

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee May 3, 1990

- Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Karin Alexander, Martin Conroy, Eric Huang, Gunnar Johnson, Norman Kerr, Tim Morse, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, Burton Shapiro, Adam Stenberg, Michael Steffes, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Tim Wolf
- Guests: President Nils Hasselmo, J. Kim Munholland (representing the Senate Committee on Educational Policy), Maureen Smith (Brief), Rabun Taylor (Footnote), Tina Tidrick (Morris), a number of others.

Note: This meeting lasted four hours, twice the usual length; these minutes reflect that fact.

1. Reports of the Chairs

Professor Ibele convened the meeting at 12:25 p.m. and began the reports of the chairs.

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning Professor Ibele reported briefly on the joint meeting with SCC on the 1990-91 budget which took place earlier in the week.

Student Senate Consultative Committee Mr. Huang reported that SSCC was preparing for the interviews with the candidates for Vice President for Student Affairs and that it had discussed the Humanities Department issues. On the latter, Mr. Huang inquired if the faculty could give them any advice on how they might pursue the interests of those interested in retaining the survey courses, recognizing that academic freedom and departmental autonomy are important.

Professor Ibele responded that a specific discussion about the Humanities Department was not appropriate at SCC because it is a collegiate matter which would likely, at some point, be reviewed by the Provost's office. The most appropriate place for interested students to appeal would be the college, he said.

Mr. Huang also reported that SSCC has been addressing the academic freedom and free speech matter, although it has presented difficulties because of their unfamiliarity with the issues and their complexity; they will try to draft a statement for publication in the Daily similar to that from FCC. Mr. Huang reported that he has been asked to serve on a committee to assess the performance of President Hasselmo.

The final item was a resolution distributed at the meeting which was approved by MSA and passed by SSCC for discussion at this meeting. Mr. Conroy explained that the resolution, calling for proportional representation for a number of unrepresented groups, was in part a response to the vote of the Senate and Assembly to recognize a separate graduate and professional student assembly (GAPSA) and representation for them on SCC. The method used, it was said, was not ideal; this resolution was intended to pave the way for the Senate to continue to move in the direction set by the precedent of recognizing GAPSA. "Once the Senate decides that it has the power to infringe upon the prerogatives of Student Senate" to make decision about representation, proportional representation for other groups becomes a possibility. Mr. Morse added that if it is determined that certain groups are to

be represented in the Senate then that course should be followed to its logical conclusion and other groups also guaranteed representation.

One Committee member said that any group should be able to form a group if it wishes, as GAPSAs did; SCC, however, should not assume that all of them wish to do so or to be represented. GAPSAs argued that it wanted something different and the faculty agreed it wished to hear their views. It was responded that other groups did not have the size or resources to draw upon for such an initiative, to which it was said that "at some point you have to stop being silly." But if there is a group which feels strongly, SCC should listen to them.

Professor Striebel expressed strong support for the resolution and expressed the wish that the resolution had been written seriously. It was written to make it look ridiculous; the idea, however, is a very good one. There are too many groups on the list, she said, but the Senate and SCC in particular would be much more vital if there were proportionate representation. "You have no idea how much I resent being the only woman on this [Faculty Consultative] committee right now" and next year, she said, and expressed appreciation for the efforts being made to bring better balance to FCC through the nomination of the vice chair of the Senate. The way that people are elected to the Senate and to the Committee ensure, she contended, that most of the positions will be reserved for older white males--who are not representative of the institution. She voiced strong support for proportional representation, as sought in the resolution; there would, she said, be strong support for such a proposal, and the Commission on Women is drafting such a proposal to bring to the group.

One of the student members affirmed that the resolution was very serious in intent; while some may feel there are too many groups listed, where, the inquiry was posed, does one draw the line? The list, it was added, got longer and longer as the resolution was considered. Another student member said the resolution was not a mockery of the process; the graduate and professional students had a legitimate cause and needed to be represented--but they are the best equipped group to obtain that representation. They have the time, money, intelligence, and experience in large institutions; other groups do not have those abilities to fight for and obtain a position on the Committee. This resolution allows for those other groups to be represented. GAPSAs representation did not come about in the manner decreed by the Senate, which is through the Student Senate--which is supposed to have exclusive control of student governance and representation. The full Senate had to act because GAPSAs would not otherwise have been able to obtain representation. So, with that rationale in mind, these other groups have been identified because they will not obtain representation in any other way. This student member, however, said others would have to make the choices if some groups were to be eliminated.

One of the Committee members responded that this resolution "slices the world in a different way" than for undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty--those are groups which have different statuses in the University by virtue of appointments. The stratification proposed here is different. Students and faculty cut across all the strata identified in the resolution; while it would be appropriate within the student and faculty groups to recommend or require proportional representation, it would not be appropriate to formally require representation of different groups in the structure of the Senate--those are different issues. It might be appropriate to have proportional representation of the faculty in the Senate as they are constituted; that is different from saying that the Senate will formally recognize those different groups (by race or sex or affectional preference). This mixes apples and

oranges, it was concluded.

Another student pointed out that the University, in a large metropolitan area, appeals to many different groups. Asian-Americans are a large group in IT, for example, who are not represented in the Student Senate.¹ It is important to have groups such as women in the governance system.

A faculty member of the Committee concurred that the groups identified in the resolution cut across all of society whereas the graduate students are unique to the University. The groups are very different.

Professor Ibele proposed that the discussion be suspended until later in the meeting in order to take up the items from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

2. Resolutions from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP)

Professor Ibele welcomed Professor Munholland to the meeting, who was representing Professor Clark for SCEP.

The first resolution proposed to establish an institutional policy governing grade changes after grades have been awarded; it requires a rationale and department chair signature on the form which changes the grade. A question was raised about the need for explanation and the implication that the faculty member's integrity would be in question as well as about possible breaches of a student's right to privacy. Professor Munholland explained that there were instances when grade changes may have been made for other than academic reasons and that the right of privacy of a student was not abridged because this policy controlled internal procedures and did not provide access to anyone not now privy to such information. Professor Munholland also explained, in response to a question, that this proposal responded less to documented instances of abuse than to clarifying and bringing consistency to a policy which SCEP learned was not well understood.

It was clarified that there is no notation on the transcript of changed grades.

One faculty member recalled having been surprised, upon reading the proposal, that no such policy was in place. Explanations are required in some departments and that policy helps faculty members resist pressure from students for grade changes. Other faculty members concurred; one argued that having the policy on the books would be useful.

The Committee agreed, without registered dissent, to forward the policy to the Senate for action.

The second resolution proposed a policy vis-a-vis obtaining a "D" grade in courses which are prerequisites for subsequent courses within a discipline; the policy declares that the prerequisite is not fulfilled if a student obtains a "D." The problem, Professor Munholland explained, is in the policing; SCEP made no recommendation in that regard and simply proposed that the policy be on the books.

¹The speaker subsequently corrected himself.

SCEP had been advised by representatives of the undergraduate deans that such a policy would be useful as an advising tool even if the colleges would have to devise their own enforcement procedures (if any could be developed).

Committee members questioned the usefulness of the policy without a policing provision; some observed, however, that if the policy were published in the appropriate places it would at least serve as a warning label for students.

Asked how the policy would affect the coordinate campuses, Professor Munholland said it would not affect whatever policies each of the campuses might already have in place but concurred with a proposal that the policy be directed to the Twin Cities campus; the Committee concurred.

One Committee member queried whether or not this policy, along with, for example, a CLA policy not to accept "D" grades for graduation, would add to the pressure for grade inflation--students would be more than ever motivated to argue for a "C" rather than a "D"; the policy functionally restricts the range of grades which can be awarded to students because it says that a "D" is no longer acceptable performance. Professor Munholland responded that SCEP had not addressed grade inflation at all in its deliberations but noted that the policy, which was directed at "building block" kinds of courses, nonetheless seemed to SCEP to be sound educational practice. One Committee member contended that the policy created too many burdens for a student and that his or her plans could be considerably affected, if the policy were adopted, merely because of a "D" in one course. It would be better for course descriptions to stipulate that a "C" or better in the prerequisite was required rather than to adopt an across-the-board policy.

On vote taken, the Assembly Steering Committee voted 5-2 to forward the motion to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for action.

Professor Munholland agreed to bring back to SCEP the concern of several Committee members about grade inflation and the possible impact of such policies on the implications of grading options realistically available to faculty.

The third resolution proposed a policy which would prohibit the scheduling of events which require student participation during Study Days and Finals Weeks; the policy also contains an exceptions provision which is to be established by SCEP by the time of the next Senate meeting. Professor Munholland explained that the genesis of the proposal was a hockey game scheduled during Finals Week but SCEP became concerned about the general principle.

It was clarified that the policy pertained only to events scheduled by the University so that championship events in athletics, for example, would be exempt. One Committee member argued, however, that the ban should be stronger and that no events be permitted; a number of others disagreed, pointing out that with the diverse calendars of colleges and universities the University could not bind a national organization to its calendar.

It was also clarified that the policy did not extend to events which could be attended at the discretion of the student, such as a ballet performance scheduled on the campus during Finals Week.

Committee members discussed briefly the relationship between athletics and the policy; one decried the animosity which appeared to be directed toward the athletic departments. Professor Munholland replied that although athletics provided the impetus, the policy is general and reflects the view of SCEP that "there ought to be a time in the quarter when we are all settled down to the same academic enterprize"; it applies to student-athletes as well as everyone else.

Others pointed out that some groups might be adversely affected, such as a band or a debate team--tour opportunities might occur only during Finals Week. Meetings of the Senate and student assemblies would also be affected; they have occasionally found it necessary to meet during Finals Weeks or Study Days. Professor Munholland explained that it was for these reasons that SCEP included an exceptions provision; with sufficient notice exceptions could be granted.

Professor Munholland was asked if the grant of exception would ensure that the faculty involved would be required to make arrangements for a make-up exam or to permit the student to complete the course work; if exceptions are to be granted, protection must be provided to the students and absent that protection no exceptions should be granted. He said that the policy did not include such a provision.

It was agreed that the policy should be returned to SCEP in order that it could take up the question of explicit protection for students for whom an exception was granted. It was also pointed out, coincidentally, that at present there is no obligation on the part of faculty members to schedule make-up exams for regularly-scheduled athletic (or any other) events.

The fourth resolution established a Senate policy requiring that all academic programs be reviewed at least once every ten years and that undergraduate education, in those programs which offer it, be given emphasis equal to that given graduate education and research. The present reviews conducted by the Graduate School be more of a joint effort between the dean of the Graduate School and the dean of the college in which the unit exists.

It was agreed that the language should be amended to provide that the Graduate School need not be involved in reviews where there is no graduate education (which would accommodate the coordinate campuses).

With one other amendment having to do with outside reviews, the Committee agreed, without registered dissent, to forward the policy to the Senate for action.

The fifth and final resolution called for the Senate to direct the Senate Consultative Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee to bring consistency to standards for honors degrees, to explore alternatives for recognition of high academic achievement when a student chooses not to participate in honors programs, and to increase institutional and administrative support for honors programs. Professor Munholland reported that this resolution resulted from lengthy discussion by SCEP about honors programs; SCEP concluded it did not have the time or expertise to adequately address the issues so requests the appointment of a special group to do so.

It was suggested that the scope of the work of the ad hoc committee be limited to the Twin Cities campus; Professor Munholland responded that the concern was about institution-wide standards

and support and that the limitation in this case would not be appropriate.

It was suggested, and agreed, that the resolution be reported to the Senate for information and that SCC would simply agree to help SCEP by appointing the ad hoc committee without being directed to do so by the Senate.

Professor Ibele thanked Professor Munholland for presenting the resolutions to SCC.

3. Discussion with President Hasselmo

Professor Ibele next welcomed President Hasselmo to the meeting; the President said he had several items on which he wished to report.

- He had recently returned from the meeting of the American Association Universities (the 58 major research universities in North America); the best-attended and most intense discussion session was on undergraduate education. A number of people commented on that fact; it appears to be a sign of the times among research universities. The debates are beginning to get at some of the important issues in education, such as the evaluation of teaching and faculty-student interaction.
- Also at the AAU meeting there was a resolution passed on the ROTC issue; AAU will write to the Secretary of Defense about changing the policy. This, however, will not be the only step taken.
- On the searches: As has been true in all of the searches, he evaluated the slate of candidates for Vice President for Student Affairs; the checking took a little longer than usual but the interviews are now scheduled. A complete itinerary of candidate meetings will be circulated so that all know who is interviewing the candidates.

Some students, he commented, appear to be disappointed because he seems not to take their views into account in selecting vice presidents; he assured the Committee that he evaluates very carefully all of the recommendations he receives and tries to select candidates best able to meet the challenges of the job. The Student Affairs vice president will be essential to improving the learning environment for undergraduates, especially in the attempt to build a sense of community.

The President was asked about the tenor of the letter to the Secretary of Defense; he said he had not seen it but that it will point out the conflict between institutional and some state policies and the rules for enlistment in ROTC and will indicate a strong concern to review the matter and bring about change. The President also told the Committee that he had been in touch with the chief executives of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the American Council on Education; both have the issue on their agendas. The University has also been in touch with all members of the Minnesota delegation in Congress and has "received expressions of varying degrees of interest in the issue." The University, he promised, will continue to seek ways to resolve the issue in ways which are compatible with the policy of the Board of Regents.

It was noted that MSA had approved the uniform tuition rate subject to increases in fourth- and fifth-year student aid; the President was asked about what was occurring in student aid. President Hasselmo replied that there may be under-used endowed scholarships at the University; he has also set a target of no less than \$500,000 for additional scholarship aid in 1990-91--the awards from which are to be as flexible as possible. Fund-raising for scholarships will remain a high priority. This effort, he added, if successful, would provide a way for the University to deal with several needs: attracting minority students, assisting students who are just beyond the federal aid scheme, and eventually helping all students who need aid but for whom the University cannot quite "close the gap" between aid and need.

Concern was expressed about the possibility of tuition being used to pay the debt service on construction and the rise in tuition which will occur because of decreasing enrollment for the next several years; are there alternative sources for paying the debt service? The President said every possibility other than tuition was being explored; at this point it is too early to assess what sources may be appropriate but it does seem that the nature of the building will affect the sources relied upon. The Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, for instance, would not be supported by tuition income because it has nothing to do with instruction. Research facilities might draw on indirect cost recovery funds. There will, however, be a stiff competition for these funds, some of which are now used for operations. The decisions made will also affect the timetable for construction; funds will not be available for all buildings at the same time but the flow of funds to pay the 30-year debt service will have to be ensured. Complete avoidance of use of tuition, however, will probably require imaginative steps.

Note was made of the large building requests (\$65 million and \$45 million for the Twin Cities campus) which have been planned for the next biennia, along with a large backlog of requests for all campuses; the President was asked if the requirement to pay one-third of the debt service on construction would preclude further construction. The President said he did not know; the facility needs remain and the University has honed its request so that there is nothing in it which could be considered frivolous by any stretch of the imagination. The total ready for construction or in the planning stages is at \$170 million--so after the \$71 million authorization from the 1990 legislature there remains \$100 million. The main concern, he said, will be to move ahead with what the state has approved; how long that will take is unclear. The next major bonding bill, if there is one, would be in the 1992 session; much will depend on the state's financial condition but the projections are not encouraging.

Asked if campuses (and student tuition) would pay for debt service on buildings on other campuses, the President said that campuses would not pay debt service; a central pool would probably be used--although these issues have yet to be explored.

One Committee member inquired if any inroads had been made on funding of new space. The President replied "no."

Another Committee member criticized the tuition increases over the last several years, both at Minnesota and across the country; when, the President was asked, will students no longer be facing these large increases? President Hasselmo sighed and said he wished he knew; he pointed out that the increases have been driven by the one-third/two-thirds formula established by the state [that is, one-

third of instructional costs are to be paid by tuition]. The legislative intent for next year was an 11% increase; the University declined to go beyond 9%. But when the increases will slow down is difficult to predict. The dilemma is that changes the University wishes to make require either new funds or internal reallocations; then when the cost per student goes up because the one-third goes up the result is "an escalator that is going in only one direction." Where the breaking point is, and when a socio-economic caste system develops in terms of ability to pay for higher education, is a question which is being asked nationally. Although the fund-raising for aid may help, it is probably unrealistic to look to that alternative as a permanent solution to the problem. The state policy is high tuition combined with high financial aid; the President said he is concerned "we are getting the high tuition but we are not getting the high financial aid."

Given that there may have been widespread misunderstanding of the impact of Commitment to Focus on tuition (declining numbers of students paying one-third of a larger instructional budget), will there be a re-evaluation or a determination that the price tag will be too high--even granting that the alternative to Commitment to Focus is unattractive? The President said the University reassesses the approach every year; the general direction is clear--a better learning environment for students--and resources are being devoted to that objective. But every year includes an evaluation of the optimal strategy; the President said he hoped a strategy of "packing students in" again and using enrollment increases as a means to lower the pressure on tuition could be avoided. There is a fairly direct relationship between student numbers and quality--but there is no perceivable optimum: "This amount of quality is what we can accept with this impact on tuition." The relationship between quality and tuition will have to be assessed annually and then efforts made to mitigate the negative impact on tuition. The President said he was alarmed by data he had seen which suggest that opportunities for lower income groups are getting worse; if so, he said, it is unacceptable and will have to be placed on the agenda of the state and nation when funding for higher education is considered.

Even though the 2% reallocation is hurting some units, the President continued, without it the University's chances to improve the learning experience for students would be even less. These all present difficult choices and trade-offs which will require the assistance of the Committee and others. The entire effort, however, he concluded, is not a straitjacket and will be reviewed each year to determine if the negatives offset the gains.

One student member told the President that for the first time all of her classes were being taught by tenured full professors and thanked him for encouraging the faculty to teach undergraduates; there is, she said, a world of difference. The President expressed delight and said that many faculty like to teach undergraduates but are pulled in many directions which are non-scholarly and non-teaching. If their agendas can be cleared, he said, for those core activities, much will be accomplished.

Professor Ibele thanked the President for his time.

4. Committee Calendar for 1990-91

The Committee approved the proposed 1990-91 schedule of its meetings, including a trip to the Morris campus on November 29.

5. Amendment to the By-laws, Senate Committee on Computing

The Committee approved without dissent the proposed by-law amendment which would extend the life of the Senate Committee on Computing and Information Services for another two years.

6. Discussion with Professor John Howe about the Task Force on Liberal Education

Professor Ibele next welcomed Professor Howe to the meeting to discuss the work of the Task Force on Liberal Education (hereinafter TFLE), the background of which Professor Ibele explained.

Professor Howe distributed copies of the membership list of the TFLE and briefly informed the Committee about the progress and discussions made thus far. The work has only begun this quarter, so not a great deal has yet been accomplished; Professor Howe said, however, he expected that the calendar set out in the charge letter will be met. A draft statement will be provided by the end of Fall Quarter and a final report by the end of Winter Quarter. Following that, he speculated, there would be a significant implementation phase, in which perhaps some TFLE members would be involved.

The task force is a strong one, he observed, and members understand they are not bringing views of particular constituencies to their work. Political brokering will of course occur, he noted, but the TFLE will not achieve its goals if it does not rise above those interests and fashion an overall vision on what a commonly-shared liberal education experience and outcome for all undergraduate students should be. Thus far the TFLE members appear to be doing that.

TFLE members bring a wide variety of experiences and knowledge about liberal education, Professor Howe observed, so the first few meetings have been a process of self-education. They have also reviewed the existing liberal education reports as well as a number of reports generated at the University over the past several years.

After meeting with the President next week, the task force will begin to address basic issues such as asking whether or not the current subject area requirements still make sense, whether some core curriculum might make sense or be possible, or if there are other strategies for approaching the issues.

TFLE members were asked to write down their views of what liberal education learning goals and outcomes should be sought; the results were analyzed and can be broken down into three areas:

- Fields of knowledge and ways of knowing
- Themes which carry through all study (international perspectives, multi-cultural appreciation, etc.)
- Ethical values.

While classical distribution requirements will be addressed, Professor Howe predicted, the task force report will also address the total undergraduate experience and will have implications for what occurs in the major and the teaching of undergraduates.

Although not far along, the task force is making reasonable progress and will try to function

through the summer in some way. Whether or not the faculty of the University can come to agreement on meaningful definitions of a commonly-shared undergraduate education is an open question, however, but a challenge worth addressing.

Professor Howe was asked about the second language requirement in CLA and the lack of a program in American Sign Language; would the task force examine this issue? He said that one thing the task force must determine is the level of generality at which it can function. Graduation requirements for undergraduates are set in a number of places (department, college, university); the task force mandate is to think across all colleges. Setting up a floor or minima, Professor Howe commented, seems too limiting--but there are limits to the specificity with which the task force can deal and in which all-University requirements can be stated. Whether or not a second-language requirement is one applicable to all students is a question the task force will need to address. Proposing to require, for example, that all students have an understanding of the biological sciences would not lead the task force to say how biology should be taught. Nor can the task force solve the problem in the CLA Humanities department. Decisions at those levels are best left to colleges to decide for their own students.

One Committee member commended the work of the task force thus far and urged that it not dally; there are a number of groups and colleges around the University which are considering curricular issues and which will need the report of the task force in order to complete their work.

Another Committee member observed that there are two ways to approach the task; one is to ask what knowledge should a student have and the other is to ask what capabilities they should possess. The latter requires a definition of the product of the educational enterprise--which institutions have been loath to develop, in part because it could perhaps not be done and in part because of a fear the standard could not be met. The task force, Professor Howe responded, is still exploring what position it will take and how it will address those issues. Different answers, it was suggested, will respond to different views of education (academic versus the parental and student expectations about being equipped to do certain things in the world, a more "professional" orientation).

The focus of an education, it was argued by one Committee member, should be on the problems of the United States; while it may have been important to be able to read a newspaper in a foreign language in the 1960s, that is no longer true. More attention must be paid to the community; learning about a lot of different things is less important than addressing local problems.

Professor Howe concurred that the recommendations of the task force might require resources and that the group--along with the administration and faculty and students--would have to balance off the resource questions with the recommendations. Practical restraints come into play; Professor Howe also agreed that the TFLE recommendations would have to be operational but that the task force would also have to decide how far it believed existing boundaries could be pushed back if it makes educational sense to do so. He also agreed that the recommendations could not be so broad as to have no impact.

Asked if there was any thought about transcending traditional disciplinary bounds, Professor Howe said the task force is examining the literature and what other institutions have done and will

have to address the issue.

It was suggested that Professor Howe spend time talking with Professor Guyotte from Morris, which campus has recently reviewed its liberal education requirements.

Professor Howe cautioned that it remains to be seen, if the task force calls for colleges and faculty to fashion new curricula, both for this purpose as well as to rethink their own curricula within the majors in light of liberal education objectives, whether or not the recommendations will sell. He invited the continuing involvement of members of the Committee as the task force conducts its work.

7. Resolution on Athletic Facilities

Professor Ibele next drew the attention of Committee members to the draft resolution on athletic facilities which had been sent out with the agenda; he explained that it reflected a statement by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning. The draft endorsed keeping men's basketball and hockey on campus and constructing or remodeling facilities to that end--with caveats about athletic income being used to finance construction and action awaiting the report of the ad hoc committee on intercollegiate athletics being jointly chaired by Professor Merwin and Regent Page.

Professor Ibele turned to Professor Steffes, who sits on the ad hoc committee, and inquired after his views. Dr. Steffes said that he believed, after much testimony to the ad hoc committee, that the athletic departments should be provided a budget with which to operate, a budget apart from revenues generated by events. The University should decide how much it wants to spend on athletics, based on the merits of the programs, and should also decide what facilities would best suit those programs. The revenues and the programs, and revenues and facilities, he said, should not be tied together. If revenues should decline, what happens? Or if there begins, nationally, to be a sharing of revenue, should that income go to the athletic department?

Another Committee member argued that the draft resolution would, intentionally or not, bind the ad hoc committee. It was also argued that implication was that the facility would be "free" because the (new) money would come from events; that money is now available, it was said. Other Committee members took issue with the latter assertion.

One Committee member recalled inquiring of Mr. Donhowe if the changed budget presentation to the Board of Regents (discussed at the Finance and Planning meeting the preceding Tuesday) presaged a change in the budgeting for athletics; Mr. Donhowe had said it did not. It is not usual to let a unit run on its own revenues without considerable oversight, it was asserted, but it appears that athletics (and the hospital) do not have that oversight.

It was suggested that construction of these facilities could drive the University toward an athletic program which could make compliance with Title IX more difficult.

Another Committee member proposed that the resolution be abbreviated to endorse the idea of sports on campus but call for the delay of any decision until the ad hoc committee makes its reports. Professor Steffes observed that the point of Regent Page's initial letter--which led to the creation of the ad hoc committee--was concern about building new facilities before deciding about the future of the

athletic programs.

There is a trade-off, however, if the large revenue-producing sports move off campus and there is no debt service as a result; that issue must be weighed.

Another commented that the impression is that the decision has already been made, by the Regents, and whether or not the ad hoc committee decides it would be better to go off campus in order to retain flexibility probably does not matter. Perhaps, conceded Professor Steffes, but if the decision has been made to build on campus then the appropriate controls over the athletic department budgets should be gathered by the administration. The Title IX issues are dramatic, and the approaches of the two departments are quite different. The women's program appears to make more philosophical sense than the men's--which seems to be driven by the revenue sports. There is, he said it should be noted, a strong commitment to undergraduate education in both athletic programs.

The Committee decided, since the Board of Regents would be taking up the issue at its May meeting, that it should adopt some statement to be forwarded to the Regents calling for them to delay a decision until the ad hoc committee has prepared its report. The discussion led it to be understood that a majority of the Committee felt strongly that sports should be on campus; the Committee, however, also rejected a proposal to include language which would explicitly call for the return of football from the Metrodome.

On vote taken, with one dissent, the Committee adopted the following resolution:

The Senate Consultative Committee endorses the principle that intercollegiate sports be on campus but recommends that no action be taken on the construction and renovation of athletic facilities prior to the release of the final report by the ad hoc committee on athletics chaired by Regent Alan Page and Professor Jack Merwin. The Committee does not wish to see the deliberations of the ad hoc committee bound by a construction decision, i.e., the requirement of an income stream to pay the debt service presumes a continuation of men's basketball and ice hockey as they are currently operated, a presumption with which the ad hoc committee might wish to take issue.

8. Action on the Ombuds Service

Professor Ibele next turned to the draft letter sent with the agenda which would create an ad hoc committee, chaired by Professor Striebel, to develop a proposal for an institution or campus-wide ombuds service. He asked if the Committee would approve this manner of proceeding.

Concern was expressed about the breadth of the proposed service; charging it with responsibility for "all those who deal with the University" seemed too broad, it was argued; it should be first for staff and students. One function of an ombuds service is to answer questions and provide information (such as when people call up), the Committee was told, and one impetus came from the Regents; they get a lot of calls and need to pass them off to the appropriate people. The other activity is dispute resolution. In many instances the service does nothing more than pass people off to the

appropriate offices. The ad hoc committee would clearly have to pare the system down so that it did not get involved in such things as the Minnesota Extension Service or patient complaints in the hospital.

Most of the Big Ten schools have such a service and information from them will be obtained by the ad hoc committee.

The Committee approved the appointment of the ad hoc committee.

9. Proposed Amendments, Senate Constitution

Professor Ibele next turned to amendments to the Senate Constitution and the Senate by-laws. The constitutional amendment provides that the vice chair may be elected from among those who have served in the Senate in the previous five years (as well as from those currently serving). Professor Ibele explained that the requirement of present tenure in the Senate was too limiting; experience with the governance system is desirable, however, so that recent service in the Senate is reasonable. The change would permit the Consultative Committee more flexibility in achieving balance among its members (inasmuch as the Consultative Committee typically recommends a candidate and the individual elected serves as a voting member of SCC).

It was clarified, apropos the comment section appended to the proposed amendment, that there is no requirement that the vice chair of the Senate be a faculty member. The language of the constitution describes the membership of SCC as 10 elected faculty, 9 elected students, and the vice chair of Senate. The comment is thus somewhat misleading because it implies that FCC membership can be balanced by the choice.

It was also confirmed that if a student were selected as vice chair, he or she would not be a member of FCC. It was not clear whether or not the vice chair is to serve also as a member of SSCC or FCC (depending on whether the individual is a student or a faculty member), although the language seemed to imply that he or she would serve with the appropriate committee.

The amendment was approved for placement on the Senate docket notwithstanding the comment.

The second amendment, forwarded from the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, repairs an oversight from the rewriting of the by-laws when the committees were restructured; it places the chair of the Subcommittee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation as an ex-officio member of the (parent) Committee on Finance and Planning.

The Committee approved the amendment without dissent for placement on the docket of the Senate.

It was noted, as a result of the discussion, that there is an unfilled faculty seat on the Consultative Committee; there have only been 9 elected faculty for the past several years. [Subsequent to the meeting a by-law amendment was prepared for the Senate which would fill the 10th seat.]

10. Continued Discussion, Resolution Calling for Proportional Representation

Professor Ibele asked the Committee to return to its (sometimes heated) discussion of the resolution on proportional representation. He expressed dismay at the resolution, describing it as "pernicious and alien" because it implies that only people from certain groups can represent themselves and that there are no common interests or no sensitivities which permit individuals to identify with others. If effected, he said, it would cause nothing but chaos in the governance system. Granting the best construction to the intent, Professor Ibele concluded, the resolution nonetheless has the potential for a great deal of mischief and, for all those reasons, said he was unalterably opposed to it. He added, however, that he would certainly not oppose a resolution calling for all due regard for the principle of diversity in electing members of the Senate or preparing slates for the Consultative Committee or the Committee on Committees and those charged with such responsibilities be held to that standard.

One Committee member responded that this argument was the same one made by undergraduates about the representation of graduate students; the response of SCC to that argument was that it does not work. The response to Professor Ibele's argument, it was said, is the same: It doesn't work. A number of groups are not now represented, it was declared, and there must be fair representation "by some kind of device that works."

One Committee member noted that there is a limit to how far he, as a white male, can be sensitive to the concerns of women, minorities, homosexuals, etc., no matter how much he might try. The University has a wide variety of groups and they should be represented in the governance system because there is a limit to how much well-intentioned white males can do.

Another, however, interjected that "this is such a grocery list of disenfranchised groups, if you will--we've got everyone in here." Could the proposal not be made more general, it was asked, and refer to gender and race. In response to a request for amending language, however, the Committee member demurred, saying he would not vote for it. Yet another agreed that the list was too long although reflected that he could conceive of no rationale to exclude any of the groups mentioned; all should be represented and the resolution heads in the right direction.

One Committee member inquired if individuals would be required to identify their affectional preference; it would not be possible to allocate the appropriate number of Senate seats to homosexuals unless their numbers in the University population could be determined.

"I don't think any one of us 'ran' for our position, did we?" queried one Committee members; several responded that they had done so. "I did not run for the position and I do not represent [my unit]; I represent the faculty viewpoint; I happen to be from [a unit]" it was argued, and this resolution does not compare the same things. The groups represented on the Consultative Committees contain minorities and other groups.

One Committee member inquired if it would be as likely that a white male Senator would introduce a resolution to respond to the racial harassment that occurred in Computer Science; several others replied that it would and that it was a white male who did introduce such a resolution. Even so,

it was responded, there is a limit to how much a white male can do.

While one can appreciate the philosophy expressed that the faculty are elected at large and are all on the Committee to represent the faculty view and the best interests of the University, expounded one faculty member, it is a nice theory but the result is that the University is represented mostly by white males. It is a practice which has been going on for a long time and it is time for it to end; there should be genuine constituencies which have their own representatives. "I assure you that I was elected by a constituency, I ran in that constituency, that constituency voted for me, and I feel a great loyalty to that constituency. This is a tradition that does have some currency in political theory--that we elect people to represent constituencies and basically that is what this resolution says and it is the only way that we are ever going to have faculty governance genuinely represents the diversity of this institution." There is much lip service given to diversity but in the final analysis there is not much seen in practice.

At this point it was moved and seconded that the resolution be approved and forwarded to the Senate.

In the discussion one Committee member said that diversity is wholly appropriate but that it should come from the top and permeate the activities of the institution; it should not, however, be interpreted as a numbers issue in every thing done at the University.

One student member noted that this resolution had been adopted by the Student Senate Consultative Committee and that for the SCC to vote against putting it on the docket of the Senate would amount to an act of censorship--which would be inappropriate given the importance of the issue. The entire Senate should decide, it was asserted. Other Committee members dissented from the term censorship; there is genuine disagreement not with the principle but with the form. Another said he would vote against it because he had only had it presented in the last hour and the implications were too great for it to be acted upon so quickly; several joined in the sentiment that the principle was attractive but that the resolution was unacceptable.

It was eventually agreed, in light of the sentiments expressed, that an ad hoc committee of SCC should meet to develop alternative language which would embody the principle. One Committee member who supported the resolution said she could accept the idea of a group to straighten out the language but that it probably would not do much good. "What I hear my colleagues saying is that they are all for the principle of diversity as long as it isn't implemented; what we are looking for is implementation." Another said, however, that he was in favor of a careful resolution which would address the issues and which could command the support of the entire SCC and also be instructive to the governance system.

One student member inquired, if this resolution were deferred until it could be rewritten, whether or not the faculty would accept wording which would call for mandated representation consistent with the rationale used for graduate and professional students. If that would not be supported then the Twin Cities Assembly would have trouble with any alternatives because mandated representation was the logic behind the graduate/professional student assembly.

One faculty member responded that the point had already been made that the faculty and

undergraduate and graduate student bodies are already composed of diverse members; the vote for the graduate and professional students was a functional separation, which is being confused with a desire to have different groups represented based on an entirely different kind of categorization. The resolution mixes up elements; to compare it to separate representation for undergraduates and graduate students is a false comparison.

Another faculty member agreed that apples and oranges are being compared but that both kinds of representation are important. This resolution represents the right thing to do. Another said the idea is to have groups represented because they have different interests. Yet another said the structure is inherently flawed in terms of permitting diversity even though the various groups in the system are diverse--and then argued that the resolution should be reworded, with a better rationale and clearer logic, if that choice would allow discussion. The question of credibility, another commented, was important; this resolution would do more damage than good.

Another Committee member inquired how his college would be expected to implement the proposal in the conduct of its elections if the resolution were adopted by the Senate; in its present form, he said, the college could not act on it.

Another expressed reservations about the reaction of the Senate and warned that the result would not be positive; any genuine effort to deal with the issues raised requires that the resolution be rewritten. One Committee member responded that "we don't expect for a minute that it will pass. We would like it to be heard and discussed. Maybe a few people will change their minds and maybe a few people will look around the Senate and see what kind of diversity they have and maybe ten years from now something will get changed."

Professor Striebel agreed to gather a group together to redraft the resolution; the Committee agreed that a place for discussion would be held on the Senate agenda and the reworded statement would be distributed by mail or at the Senate meeting.

The Committee adjourned at 4:20.

-- Gary Engstrand