

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
12:30 - 1:30, 2:30 - 3:00
Faculty Consultative Committee
1:30 - 2:30 [minutes with FCC 02-01-96]
Thursday, February 1, 1996
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Carl Adams (chair), John Adams, Joel Bergstrom, Bruce Bromberek, Mike Davey, Virginia Gray, James Gremmels, Robert Jones, Corey Kopacek, Laura Coffin Koch, Melissa Lind, Geoffrey Maruyama, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson, Michael Steffes,
- Regrets: Lester Drewes, Roberta Humphreys, Paul Kluge
- Absent: Benjamin Duranske, Helen Phin, Malik Shabazz, Amber Strack
- Guests: Assistant Vice President Jane Canney (Student Development and Athletics), Jamie Tiedemann, Carla Ferucci (both from the Program Against Sexual Violence); Senior Vice President E. F. Infante; Associate Vice Presidents Roger Paschke and Richard Pfutzenreuter

[In these minutes: Semester conversion standards; grading policy; sexual assault policy; discussion with Senior Vice President Infante about budgets, planning, the Graduate School, University College, and tenure; provostal governance; administrative process redesign]

1. Semester Conversion Standards

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 12:40 and asked Professor Koch about changes to the Semester Conversion Standards.

She said that there were few. The Law School would be exempt from the 72-hour rule for turning in grades (as it is now) because they need a two-week grading period. SCEP is looking into the financial implications of a January or May term. SCEP has also proposed that the Senate express its view, on each conversion standard, whether the standard should be campus-specific or system-wide. She confirmed that if the motion to make a standard system-wide failed, the Senate would then seek to pass it as a recommendation to each campus assembly for consideration, with acknowledgement of the costs and benefits of variance. The assumption, she agreed, is that if a campus adopted a different standard, they would have to bear the costs associated with the decision. While there did not seem to be a lot of controversy about the standards, SCEP believes the autonomy issue is important.

Questions were raised about whether the Medical School could accept the semester calendar; it has a very different calendar at present and may have equally compelling an argument. Forcing it on the

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

semester system may force an unnecessary change in its pedagogy. If exempted, Professor Koch commented, it could keep its calendar; if not, it would not. One Committee member cautioned that it is not appropriate to exempt anyone from the standards solely because that is not how things are done now. If there are to be exemptions, there must be a rationale for them.

Some of what the Medical School teaches interacts with the rest of the University, it was pointed out, and it must to some extent be on the same calendar as the rest of the University. If there are exemptions, they may apply to clinical training.

Professor Koch promised to talk with the Medical School about its calendar. It was emphasized again that it would not be a problem to exempt a unit, but there must be a reason, and the same reason should be available to all--but the reason CANNOT be because the semesters are different from what they do now.

If there is no provision in the standards for seeking an exemption (which there is not), then the Medical School may seek one in the standards, it was said, in order to be on the same calendar as other medical schools.

It was agreed that the semester conversion standards would be on the docket.

2. Grading Policy

Professor Adams turned again to Professor Koch for a discussion of the grading policy.

There have been some changes, she reported. The biggest one has to do with the W. SCEP had a discussion about points raised by CLA with respect to the W, and concluded it should rewrite the provision. The previous version provided that after the sixth week of class, a student had to have a passing grade in the course to receive a W, otherwise it would be an N or an F, depending on which grading system the student had enrolled under. The revision provides that a student must have the permission of the college to withdraw after the sixth week (whether passing the course or not), and that permission should NOT be granted solely because a student was not passing the course.

SCEP retained the one-time "get out of jail free card" option, permitting a student to withdraw anytime up to the last day of classes with a W once during his or her undergraduate career. CLA permits a student to withdraw once, without penalty, from all but one course in one term; SCEP needs to discuss this issue further, Professor Koch commented.

Another change is in the provision on repeating a course; in the earlier version, only the LAST grade earned would count. The current draft says that the FIRST grade will count, if a C or an S or higher. This allows students to repeat a course, but not simply to increase the GPA, and all grades will appear on the transcript. CLA students have argued that the two grades should be averaged, and some have argued this penalizes students who want to learn the material better.

Some students have expressed opposition to pluses and minuses, fearing there will not be uniformity with the finer grading scale, and because the S is set equal to the C (2.00), rather than C- (1.67). It was reported that of the 43 AAU schools who responded to a request for information by the

Registrar's office, only 6 do not use plus/minus grading.

Professor Koch said the grading policy is not to be for action, because SCEP wishes to talk with more students and to reconsider some of the provisions.

Committee members talked more about setting the S equivalent to the C rather than the C-; one observed that a student would receive credit towards a degree with a C- if on the A-F scale but not if on the S-N scale, which seems inconsistent. What is sufficient work? The reason goes to the definition of the grade of C (2.00), which is the point at which all of the work required for the course is satisfactorily completed and worthy of credit. If a C- does not meet that standard, then what logic is there for giving it an S, Professor Koch inquired? The question is where to draw the line. She said that SCEP would talk about the issue again.

There was also concern whether or not faculty would use pluses and minuses, if the policy were adopted. Some faculty teaching introductory courses might use them; others teaching the same course might not. Variations in grading occurs now, Professor Koch pointed out; faculty bring different grading philosophies to classes: some think most students should receive an A while others think almost no one should. The existing system is actually LESS descriptive.

The concern is that if someone does not want to use pluses and minuses, they will not. This is a subtle issue, said one Committee member. If the Senate says there will be S-N grading and A-F grading with pluses and minuses, does that mean someone has the option not to use pluses and minuses, or is the presumption that faculty WILL USE them, but could argue that no one earned a plus or minus? Is there an option, or will faculty use THIS SYSTEM? If the latter, the presumption is that faculty will use pluses and minuses, although no one will insist they do so through enforcement.

The use of pluses and minuses could vary with the course, observed one Committee member. A 350-student introductory course with machine-graded finals invites a different discrimination from a small 5-XXX specialty course in a major.

The question is whether to opt for ambiguity or to search for clarity, said one Committee member. One might say that when the system is adopted, people will be expected to use it. Or one might not say that. To say pluses and minuses are required, responded one Committee member, is to say one should use all the grades in each class, and most professors do not believe that: sometimes one has a good class, sometimes bad. This is an option, not a mandate that cannot be enforced.

If the policy is adopted, the presumption is that people will use it; otherwise, why adopt it? It is not an option from which one can pick and choose, even though there will be no enforcement, and to mandate use is to mandate the unenforceable. If one SAYS there is an option, however, that is a different posture.

It was agreed the policy would be on the Senate docket again for discussion.

3. Sexual Assault Policy

Professor Adams next welcomed Assistant Vice President Jane Canney from Student Development and Athletics, along with Director Jamie Tiedemann and student volunteer Carla Ferrucci from the

Program Against Sexual Violence, and turned to Mr. Bergstrom, chair of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, to lead the discussion of the proposed Sexual Assault policy the Committee recommended to SCC.

Mr. Bergstrom explained that this policy had been revised because an earlier version had referred only to students; it now covers the entire University community.

The first question raised by the Committee was why the word "survivor" was used; Mr. Bergstrom explained that this is the term accepted in the field. Why not "victim," asked one Committee member? "Survivor" implies that there was intent to kill and the person narrowly escaped. This term, added another, convicts the person who may be accused of the assault.

It was explained that this is a term preferred by those who have been assaulted, rather than the term victim, because it is a positive way to get through the experience. A person loses control of the situation; this term helps "re-empower" them to recover. One "re-victimizes" them by calling them victims.

Using either term connotes knowledge that there was an offense and someone is guilty, said one Committee member; one cannot always be sure that assumption should be made. One can understand the use of the term "survivor," but one ought not to write legislation with such terms in it.

This policy is important, it was said; one can understand the concern but if the Committee keeps heming and hawing, it will be delayed again. As a student, one would be glad to know the University has this policy on the books. The policy was developed and approved by the Program Against Sexual Violence Advisory Board, Ms. Canney reported, which consists of students, faculty, and staff, and was the result of work done across the campus. The campus was "a sorry state" when the President appointed a task force on sexual violence, which moved ahead and was recognized nationally. There has been a 33% increase in requests for service from the Program Against Sexual Violence in the past year; the problem cannot be pushed aside or not addressed, she told the Committee.

Another Committee member took exception to language in the policy that provided "the decision to report the sexual assault of a member of the University community by another member of the University community rests solely with the survivor. . . ." This means a bystander should not report an assault to the University? This is ABSOLUTELY WRONG, it was argued; this says it is WRONGFUL for a witness to report an assault.

The intent, Ms. Canney said, is that it is up to the survivor to report an assault and seek advice. What is the rationale for that, she was asked? This draft says that if someone observes an assault, they should NOT, as a matter of University policy, report it. The goal is to protect the identity of the person assaulted, Ms. Canney replied. How can the identity be protected if the assault is reported, asked another Committee member? Just because it is reported does not mean the identity of the person must become public, although it would be available to the police.

One Committee member objected to some of the language in the policy, suggesting it was editorial rather than part of the policy, and cited several examples. Other Committee members concurred. Ms. Canney said the language is similar to that used in other policies and statements; it is more than a policy, but is also a statement about sexual assault. They wanted to keep in mind the concerns of parents about

the safety of their children when considering attending the University.

Professor Adams suggested that the document could be edited, with some of the background statements as a lead-in, not tied to the rest of the policy. It is not clear the policy should editorialize. He said the Committee could send the policy back to be cleaned up, or it could be accepted, or accepted with the understanding it would be cleaned up before being placed on the docket. One Committee member noted that there was a motion on the floor to approve the policy; on vote taken, the motion failed on a 5-5 tie vote.

There is a need for the policy, Professor Adams commented; he said he had heard nothing against it except that editorial changes are needed. If they can be made, the policy could probably be put on the docket. One Committee member said that policy and conversation about it are all mixed together; they should be separated into a policy and commentary. Professor Adams suggested that Committee members put their suggestions in writing, but that there be no change in the substance of the policy.

To whom does one report an assault, asked one Committee member? Mr. Bergstrom said the Program Against Sexual Violence is there for advocacy and support, but nothing says anyone must go to the police; that is an individual decision. There is a "victim's rights statement" to accompany the policy, Ms. Canney reported; it was not included because it is redundant with the policy; the language in it comes from the 1992 crime bill adopted by the legislature.

Professor Adams thanked Ms. Canney, Ms. Tiedemann, and Ms. Ferrucci and asked Committee members to convey their comments on the policy to Mr. Bergstrom or Dr. Engstrand to be forwarded to the policy authors.

4. Provostal Governance

Professor Adams reconvened the Senate Consultative Committee and drew the attention of Committee members to the item, for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly docket, on provostal governance. The significant question is how to deal with the student component of provostal governance, he said.

The students do not see a reason for separate committees, said one Committee member. It is understandable that the faculty wish to get up and running as soon as possible. The faculty and students of the Senate Consultative Committee meet separately when necessary; students wish to see joint provostal committees that meet separately when necessary. Students also fear the provosts will forget about students if student representation is not acted on.

There is also a concern that once the faculty piece is enacted, they will forget about the students, Professor Adams related. One way to protect the students would be to include a sunset clause in the bylaw creating the provostal faculty consultative committees (PFCCs), which would force re-introduction of the issue to insure student needs are addressed.

Professor Gray, who led the effort to create the PFCCs, explained the reason for separate bodies. If they are joint, they become too large; the provosts have made it clear they do not wish to meet with big groups, but want small groups and a conversation. Second, these are not legislative bodies, unlike this Committee, which serves as the agenda-setting body for the Senate. Third, faculty must get involved in

consulting quickly because there are critical issues to be addressed. Fourth, especially in the Academic Health Center, there remain a number of unresolved issues about student representation which cannot be solved immediately.

Committee members expressed a variety of views in support of and in opposition to a sunset clause. A motion to place the item on the docket without a sunset provision failed on a 3-4 vote. A motion to place the item on the docket with a sunset clause in 18 months failed on a 2-2 vote.

At this point Professor Adams recessed the discussion and welcomed Associate Vice Presidents Paschke and Pfitzenreuter to the meeting to discuss administrative process redesign.

5. Administrative Process Redesign

Professor Adams welcomed Messrs. Paschke and Pfitzenreuter and explained that Professors Fennel Evans and David Hamilton had raised with the Committee a number of issues; the President asked Mr. Paschke to help the Committee understand them better. One hears there will be a lot of administrative process redesign, with funds available to be directed elsewhere. Professors Evans and Hamilton said there is a lot of money in support services, and there are large efficiencies to be accomplished if they are rethought, with the money to be used for other things. The President has talked about a target of 25% savings in selected areas.

Mr. Paschke noted that Senior Vice President Jackson, Associate Vice President Carrier, and Associate Vice President Kvavik were also present and could answer questions. He distributed a handout explaining and summarizing the administrative process redesign projects planned or underway, and said the process began in July of 1995, when a group identified business processes and systems that were not working well, could be more efficient, and could generate savings for the institution. The group identified six areas of priority: grants management, business service delivery (procurement), human resource information system, facilities utilization, student systems replacement, and financial management systems. Semesters and Responsibility Center Management have since been added to the list.

The second part of administrative process redesign is implementation. The decision was to identify the responsible unit heads as the ones to carry the ball. The President has said the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations is in charge, because most of the units report to her, and she is to see that efforts are started and carried forward.

There are two things missing from the list, said one Committee member. One is a target for savings; the other is a timetable. These have been talked about endlessly; if there are improvements in business services, \$10 million should be available from Purchasing by January. If the biweekly payroll is implemented, Payroll should be cut by \$250,000. This is what was promised; money should be transferred, not absorbed into general overhead.

Mr. Pfitzenreuter reminded the Committee that the President has already ordered cuts in central administration of \$8.9 million; the savings from adopting the biweekly payroll are included in that figure. But he agreed on the desirability of "mapping" the savings.

There should also be downsizing after the sale of the hospital to Fairview, it was said, and money should go into a pool that can be allocated--or into the \$8.9 million. If the money is not pulled out, work will expand to fit the number of bodies. There are savings outside central administration, Mr. Pfitzenreuter observed, and capturing those savings as well will be important.

The contract with Coke is wonderful, said one Committee member, but the unit that developed it also captured all the money, and it is not available for institutional reallocation. The Committee does not want to see that happen again.

Mr. Paschke agreed it is important to capture the money; the question is how to do it. He mentioned the introduction of a purchasing card, to save money on the 600,000 small transactions the University has every year. The card should cut the amount of paper involved and save departments money. How will the money be captured in departments? One Committee member exclaimed that if the money is not captured, it is not savings! At a minimum, suggested another Committee member, there ought to be an estimate of what is given to someone else (i.e., the departments).

Asked about the need to integrate the payroll system with other systems by the year 2000, and if there would be any long-term savings from the biweekly payroll, given the initial cost of \$500,000, Mr. Pfitzenreuter noted that billions of lines of code will have to be rewritten for the year 2000 and that processes will have to be redesigned as a result. He agreed that savings to be captured from central services can be identified; it will be hard to do for savings in departments. Even a reasoned estimate of those departmental savings would be helpful, said one Committee member.

One Committee member asked what the base was from which the \$8.9 million was being cut; if there is to be a 25% savings, what is the total amount? Mr. Pfitzenreuter said he could not answer the question because it depends on what is included in the 25%, University administrative costs or just central costs. Does it include libraries and computing? The \$8.9 million was applied to units in Finance and Operations and in Academic Affairs; one Committee member pointed out that no one knows what units those were. Another Committee member commented that if the percentage were high, one could feel sorry for the administration and tell them they deserved to keep the \$250,000 savings from the biweekly payroll. If the cuts were no higher than those imposed on academic units, however, then the administration should not keep the money. The reductions for salary increases came on top of the \$8.9 million, Mr. Pfitzenreuter explained.

There has been a reluctance to supply information about the \$8.9 million, Professor Morrison pointed out, but the President has said it should be made available. Mr. Pfitzenreuter said it would be when the budget is made public; documents will be ready on February 23, when the hearings are over. Then consultation will be meaningless, Professor Morrison rejoined.

The question is whether consultation is appropriate or desirable or possible, said another Committee member. One side says there will be no consultation; the other says there is nothing to consult on. One hopes there is something that could be consulted on. Mr. Pfitzenreuter explained that all budget documents are due February 23, after which there will be sessions to review them. The final decisions will be by the President and Board of Regents; the budget will go to the Board in April, and there will be time to consult after information is assembled on February 23. Asked if there could be consultation then, Mr. Pfitzenreuter said there could be, but it must be through the two senior vice presidents. Professor

Morrison promised to address the request of the Finance and Planning Committee to them.

With respect to the \$8.9 million in cuts, Mr. Pfutzenreuter explained that the two senior vice presidents will need time after February 23 to review them and to meet with the units that are affected. There should be effective consultation after that, Professor Adams concluded, and before decisions are made.

Professor Adams then inquired, about the redesign process, whether there is an expectation of savings or simply a "do your best and see what happens." What guidance is being offered to the groups working on the redesign about savings and timing? To the extent projects have been launched, timelines have been identified and the expectation of savings made known; the amount of savings has not been identified, Mr. Paschke told the Committee.

This is critical, said one Committee member; the redesign effort could be very significant to long-term forward financial planning. If 25% savings are accomplished, that would have a BIG impact. But there is a lot to do that could require investment, so the net will be nowhere near the 25%. As the biennial request discussions start, someone must make judgments about how much in savings is expected over the next three to five years; that will interact with tuition and other revenue sources.

Mr. Paschke agreed. As the projects occur, they will be able to make estimates. He also alluded to the savings that can be achieved if there are new systems in place in human resources, student systems, and financial management. There will be a clearer idea of savings to be achieved in the next budget.

The new systems will cost money initially, pointed out one Committee member; the two most expensive items will have the biggest payoff for the University in the next three years: student and human resource systems. This is an important point, said another Committee member; at an appropriate time, it will be important to have gross estimates of savings--for example, there will be a 25% savings expected, with an initial 10% increase in expenditures, and then a series of reductions. People do not know how to think about this; there is a need to know the structure and the timeframe to provide guidance.

Mr. Paschke said they would take the initiative to provide information to the Committee when the projects are more clearly defined. Professor Adams said the Committee would appreciate it, because people see these huge numbers of dollars to be saved and opportunities to be efficient, but then don't know how to think about it. It is important to understand that the University must spend money to save money, and the result may be to help people in the units, not additional funds freed up.

The Committee was told that 2/3 to 3/4 of the costs of the University are for support, not direct instructional costs. Is there any idea of the base on which savings are to be achieved? Mr. Pfutzenreuter said it is a mistake to view the situation that way; one could look at activities by function--but at the same time the CUFS org function codes may bear little relationship to reality. He said he would not dispute what the Committee was told, but he has trouble with the data.

Professor Adams thanked Messrs. Paschke and Pfutzenreuter and assured them the discussion would continue on this important issue.

4., continued: Provostal Governance

Professor Adams then inquired again of the Committee what disposition it wished to make of the bylaw change creating the provostal faculty consultative committees. It was unanimously voted to approve the bylaw amendment, with a sunset provision, and the dockets for the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly were also then unanimously approved.

Professor Adams adjourned the meeting at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota