

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
April 4, 1991**

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), W. Andrew Collins, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, J. Kim Munholland, Thomas Scott, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine, Shirley Zimmerman

Guests: Dean Hal Miller, Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Ibele began the meeting by presenting a number of governance personnel items for consideration of the Committee. Agreement was reached on a number of appointments to be sought.

Professor Bruce Overmier, who is on leave for Spring Quarter, has resigned; the Committee elected Professor Mario Bognanno to begin his term early.

A vice-chair of the Senate must be nominated at the next meeting. It was agreed to propose dividing the position of vice-chair of the Senate and vice-chair of the Assembly, which would permit the students to nominate an individual for the latter position. Because the Faculty Consultative Committee is one member short--due to the vacancy in the Duluth seat--the faculty wish to have a faculty member serve as vice-chair of the Senate (and thus as a member of SCC and FCC).

The search for Dean of the Graduate School and Vice President for Research has begun; the deadline for applications is April 19. FCC will be involved in interviews of the candidates.

Faculty Salary Increases; Retention Cases Senior Vice President Kuhl has informed him that it is the intention of the administration, if there is no money for faculty salary increases, to provide small raises for those who are promoted and to set aside funds for retention cases. Concern was expressed by Committee members about retention cases; one said they are seen as "gifts from the dean to his buddies and in many cases has nothing whatever to do with retention." One individual responded that that was an over-broad generalization and that many units do try to retain individuals on the basis of merit. Professor Ibele said that if there is a concern the subject should be raised with Dr. Kuhl in the near future.

The problem with retention cases, it was said, is that there is no review, unlike in the instance of promotion. The intent, it is understood, is that the cases which will be addressed will those where the individual has a bona fide offer from another institution, rather than "anticipatory retention." It was agreed that the Committee would communicate its views that any retention increases be based on bona fide offers and that any such increases be reviewed by some appropriate faculty group within each college.

* 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.

It was recalled that central administration had earlier decided to take itself out of retention cases; the funds, in these prospective cases, will apparently have to come from the deans' offices, because there are no centrally-held funds for this purpose.

One Committee member observed that there is no real incentive for central administrators to obtain salary increases for the faculty--because some time ago they announced that they themselves would receive no increases. There does appear to be a marked lack of interest in lobbying for faculty salary increases; if the administration does not make the pitch, and this Committee does not urge it, then no one will make the arguments. It was agreed that Professor Ibele should inquire of Professor Maruyama, faculty legislative liaison, whether or not he believes the case is being made or if the University appears to believe the cause is lost.

Another concern arises because even if there are some monies from the State, the administration is unwilling to give general salary increases. The administration would prefer to use the funds selectively for groups of faculty "who are out of line." It appears that the intent is to use whatever funds are available to begin address salary inequities--before the working group now examining the structure of academic salaries completes its work.

It was agreed that Professors Ibele and Shapiro will write a strongly-worded letter to President Hasselmo concerning the points raised in this discussion.

It was also agreed that the Committee should take up, in a more serious fashion, the entire question of retention. In the view of one faculty member who was a retention case some years ago (and who left the University), when someone leaves an institution it is like taking your arm out of a bucket of water: Once it's gone, there is no evidence it was ever there. Even when the University loses a retention case, the individual is not missed and is replaced. The entire concept of retention should be reconsidered; "I think it's blackmail." Another observed that if it is a case of the dean rewarding buddies, it is intolerable. If, however, the case is made by the faculty themselves--who feel keenly enough about one of their colleagues that they wish to see him or her retained, even at some expense to themselves--then it should be carefully considered. The present system, it was riposted, is a "sick system . . . and it begs for bad behavior." It also inherently discriminates against women, it was observed, because they are less mobile due to greater family commitments; all the statistics show they are much less apt to move--and are perceived as much less willing to move.

One Committee member said that salary increases accompanying promotion need to be more than nominal; if not, problems are created later and departments feel obligated, down the line, to mortgage money to adequately reward faculty who earlier received only these nominal increases. Departments are now agonizing over inequities due to varying amounts of funds for salary increases in the past.

Professor Ibele said he would comment to the Board of Regents on the concern about faculty salaries when he makes his report at the April meeting. He also solicited from Committee members other items about which he should report to the Board.

Professor Ibele urged that FCC members attend the next meeting of the Working Group on Academic Salaries.

2. Discussion with Dean Hal Miller

Professor Ibele next welcomed Dean Miller to the meeting and recalled for Committee members a discussion held several months earlier during which a number of comments about Continuing Education and Extension were made. Some of those comments, it appears, suggested that there are misconceptions abroad in the land about the financing and organization of CEE; it seemed that it would be useful to have Dean Miller speak to the Committee to clarify those misconceptions.

Dean Miller began by saying he had read with interest and some concern the comments by a number of people about CEE; he then wrote to Professor Ibele about them, who, in turn, invited him to join the Committee. Dean Miller distributed to Committee members a 1988 brochure which summarized the programs offered by CEE, although noted that some of them have since been retrenched or reallocated.

Dean Miller then briefly reviewed the history of CEE as well as the scope of its programs. In 1989-90 there were about 40,000 students in Extension classes on the Twin Cities campus taking courses for credit; there were about 90,000 course registrations. They offered about 3,000 classes. CEE also operates the programs at Duluth and Morris and has a center at Rochester; both credit and non-credit programs are offered at all sites. About 40,000 people also enroll for non-credit courses in various professional areas. The budget of CEE is nearly \$50 million, almost 90% of which comes from fees and course tuition. CEE also operates the University film library and KUOM--until it closes--and KUMD at Duluth. There are also about 29,000 people who watch television programs offered by CEE (the most well-known of which is "Minnesota Issues," a joint effort involving University Media Resources--a CEE unit--and the Humphrey Institute and University Relations.

One point mentioned at the earlier meeting was the problem of coordination of University outreach activities. While this is a problem, Dean Miller said, and it has existed for a long time, a more critical question is who is speaking for outreach in the President's Cabinet and Provost's Council. There has been discussion, ever since President Hasselmo arrived at the University, about the need for better coordination of research; there is an equal need for coordination of outreach. While he and Dean Borich (Minnesota Extension Service) do not necessarily advocate the creation of a vice president for outreach, nonetheless someone needs to be the spokesperson for the role of outreach in the University's central councils.

Dean Miller said he keenly felt the need for such a voice in light of the deep cuts CEE has taken in the last two rounds of retrenchment. This year, out of total of \$7.6 million in State funds, CEE was cut by \$1.4 million. This does not count Summer Session. Contrary to what may be understood, Summer Session produces substantial income; at this time it is budgeted to produce \$1 million above expenses. Last year, because enrollment was higher than expected, Summer Session actually produced \$1.25 million for the University. With reallocation, Summer Session tuition has been increased and it is expected to provide an additional \$360,000 in revenues; the contribution of Summer Session to general University programs will then be well over \$1.5 million.

Another issue mentioned at the earlier meeting had to do with quality and quality-control. CEE believes that quality control (particularly for credit courses) is a departmental responsibility. It is CEE's

expectation that departments will select faculty from among their own ranks. But they may select someone from outside and authorize that individual to teach for them. Quality control is primarily in the hands of the departments. CEE will advise departments about whether or not there is a demand for a course; it is up to departments to staff the courses.

On the issue of KUOM, Dean Miller said, he has been fighting that battle since 1974, when there was an effort at that time to turn the station over to another network in the State. Under Commitment to Focus, the program was changed and the audience declined. The battle has now been lost.

Dean Miller was asked how CEE accounted for increased enrollments in Summer Session and what the tuition is. The tuition is currently set at the tuition rate charged the previous academic year. Enrollment changes are difficult to account for; 70% of students are regular-year academic students. The economy also has an effect on enrollment. CEE markets and publicizes Summer Session quite a bit. Generally, there is a correlation between enrollment in a Summer Session and enrollment the previous Fall Quarter--a statistic which obtains nationally.

What is the breakdown between students who take Extension courses and students who take regular courses? It is understood that Extension students can take Day courses as well as Extension courses. About 30% of the students who enroll in Extension courses, Dean Miller said, are also taking Day courses; about 70% are not. He said he did not have figures for the number of Day students who take Extension courses, and vice-versa; the total number who mix their courses make up 30% of Extension enrollment.

This is complicated, one Committee member observed, by the fact that Extension tuition is much cheaper than non-resident tuition. Any non-resident student "who has a brain registers for as many of their courses as possible through Extension--even though they are taking Day courses and are really Day students." Dean Miller reported that Student Support Services has just completed a study to learn if there were significant numbers of non-resident students, especially international students, who avoid non-resident tuition by taking courses through CEE. This hypothesis was not supported. Overall, non-resident-tuition-paying students take fewer credits in CEE than those paying resident tuition. While there are some international students who take more credits in CEE, they are relatively few in number. Rather than using CEE as a vehicle to avoid paying higher tuition, the vast majority of non-resident students who pay resident tuition do so by virtue of exemptions explicitly created in University policy. Two examples of such exemptions would include having a graduate assistantship or being from a reciprocity state. The Committee member cautioned that he did not see reliance by non-residents on Extension courses as a problem; anything the University can do to encourage more international and non-resident students to attend, in order to increase diversity, is desirable. The practice will be less widespread in the future, Dean Miller commented, as CEE implements its automated registration system; they will be better able to track resident status.

Some years ago there was talk about inloading, which meant that regular faculty would teach Extension courses on a regular basis; whatever became of the plan. There are many definitions of inloading, Dean Miller noted, and there is some of it occurring. There are units where CEE has faculty lines in the department; in return, the faculty teach a certain percentage of Extension courses as part of their teaching load. That is the most common definition of inloading. It is not, however, widespread; a system is in place but not very much used.

CEE reports to the Academic Affairs vice president, Dean Miller said in response to a query; he is one of the five deans who reports directly to the senior vice president rather than through another vice president or vice provost. Inasmuch as these are outreach activities, why does not CEE report to the External Relations vice president? Dean Miller said that nationally such a structure is extremely rare; the programs derive their resources from the academic enterprise and in order to be integrated with the academic programs they report to academic affairs offices. One exception is Wisconsin, where there is a chancellor for extension who reports directly to the president. Extension has elements of public relations to it, but it is primarily an academic activity.

To what extent have Continuing Education and Extension and Agricultural Extension come together--and is it desirable that they do so? Would he, Dean Miller was asked, combine them if he had a choice? Or are their missions sufficiently distinct that they should remain separate? Dean Miller said he has watched what has happened in other states; Wisconsin combined them for a long time and it worked well in that there was a central representative for the extension function. Recently, however, even the Wisconsin program has been broken into two parts, general extension and cooperative extension: Even though they made a real effort to combine them, it just did not work. They now have two freestanding units which report to the same officer, an arrangement which might work well at Minnesota.

There are other outreach activities at the University, Dean Miller pointed out; there have been a number of conversations with these units. All of these efforts are drawing from the same resource base; they need to be coordinated under Academic Affairs. There is a problem of how to manage them all: research, resident instruction, and outreach. The discussion is not being held in the way it should. At a land-grant institution, attention to outreach should balance attention given to research and instruction.

How do CEE and the Minnesota Extension Service make the distinction between themselves? Dean Miller replied that in the past MES related to agriculture, forestry, and home economics, and had a more rural orientation; the arts and sciences and other disciplines, and a more urban orientation, were in the purview of CEE. Generally, he said, the two units did not "bump into each other;" there was not a need for a lot of specific coordination. In the 1970s there was joint funding of certain officers at the coordinate campuses and at Southwest State University; the idea was to coordinate in the field and to draw resources from CEE which could be used around the State. Those arrangements, however, were a casualty of the retrenchments of the 1980s.

Dean Miller observed that MES is now moving in a direction that broadens its base to the larger parts of the University; there might be a coordination problem in the future.

Dean Miller was next asked about possible duplication and overlap in study abroad programs. Would there be advantages to better coordinating the programs? He said that CEE sends 600 - 800 students abroad every year, through the Global Campus; CEE has subsidized that program but has now proposed to eliminate the subsidy in the reallocation plan. Students will now have to pay the full cost of going abroad, including the overhead. Associate Vice President Kvavik has a plan for coordinating the programs; the plan is complicated by the fact that one of the units is funded by student fees. If it is moved, there is concern that the funding might be lost. Academic Affairs has the money that CEE put into the program; they could move it wherever they wish, although it is his impression that they wish CEE to continue to operate the program.

The organizational structure is a concern, one Committee member said: there are very clear priorities in Academic Affairs and outreach is at the bottom of the list. The results of this are troublesome; the University, as a State institution, does itself no good politically or otherwise when it shortchanges outreach activities. This was true in the case of KUOM. Academic Affairs' priorities are perfectly understandable, said this Committee member--they have to make choices--but is there not a better organization structure possible, one which could place a little more emphasis on outreach? And focused in such a way that it is more centered on outreach than on linkage with the academic programs? Dean Miller concurred that a new structure might be more effective.

Another Committee member observed that the census results show that a majority of the State's population in the metropolitan area. The question is what resources the University will commit to serving that population? That is huge market for educational activities; to what share should the University reasonably aspire? Will there be competition with the State Universities? There will continue to be a need for Agricultural Extension, but small towns will look to the University as a source of information about transportation, the organization of social services, about community planning, and other problems. What will be the University's response and will it be organized to respond in the most effective manner?

Dean Miller said the question is a good one. A player in this area is the Higher Education Coordinating Board, which recently commissioned the MSPAN reports. The MSPAN report on the urban area called for the University to continue to do what it is doing and downsize and that the needs of the metropolitan area should be met by expansion of Metropolitan State University. The difficulty with that is that what the University is doing, at marginal cost through CEE, would then be funded by the State University System through Metropolitan State--at a higher cost to the State. If we assume that the proportion of State funds for higher education is constant, the money will go to the State system rather than the University. To cut a bigger slice of the pie for the expansion of Metro State ignores the fact that the University now provides a service to 40,000 people per year in credit courses. That will put the University in a financial box in that its budget will not grow. The administration is not asking for additional funding, but is trying to protect what it has, while the State University System is talking about expansion. The issue will have to be addressed during the 1990s; the University could be closed out of the discussions on serving the metropolitan area. And if the funding is to be there for the State University System, some of it will come out of the University's budget.

This is also an important group of people, one Committee member noted, in terms of financial support for the University apart from tuition.

It is also important, Dean Miller said, that the Extension Service move in the directions it has identified, and turn some of its resources to the urban area. They have a problem, however, of making too sudden a shift from their rural and agricultural base. They have a political and agricultural base which they need to protect, in addition to many years of service to that clientele and the fact that their federal funding comes from the Department of Agriculture.

The idea of trying to send people to Metropolitan State is not attractive, said one Committee member. There are many people who take courses at the University for professional reasons, in fields which Metropolitan State does not have programs. It is difficult enough to find people to teach the

courses; Metropolitan State won't be able to offer them, except perhaps at the introductory level. The University has many resources which will not be available if this plan goes forward, or, more likely, will be available only in an ad hoc way.

Dean Miller is right, said one Committee member; Metro State will consolidate its campuses. They may not, right now, have exactly what they need, but they will have a downtown campus with free parking. St. Thomas also needs to be considered, which is building a major campus in downtown Minneapolis. The situation will be very competitive and the University will indeed position itself to be frozen out. It is not geographically well-located, in some respects.

Moreover, it was said, the present administrative structure does create problems. The Minnesota Extension Service, to a certain extent, has its own vice president, which puts it in a different situation. The question becomes one of balance, the offices to which various outreach activities report and the priority attached to these activities by the different offices.

The kind of discussion occurring at this meeting, Dean Miller said, may not be going on in central circles in any coordinated way--about the objectives of the University in outreach activity. This is a concern, said one Committee member, because it is important; it is a source of public support that the University is letting slip away. What little political capital it has will flow to the other systems.

On the other hand, there is cause for concern about pulling away support from rural areas, said another Committee member. As people perceive more and more being taken from them and invested instead in the metropolitan area, there will be increased apathy about improving rural areas. The Morris CEE program, Dean Miller noted, is subsidized by CEE Twin Cities tuition income.

If he had two or three items which would be most profitable to address, Dean Miller was asked by Professor Ibele, what would they be? He listed these:

1. Discussions about coordination and strategic planning for the role and future of outreach at the University need to be held at the highest circles in the institution. This could be a helpful discussion; it needs to be held in an ongoing fashion, just as there are continued discussions about research. This would include, he affirmed, questions of structure. He and Dean Borich agree that there should be a central spokesperson for outreach in the Academic Affairs office (although neither of them wants the job).
2. Consultative Committee suggestions as to issues to be addressed in the upcoming self-study would be appreciated. The self-study will address organization as well as issues of program directions. It will also include attention to the quality of courses delivered through CEE, although as always, this is a matter for faculty and departments.
3. It would be helpful if the Committee could give CEE guidance on post-baccalaureate study. The MSPAN study spoke about Master's degree programs in the Twin Cities. There is a limit on the number CEE credits that can be used for the Master's degree; CEE hopes to expand opportunities through post-baccalaureate certificate programs in order to address a number of practitioner-oriented needs. Perhaps graduate degree programs could be developed in a few areas, with the support of departments and the graduate faculty.

Funding of the whole enterprise is also a matter which needs to be addressed. The more CEE is placed on a self-supporting basis, the less it is able to respond to the needs of people who cannot afford to obtain its programs. There is a sense that if one is offering a program for adults, their companies will subsidize their education and there is no reason to try to keep tuition low. If CEE is reduced to a self-supporting basis, it will be less able to serve those less able to pay. CEE has been frankly told that it has been successful in being self-supporting--so it should be even more self-supporting in order that institutional funds can be used for other purposes. That presents a dilemma, in terms of trying to provide access to programs at low cost to people who do not have a lot of money.

Dean Miller expressed appreciation to the Committee for its time. Professor Ibele thanked Dean Miller for his comments.

3. Discussion of the Report of the Task Force on Liberal Education

Professor Ibele next turned the attention of the Committee to the recommendations of the Task Force on Liberal Education. He noted that Professor Munholland is a member of the Task Force and can answer questions. The Committee discussed briefly the schedule of events and the nature of the discussions which would take place. It is the plan that some form of the report will be present for action to the Assembly at its second meeting of Spring Quarter.

SCEP, Professor Munholland, will make its comments directly to the Task Force rather than submit separate recommendations to the Assembly.

The Task Force, Professor Ibele remarked, has confronted what are excruciating difficulties in addressing the issues. For example, everyone would probably be in favor of students having greater quantitative skills when they leave the University. Consideration was given, at one time, to whether or not there should be two courses required in mathematics or quantitative analysis; the estimates the Task Force received of the costs of doing a good job with the second course (calling for faculty members doing the teaching rather than teaching assistants, in section sizes of 18-20) were prohibitively expensive. The outcome is desirable but the cost of that one recommendation might have eclipsed all the others.

This suggests, he commented, that any attempt to make quantum improvements in any particular part of a student's education cannot be done in one step; the situation has deteriorated too far over too long a period. He himself lamented the situation in mathematics, Professor Ibele recalled; as one looks at students in other nations, what the University will ask of graduates is what most other nations require on entrance to higher education.

Professor Munholland concurred and noted that this has been the subject of extended discussion by the Task Force. The one course envisioned by the Task Force is intended to be meaningful so that one does not "escape" mathematics--and is an improvement over the present situation, albeit not by much. The Task Force has also considered a possible "mathematical thinking" designator for courses across the curriculum, similar to the proposal for "writing intensive" courses. If university students are ever to catch up with the Japanese, however, the effort with students will have to begin long before they ever come to higher education. When the Task Force discussed this question with the mathematics faculty, it

learned that there is an entrance requirement but that 60% of the work in the "college" courses is remedial--and even then 30 - 40% of the students flunk the courses.

Part of the purpose of the report, he continued, is to send a message down the line--that the University is getting serious, although perhaps not to the extent most would wish. Whether or not the message is strong enough remains to be seen.

One Committee member expressed doubt that the Mathematics department was interested in providing the mathematics portion of liberal education requirements; it, like most departments, is primarily interested in its majors. If there are to be courses that serve liberal education purposes, they must be seriously considered and established by a group which does not have a clearly different agenda. The Math department already resents having to teach as many service courses as it does; this report would load on additional responsibilities. The way to develop a meaningful program is not to thrust it on a department which does not want it. One individual recalled that CLA, when it was the College of SL&A, had proposed an increased math requirement which the Math Department had flatly refused to support. The recommendation was never made.

What may loom as a solution, another Committee member observed, is a program to parallel the Composition Program, which developed because the English Department did not want to teach students how to write. A cluster of faculty interested in teaching students quantitative skills might be developed.

What is true for the math courses, it was observed, will be true for all of the other courses proposed by the Task Force. These introductory courses are outside the major and will be a very low priority for most departments. Other Committee members concurred.

The Finance and Planning Committee, Professor Shapiro reported, approved the report in principle but called for identification of where the funds will come from to pay for the program proposed by the Task Force. Until those funds are identified, in the judgment of the Committee, the recommendations cannot be implemented. Professor Munholland agreed that the implementation timetable is an issue and will depend on resources; the Provost has told the Task Force precisely that. The Task Force has been asked to assign priorities to its recommendations because it may not be wise to implement the cheapest steps first; there may be a more intellectual rationale for proceeding. The Task Force has always been cognizant that phasing will almost certainly be necessary.

The biggest unknown in the cost estimates, said one Committee member, is the extent to which the faculty will be willing to redirect their efforts rather than treat the recommendations as an add-on. They will have to look carefully at the courses now being offered and decide that "we will not continue to offer this course because some of our effort will go into the development of courses that will satisfy the liberal education requirements." Unless the faculties do this, they will end up being overloaded--and will dispense with the entire effort. There is no other way the report can be implemented, because there will not be a lot of new money available. Professor Munholland said that the Task Force was fully cognizant of that problem but noted that the Task Force was instructed to write a report calling for the best that could be obtained and not worry, in the first instance, about the possible costs.

The Committee discussed how faculty interest in the liberal education courses could be maintained and renewed. This is an important concern, one Committee member noted, but one the University is

unsure about how to implement. The Morris campus, it was reported, saw an initial flush of enthusiasm for its new curriculum, but then the faculty began to realize it would be a great deal of work, work for which they are not given much credit.

The Committee also discussed the new Council on Liberal Education. This will be, it was said, a much different body from the one that existed previously, even though it carries the same name. Professor Munholland agreed; this group, he said, is intended to have a lot of clout. The earlier group was also vital, at the beginning, although not as focused as the one proposed. It finally could not sustain the necessary effort and the responsibilities were turned over to the colleges.

Professor Ibele asked Professor Munholland to touch on the major issues the Task Force is dealing with. They are:

- The mathematics issue
- Whether or not the science requirement is well enough developed
- The meaning of the "cultural diversity" requirement
- The possibility of a "western tradition" emphasis
- "Environmental literacy"
- The possibility of a requirement for non-text-based humanities study

He also reported on the discussions in the Task Force about the possibility of increasing the second language requirement and the reasons why a change was not proposed.

One Committee member pointed out that the Council on Liberal Education will have to take account of the fact that many students at the University begin their education elsewhere, and many do not come from community colleges. These students should not be penalized by "nit-picky" requirements. Professor Munholland agreed and reported that the Task Force has once again taken up the transfer issue. The Task Force does not want to see the liberal education requirements as a hurdle over which one jumps in the first two years; it has recommended that part of the requirements be taken during the last two years of enrollment. The other side of that consideration, it was noted, is that students should not leave the University without meeting certain of its liberal education requirements (must they meet the cultural diversity or citizen ethics requirements?). There is also a sufficient number of other institutions engaged in this same sort of reform that transfer may be easier than first thought. Whether they will have similar requirements is not known. The problem is complicated by transfers from foreign institutions or schools in other states. This will be a complicated issue but there is no way to avoid it, Professor Munholland commented. The language of the report, he added, will be as instructive as possible so the Council on Liberal Education can act on the recommendations.

This is a very important issue, Professor Ibele concluded, so the discussion at the Assembly should be as informed as possible.

The Committee adjourned at 12:00.

-- Gary Engstrand