting into the system. Minorities have extra problems; some say the University is not a warm, welcoming, hospitable place--which may be true for everyone.
- The University needs to set realistic goals so they can be successfully met and escalated over the years. There is also a selling process involved; the University needs to look at what other institutions have had in the way of expectations and what research they have done on early awareness campaigns and recruitment.
- There is a need to develop a mission statement to guide the development of plans; Academic Priorities calls for numerical goals for minority faculty by the Spring of 1989 and for minority students for the Fall of 1989. Quotas are too rigid, however; the numerical goals are to be striven for.
- The University must do more than engage in passive recruiting; the Arthur Andersen report suggested more aggressive marketing and letting students know how much financial aid is available. Students also need to have an early estimate of the aid they will receive so they can make decisions on college; providing the information in September, which is now the practice, is too late.

- There are varying levels of commitment from the minority offices themselves; there is a need to energize them and to do staff development work.

Professor Brenner thanked Dr. Cross for her presentation and discussion.

2. Minutes

The minutes for SCC will be distributed, in accord with the practice last year, with the assumption they are final and approved unless changes are called in to the Consultative Committee office within approximately a week after distribution.

3. Reports of the Chairs

Professor Ibele reported that the Senate Finance Committee is attending to the next planning cycle and will also look once again at the biennial and capital requests. He commented that they need a better historical record, better data bases, and more complete information on the University budget.

Ms. Simenson reported that the Student Senate Consultative Committee had looked at tuition levels and the restructuring of Senate Committees.

Professor Brenner reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee had dealt with spousal exemptions from the consent decree, recommendations from the Judicial Committee, and had had a closed discussion of the class settlement for women faculty.

Professor Brenner also said he regretted that Susan Severeid, the Daily reporter who had covered the last meeting, was not present, because he had strong objections to her article about the Committee discussion of the presidential search procedures; she had, he observed, grossly misrepresented the discussion. The Committee, he added, should consider both sides of issues and not address them with blinders on; he had purposely made statements in order to promote the deliberation. The Committee had certainly not "flip-flopped."

On the presidential search, Professor Brenner reported that he understood there were good candidates and that secrecy must be kept for some of them. He has informed the Advisory Committee and the Regents of the wish of SCC to be involved in the process; the final interview process has not yet been determined.

4. Restructuring of Senate Committees

Professors Douglas Pratt and Tom Scott, who had served on the ad hoc committee to draft the implementation of the Senate resolution adopted last Spring, joined the Committee for the discussion. Professor Scott noted that the committee had been appointed for implementation; it did not start with global inquiries or a massive examination of the Senate structure. The question, he said, is whether or not SCC likes the result of their work. If it does not, it will have to appoint another group to do more work; if it does, the work of the committee, with whatever modifications SCC wishes, can be forwarded to the Senate for action.

Professor Scott made a few comments about what the ad hoc committee had done; he noted that it had done nothing it did not have to do to implement the Senate resolution.

- For 10 committees, there were essentially no changes;
- 4 committees are on hold (Judicial, Research, Animal Care, and Use of Human Subjects) pending additional information; the intent is to eliminate the latter two from the Senate structure and ask the administration to establish committees which would have representatives from the Research Committee;
- All the other committees have been reconfigured in some fashion.

The important changes made were these:

- A significant number of committees have been collapsed into SCEP, and while it looks overwhelming, past chairs have said it should work and the use of subcommittees should help; if it proves to be too much, it can be changed in a couple of years;
- Combining Planning, Finance, and Physical Plant may be the most important change because it will integrate planning and fiscal issues in one place;
- The new Support Services committee, for the Twin Cities, will consolidate support services review at a time when many such units have become more important;
- The policy and agenda-setting responsibilities of SCC have been increased in order to keep track of all business before the Senate;
- The Senate/Assembly distinction was maintained, as were the patterns of representation on committees;
- Compensation for chairing the major committees has been suggested (released time for faculty, perhaps direct compensation for students).

Professor Brenner asked if the reduction in the numbers of participants in the governance system were known; Professor Scott said that the number would be difficult to determine when one takes into account the possible subcommittees that might evolve, although the number of faculty and students on standing committees would certainly decrease. Professor Pratt added that the intent was to make participation more meaningful and important; when committees don't meet, or spend all their time debating their charge, or have no business, cynicism is increased and the damage to the governance system is far greater than any possible reduction in the number of participants.

Professor Brenner inquired about the wisdom of completely eliminating other committee chairs from the Finance/Planning/Physical Plant committee. While the continuous turnover under the present structure was undesirable, to eliminate all the chairs cuts a line of communication that is important. The Committee agreed that a representative from SCEP, SCFA, and Research should be designated as ex-officio members of the new Finance Committee.

It was also agreed that one retired faculty member, in addition to the one undergraduate student, should be added to SCFA as a voting member. There were several exchanges about the charge to SCFA, and Professor Scott agreed that the charge could be reviewed again.

It was suggested that there be some provisions about coordinate campus membership on the various committees.

5. Revision of the by-laws of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

(Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee business)

Professor Brenner welcomed Professor Deon Stuthman, chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) and asked him to explain the changes in the charge to ACIA.

Professor Stuthman told the Committee that the intent of the revisions was to respond to the recommendations of the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics appointed by President Keller in early 1986. The membership had been altered last Spring; the principal change now being considered was the delegation to ACIA of the authority to act, on behalf of the Assembly, on all policy matters. The actions would be reported to the Assembly, but unless specifically rejected, ACIA actions would be considered Assembly policy.

Committee members asked Professor Stuthman a few questions about the revisions. One section of the revision was being temporarily withdrawn by ACIA for additional work and several other minor changes were suggested by SCC.

[It was subsequently agreed that both the Senate restructuring and the ACIA by-laws revisions would be brought back to SCC for additional review and referral to the Senate; that SCC meeting will be held October 20 from 11:00 to 12:00.]

The Committee adjourned at 3:15.

--Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota