



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, January 20, 1983
12:30 - 3:00
626 Campus Club

Approx. time

- 12:30 1. Minutes of January 6 (enclosed).
2. Report of the Chair (enclosed).
3. Report of the Student Chair.
4. Committee reports:
 a. Finance
 b. Others?
- 12:45 5. Report from Regents Educational Policy and Long-Range Planning Committee. Paul Quie.
- 12:55 6. Senate Committee on Social Concerns: Resolution to be presented to February 17 Senate meeting re Selective Service Act/Financial Aid legislation (enclosure). Pat Williamson.
- 1:10 7. Senate Judicial Committee (Faculty Consultative Committee business). Resolution to be presented to Faculty Senate on February 17 urging faculty cooperation with Judicial Committee (enclosure). Dick Poppele.
- 1:35 8. Quality of Education Subcommittee of Senate Committee on Educational Policy: Request for recommendations (enclosure).
- 2:00 9. Second Planning Cycle: Report from Vice President Hasselmo, including decision to postpone three themes and concentrate on
 - Quality of graduate education
 - Higher education and economic development.
Description of how Quality theme is being developed.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 2/3/83

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

January 20, 1983
626 Campus Club
12:45 - 3:10

Members present: Ron Bonaguidi, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Barry Hogen, John Howe, Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dave Lenander, Marv Mattson, Douglas Pratt, Paul Quie, Burt Sundquist, John Turner, Kathy Watson.

Guests: Nils Hasselmo, Randall Mikkelsen, Carol Pazandak, Mary Jane Plunkett, Dick Poppele, Maureen Smith, Pat Williamson.

The meeting was called to order at 12:45 p.m. by acting chairman Douglas Pratt.

1. The minutes of January 6 were approved with one editorial correction.
2. The Report of the Chair had been mailed in advance.
3. Report of the Student Chair. D. Lenander. Nominations procedures and ACSA. Mr. Lenander described the problem of the Student SCC in devising new selection procedures for student representatives to the Board of Regents as being related to the general questions regarding SCC/FCC's appointments to bodies which stand free of the Assembly and Senate. Mr. Lenander and Ms. Watson propose a discussion of changing the role for the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs to make it less active and investigative and more a reviewer of reports which it would receive from an even broader number of student-related organizations.
4. Announcements. Two new volumes are available for circulation from the SCC office. They are, An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Mathematical and Physical Sciences (National Academy Press) and The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). Members please call the office to arrange to borrow.
5. Committee reports.
 - A. Finance. Prof. Sundquist. Senate Finance Committee met on January 6 and meets again today. On January 6 Vice President Keller reported on retrenchment and SFC discussed several aspects with him.
 - i. Retrenchment of compensation funds (contribution to pension fund); civil service cut is underway automatically and recapturing the faculty contribution has been delayed until after July 1).

ii. The \$3 million base budget reduction. Anticipating further state retrenchment in FY 82-83, central administration's aim is to trim \$4.7 million. SFC reviewed the administration's principles for determining the cuts. The first action has been to freeze hiring between January 10 and June 30. Central administration is now directing the collegiate units to save money by all further available means. SFC has been told it will have a chance to review the final plan before it goes to the Regents (Feb. 10,11).

iii. Reviewing the first cycle's planned decisions and retrenchments. At today's meeting SFC will try to compare the achievements with the objectives.

iv. SFC is urging central administration to try to proceed with as much speed as appropriate in line with the long term plans and not across-the-board.

Professor Howe asked Professor Sundquist whether there appears so far to be a reasonable correlation between last year's retrenchment and planning and this year's decisions. Professor Sundquist said it is his immediate judgment that things are moving reasonably well. Where there is a deviation from the plans, the temporary nature of that deviation is well documented. Because of such temporary deviations, implementing the plan will take longer and so will SFC's tracking task.

Professor Pratt asked if there have been any reverberations based upon the governor's just-announced state hiring freeze? There has not yet been time. Professor Quie asked if there is an estimate on savings to be achieved from the academic hiring freeze? SFC has not yet been able to obtain an estimate.

B. Budget Committee. Professor Turner announced that subcommittee will meet after the SCC meeting on February 3.

C. University-Industry Relations Committee. Professor Pratt announced the first meeting has been scheduled for next week. Warren Ibele will chair the committee. Pratt reported that the University had not been represented at the University of Pennsylvania conference but was represented at a December conference at U. Wisconsin with the same theme.

6. Reports from Regents meetings.

A. Written report in the SCC mailing on Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee and Committee of the Whole.

B. Educational Policy and Long-Range Planning. Professor Quie summarized the major discussion items: state-mandated retrenchment and the drop in faculty positions; second planning cycle and the value of ratings; procedures for determining class size in professional schools; new UMD constitution; state support of clinical teaching in the health sciences and numbers of health science students involved daily with patients; new procedures for Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research.

Professor Freier asked whether any of the state's \$12 million appropriation for clinical education costs for University health science students go to

the other hospitals in which University medical students obtain about 75% of their clinical experience. Dr. Quie answered that some support from the medical school is received by affiliated hospitals for undergraduate medical student education, but most hospitals actually pay the University Medical Center while providing training opportunity for post-graduate residents.

7. Senate Committee on Social Concerns. Draft registration/financial aid legislation. Pat Williamson.

Ms. Williamson presented the resolution her committee had passed after it was submitted to them by the MSA Student Concerns Committee, opposing the federal legislation which requires male financial aid applicants to have registered for the draft in order to be eligible for aid. Social Concerns reported to SCC its intention to present the resolution to the Senate on February 17. Comments:

Mr. Lenander: Change the wording of the final statement to indicate we commend the Regents for taking legal action against the enforcement of this law.

Professors Howe and Turner: In the interest of a good strong resolution, recommend the students delete the violation of right to privacy clause and stress the self-incrimination clause.

Professor Fredricks moved the SCC encourage the Senate Committee on Social Concerns to pass the resolution on to the Senate for the Senate's consideration. Ms. Hunt seconded the motion. Professor Sundquist asked to add that SCC "supports the resolution in principle," which the mover and seconder accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion so amended was carried without dissent and with one abstention.

Ms. Hunt noted that the court had accepted the University's brief on January 18, making this the first university to have actually submitted a brief on this legislation.

8. Senate Judicial Committee (Faculty Consultative Committee item).
Dick Poppele.

A. Resolution to Senate requesting faculty cooperation with the committee.

Professor Poppele reported the committee has had some problems in three areas: (1) cooperation in scheduling, (2) witnesses refusing to appear (the committee has no power of summons) and (3) disclosure of documents, where the greatest problem regards a faculty member's access to his or her own personnel file. This last problem is lessening as Judicial works to inform administrators of the law and sends every respondent a copy of the law on the matter.

The Judicial Committee at its annual meeting with President Magrath last fall requested him to include in his letter to the community a request for cooperation with the committee; the President was sympathetic but advised them that an appeal from the Senate would carry more weight.

Professor Freier expressed the hope Judicial's appeal would not itself create a problem by making non-cooperation seem worse than it is. Professor

Poppele said Judicial intends an affirmative presentation explaining the need for cooperation.

FCC members recommended strengthening the resolution's impact with arguments that the faculty depend upon this grievance system to protect their rights within this University, that the continuing integrity of the Senate's judicial process depends upon the cooperation of the faculty, and that since it is a voluntary system it can work fairly only if it has that cooperation.

Professor Fredricks moved the FCC heartily endorse this resolution. Professor Howe seconded the motion, recommending surrounding the wording with flourishes such as those in the paragraph above. The motion carried without dissent or abstention.

B. Publishing abstracts. During the years of closed Judicial Committee meetings, "neutered" abstracts (names omitted) were published for several years. Although hearings are now open, printed abstracts would serve as a valuable reference, particularly for a faculty member who believed he or she had a grievance. Abstracts do not exist for recent cases.

Professor Poppele told FCC the Judicial Committee is contemplating changing its rules to require each hearing panel to prepare for publication an abstract outlining the case and naming the respondent and claimant (names would be omitted if hearing had been closed). They might publish in the Daily. Poppele said the Committee hopes publication will serve a deterrent purpose by calling attention to respondents who have been in error. Professor Freier observed that the hope of earlier Judicial Committees that the administration would press offending units to correct themselves has not been answered.

FCC members did not regard naming the participants as essential to the educational value of a case abstract. Including names would only serve to titillate, they thought, while it could worsen the problem of poor cooperation. While AAUP's Committee A publishes case reports containing names, that does not occur within a campus community. FCC members also regarded publication in the Daily as unnecessary. Professor Howe recommended keeping the precis on file and available. Professor Turner recommended including a precis of each case in the Judicial Committee's annual report and making it available in mimeographed form to all Senators at the end of each year. They would comprise a collection of law which would serve as precedents.

The collective FCC inclination was for Judicial to resume neutered summarizing and reporting of its cases.

9. Request from SCEP Subcommittee on the Quality of Education for recommendations on the evaluation of instruction. SCC members had copies of the letter from the subcommittee co-chairs.

Professor Turner said that since an earlier Educational Policy Committee had worked for years on the question of teaching quality and had submitted a good report to the Senate, and since not much has yet happened in response, and since we all know there is some fine teaching at the University and some that needs improvement, the question remains how to help bring about such improvement. Implementing the recommendations of that 1978 SCEP report is the best available means. The SCC by consensus asks Chairman Swan to recommend to the SCEP subcommittee that it undertake to discover to what extent the 1978 recommendations have been implemented and to encourage their further implementation.

10. Report on the Second Cycle of Planning. Vice President Hasselmo.

The Vice President had sent all SCC members in advance a 15-page "Overview of the Second Cycle of Planning."

A. Unit Planning. Dr. Hasselmo reported that on January 26 the Budget Executive will hold its final meeting before sending its preliminary budget targets to the deans. They will contain precise unit targets for 1983-84 and rough targets for 1984-85 and beyond. In April Dr. Hasselmo will report to the President and to the Senate Consultative, Finance, and Planning Committees.

Dr. Hasselmo's presentation and SCC comment focused in part on the "Overview" document and in part on policy recommendations being generated from elsewhere. For example, Governor Perpich is reported to be considering making his own recommendation to the legislature on higher education tuition policy. His initiative could impinge on University autonomy. Dr. Hasselmo reminded SCC it remains the Regents' prerogative to set tuition.

Vice President Hasselmo emphasized that targeted reallocation is a fundamental part of the planning approach. Professor Fredricks asked if we are not falling further and further behind achieving program priorities because of repeated cuts from the appropriation. Vice President Hasselmo acknowledged that the first cycle was largely negative. The aim now is to free up money for program enhancement. Six percent will be moved for 1983-84 (includes the \$3 million base reduction) and 3% in 1984-85. These are percentages of the "retrenchable" budget which excepts absolutes such as utilities where the state pays precisely the University's cost. We have made it plain, he said, that not every unit will retrench 6%. Some will retrench more, and some less or not at all.

Professor Fredricks asked if there is a danger the state will regard a fund established for flexible application as retrenchable. Dr. Hasselmo acknowledged the concern but said not creating more flexibility seems even more detrimental in the long run.

Professor Howe observed that the process appears to point to more vigorous programmatic decisions than we have heretofore seen. Vice President Hasselmo indicated his agreement with that assessment.

Professor Turner said that, in contrast with the beginning of the planning effort in 1979, deans now appreciate the financial danger and approach the exercise differently from simply trying to protect everything. He urged asking each unit three basic questions which would force them to look seriously at prioritizing: (1) What in your unit should be protected, no matter what? (2) What could be eliminated or severely cut back? and (3) What additional evidence do you have regarding the quality of your programs (especially as it varies from the reputational rankings)? Some noted that the first two questions were asked in the first cycle of planning.

Vice President Hasselmo said that while the questions for units listed in the "Overview" were very general, each unit will also get a unit-specific list of questions which will relate especially to implementing first cycle plans. Those specific questions and the units' answers will become the real planning agenda, he said.

B. Institutional Themes. Dr. Hasselmo said that with one exception, all the "Institutional Goals" referred to in this section of the overview are taken from the University's goals published in the spring of 1981. Vice President Hasselmo has defined the stated "Objectives." The first theme, "Quality of Graduate Education and Research," will make a claim on resources. The other themes will not necessarily do so.

Professor Sundquist said that since good cases can be made both for resources to maintain a top-ranked department at the top, and to improve a much lower-ranked unit, it is necessary to have a pretty firm view of program priorities at the outset. The University must ask which departments are so important they must be kept strong or made strong.

Vice President Hasselmo said applying the six criteria defined in 1981-82 will be one means of making those decisions. We can all probably quickly agree on the core of essential units, he said. The University will ask where upgrading is most possible given the facts about a unit in its current state. It will also identify factors other than money that have affected the improvement of some departments.

Professor Howe asked if it is possible to build in unit performance incentives, to show a unit it can logically affect its own prospects by the University's stating the conditions under which it will give the unit more money. Vice President Hasselmo agreed on the importance of incentives and said the administration has discussed them at length and has no answers yet.

Professor Mattson spoke to the condition of the 2-year and 4-year undergraduate units and their role in feeding graduate programs. UMC faculty, for example, need but don't receive monetary support to travel to national association meetings so they can keep up in their fields and be good educators. Professor Sundquist said it is also important for the UMC faculty to have enough time to interact with firms, processors and manufacturers if they are to provide good training for their students.

Vice President Hasselmo told SCC the Quality theme and the theme "Higher Education and the Economy of the State" will be addressed immediately; the remaining three themes are on slightly different timetables. All should be underway a few months from now or by next fall at the latest. The Student Experience theme has to await the hiring of the new Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Ms. Iverson expressed her dismay at the delay of the other themes (Student Experience, The International Character of the University, and Communication, Computation & Information Technology). The first two are closely bound up with each other, she said, so the priority is leaning all one way--to graduate education. Professor Howe asked people to keep in mind that the quality of graduate education is not identical to the quality of the institution.

Professor Turner focused on the "battle of numbers" and the inhibiting effect upon both research and teaching of enrollments which have boomed without a corresponding increase in numbers of faculty. He urged reflective admissions policies. Vice President Hasselmo said the enrollment issue is being addressed through the Student Experience theme and in other qualitative ways. He referred to CLA's steps regarding remedial instruction as one example. He indicated such indirect approaches may lead to desirable changes and cautioned against head-on efforts to control admissions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant, recorder

January 13, 1983

Report of Observations - Board of Regents Educational
Policy and Long-Range Planning Committee

First three items on the agenda involved discontinuation of programs. All passed without discussions.

Vice President Stan Kegler described the Universities response to the legislative mandate for 3 million dollar reduction in budget. Questions were asked about faculty retirements. It was stated that the University has 130 fewer faculty positions than two years ago. In some units early retirements have results in reduction, especially in agriculture extension.

Several task forces are in place, including the library and biochemistry. These will be reported to the Regents at the February meeting.

Vice President Hasselmo presented a document describing the "Second Cycle of Planning". This document will be sent to all SCC members. Good discussion of this document followed; especially the usefulness of national ratings of graduate programs. Vice President Keller promised to provide the Regents with only useful evidence generated from good data on this subject.

Vice President Vanselow presented the procedures that would be used for determining class size in graduate professional schools, and this information was accepted with thanks by the Regents. V.P. Vanselow explained to Regent Casey that a non-institutional member of a task force charged with recommendations about professional school size was not a good idea and the Regents accepted his argument. The presentation by Al Linck about the development of the new Duluth constitution produced lively discussion. A paragraph in the constitution requesting that the Regents confer before changing the constitution was considered to be a thinly veiled "slap on the wrist". The paragraph in question will need to be changed before the regents will accept the new constitution.

Vice President Vanselow described teaching in University Hospitals and Clinics for information. There is \$12 million dollars provided to University Hospitals for educational costs which are distributed throughout the hospital budget since costs of learning by doing and learning under supervision cannot be itemized. Since each patient-physician interchange is no longer in a teaching situation, the costs need to be spread across the board. Most patients cared for at the University Hospital realize that medical students and other trainees will participate in their care.

An interesting fact is that approximately 1,100 health science students are involved with patients in the hospital during any single day. These are primarily medical students who even so obtain only about 25% of their clinical experience at the University Hospital.

The final agenda item was the new procedures for Human Subjects in Research which had been accepted by the University Senate at its' last meeting. This information item will be voted on at the next Regents meeting.

- Paul Quie, FCC observer



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

January 14, 1983

To: SCC

From: P. Swan

Re: Report on Regents' Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs (Jan. 13, 1983)
and Committee of the Whole

In approval of personnel actions, questions/discussion occurred on:

- 1) Appointment of a "Mayo Professor" (honorary title) without a search;
- 2) Why John Brandl was still 40% time and hadn't requested leave through May;
- 3) Hiring of Emeritus professors only when they were not replacing junior faculty appointments (Keller stated this policy);
- 4) Keller mentioned data on faculty members who have resigned over a 3-year period (half left academia; the other half went to schools with scattered locations, but there were concentrations of numbers going to Texas and to the state of New York);
- 5) What is the difference between a "planner" and a "planner coordinator" (Civil Service classifications).

Keller and Bob Morris presented an update on the Tenure Code review. Regents were given copies of the current official code and 1973 revision. Keller mentioned that the committee was striving to simplify and clarify the code and they were removing a lot of the procedural sections. He said they were relaxing the coupling of rank and tenure and reducing the extent of our liability if administrative error is made in date of notifications, etc. He also said that it is clear that the committee will want to look at definition of circumstances for removal of tenure. He mentioned the question of "defining what is a financial exigency at this institution." He then raised the question of the AAUP guidelines for dismissing tenured faculty because of programmatic change in directions. Morris said that he hoped he would have the draft finished in a month.

Shertler asked if her committee might look at some of the issues at the same time the Senate discusses them. Later Unger suggested the same thing, saying they might want to make suggestions to the Senate. Keller asked me if I would agree that would be a good idea. I (by not responding) indicated some reservation. (I think we have to be careful about how the Regents'

activities might influence how free the faculty feels in its debate.) McGuiggan asked how contracts are converted to tenured positions (Ans.-- a clause written into the contract about such consideration and/or renewal of contract). Casey asked if Keller intended to propose his own version of a tenure code. He said he intended to work with the committees and expected to bring the code as passed by the Senate.

Schertler indicated some unhappiness about her committee's usual agenda ("just rubber stamping a lot of internal actions"). She wants more items such as on-going reports from the tenure review, administrative augmentation, up-dates on major searches and major personnel items and personnel policy reviews. Keller reported he hoped to have an Assistant V. P. in about a week and in about two months a search committee for a Deputy V. P. for the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics. McGuiggan said he would like to suggest agenda items including information on the number of administrators per college, hear from the Counsel about his philosophies on preventive law, the faculty review of grievance procedures (Keller put in), and appropriate discussion of whether or not they needed a Deputy Vice President for the I.A.F.H.E. He doesn't believe we do. Then he added that some of these items might be management, but he'd like to talk about them without necessarily considering them for action.

Report on Regents Committee of the Whole (January 14)

As their main agenda item, the Committee of the Whole had a report from Hasselmo and his colleagues on intercollegiate athletics in the Twin Cities. A copy of his written report will be in the circulating file for SCC on 1/20/83. Stein discussed (at some length) NCAA's academic eligibility rule changes. Regent Roe indicated he would like more home games--there will only be 5 home football games in 1983. Giel stressed how interesting those games would be (Nebraska, Michigan, Wisconsin (Homecoming), Purdue and Illinois). Giel said there would be 6 home games in 1984 and 1985.

The faculty salary increase portion of the biennial request was approved without discussion (8% and 9% increase). The President mentioned the Harper's article in his presentation of this item.

The Regents approved a resolution of the HECB financial aid position.

Regent Unger and a committee have been working out a more explicit statement of what powers are delegated to the Hospital Governing Board. Everyone expressed great satisfaction with the statement. There will be further administrative examination of personnel reporting relationships. Unger's statement was approved.

University
of
Minnesota
memo

date 1/12 1983

to Senate Consultative Committee

from Senate Social Concerns Committee

Pat Williamson, Chair

373-0274

This will confirm my telephone call to Meredith Poppele to add this item to the January 20 meeting agenda for action.

The attached Resolution originated in the Student Concerns Committee of MSA and received unanimous support at the Social Concerns Committee meeting held January 11, 1983.

I will attend your meeting on January 20. Ann Hunt, member of the Student Concerns Committee, Social Concerns Committee, and the Consultative Committee, will also be present to provide background information and answer questions.

Please let me know if additional steps are necessary.

cc: SCC members

SENATE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL CONCERNS

The following Resolution was approved by the Social Concerns Committee at its January 11, 1983, meeting and is submitted for approval of the University Senate. It was submitted to our Committee through MSA Student Concerns Committee.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND: In Fall 1982, Congress passed a bill, the Military Selective Service Act (Section 1113a, Section 12), which requires all male applicants for financial aid to declare whether they have registered for the draft; if not, they shall be ineligible for any Federally-based financial aid. This law takes effect July 1, 1983.

WHEREAS This law violates students' rights of due process because it presumes guilt and provides no opportunity for a jury trial, and

WHEREAS This law violates students' Fifth Amendment right to refuse to incriminate themselves, and

WHEREAS This law ignores the Constitutional protection of attainder which prohibits one body from being both legislative and judicial bodies of government (Congress in this case is acting in both capacities), and

WHEREAS This law discriminates against those students whose economic background dictates a need for financial assistance for their education, and targets them for punishment, and

WHEREAS This law violates students' basic rights to privacy, because their age, sex, and registration status shall become public, therefore

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED

That the University Senate finds the Military Selective Service Act of 1982 to violate the Constitutional protections and academic freedoms of students, and hereby declares its opposition to this law and its enforcement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the University Senate urges the University administration to take legal action against the enforcement of this law.

Submitted by:

Patricia A. Williamson, Chair
Senate Social Concerns Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Senate Judicial Committee
c/o Department of Physiology
5-270 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
612/373-3069

January 11, 1983

Professor Patricia Swan
Senate Consultative Committee
166 Food Science and Nutrition
St. Paul Campus

Dear Professor Swan:

The Judicial Committee has drafted and approved the enclosed resolution regarding faculty cooperation with the Judicial Committee. The Committee would now like to submit it to be considered for adoption at the next Senate meeting.

I will be available to meet with the Consultative Committee on January 20, 1983, after 1:00 p.m. to address any concerns about the resolution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Richard E. Poppele".

Richard E. Poppele, Chair
Senate Judicial Committee

REP/lmw
enclosure

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Senate go on formal record as encouraging faculty members to cooperate fully with the Senate Judicial Committee by providing requested information for cases conducted by that Committee, both in the form of oral testimony during hearings and in the form of written information during the hearing process.

January 4, 1983

Professor Pat Swan, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
166 Food Science and Nutrition
St. Paul Campus

Dear Professor Swan,

We are writing you in regard to your letter of August 31, 1982, to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. In your letter, you charged SCEP with the task of looking into the status quo of instructional quality and to report back to the Senate. SCEP has since set up a sub-committee called the Quality of Education Committee. This committee is charged with identifying key issues and relevant policy questions concerning the quality of education at the University.

The first issue which we are focusing on is the evaluation of instruction. We ask that you and the Consultative Committee give us any further input that you may have as we proceed with our study.

We would also request that the Consultative Committee instruct any other Senate committees that may be studying this area or have pertinent information to pass it on to our committee.

The charge to this committee is quite large and we appreciate your help and support in our study. Please feel free to contact us at any time with your own concerns.

Please respond to me using the address of Academic Affairs, 213 Morrill Hall.

Respectfully,

Martin G. Smith

Martin G. Smith, Student

Co Chairman, Quality of Education Sub-Committee

Gloria M. Williams

Gloria M. Williams, Assistant Professor

Co-Chairman, Quality of Education Sub-committee

cc: Gerald Kline, Chairman, Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Senate Committee on Educational Policy Members
Thomas Benson, Acting Director, Center for Educational Development
Wally Hilke

OVERVIEW OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF PLANNING

(covering planning activities

during 1982-83 and 1983-84)

Contents

1. Outline of Second Cycle of Planning
2. Fiscal Guidelines
3. General Agenda-Setting Questions for Unit and Inter-unit Planning:
Collegiate and Academic Support Units
Support Units
4. Proposed Institutional Themes (Issues of Institutionwide Concern):
Quality of Graduate Education and Research
Higher Education and the Economy of the State
Student Experience
The International Character of the University
Communication, Computation, and Information Technology

OUTLINE OF
SECOND CYCLE OF PLANNING

0. Key Elements

- Unit planning to determine program reduction, expansion, or change; potential for retrenchment
- Inter-unit planning to determine program reduction, expansion, or change; potential for retrenchment - across units (very limited number of issues)
- Thematic planning to determine needs and propose actions in areas of institutionwide concern

1. Unit Planning

- Agenda set by each vice president, reviewed by Budget Executive
- Focus on changes in environment and assumptions for unit's planning, if any; program reduction, elimination, reorganization; expansion (very selectively); outside fund raising, if any; workload
- Budget targets set by vice president, reviewed by Budget Executive, CPM, used as basis for program planning
- First instructions issued by vice president in January; meetings with units as needed
- Preliminary decisions due late April; reviewed by Budget Executive, CPM
- Final decisions due in June/July, reviewed by Budget Executive, CPM
- Revised Program Priorities Statement (including academic and support units; with program reductions, eliminations, reorganizations, expansions and budgetary details) issued in July of 1983; reviewed by Regents
- Special budget (retrenchment) plan for 1983-84 also issued in July of 1983, including programmatic and non-programmatic retrenchment; reviewed by Regents

2. Inter-unit Planning

- Cycle 1 task forces established on Composition and Rhetoric; Academic Counseling for Returning Students and Non-traditional Learners; Social Work and Social Development; and Remedial Programs

- Candidates for inter-unit planning in Cycle 2: Biochemistry; Student Services; and Personnel.

3. Thematic Planning

- Cycle 1 task force established on "How to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty" (Merwin Committee); expected to report in late spring of 1983
- Candidates for thematic planning in Cycle 2: Quality of Graduate Education and Research; Higher Education and the Economy of the State; Student Experience; The International Character of the University; and Communication, Computation, and Information Technology; first two themes will be addressed immediately

FISCAL GUIDELINES

SECOND CYCLE OF PLANNING

- Basic fiscal objective to be creation of a sizeable pool of funds through expense reduction and income enhancement.

Reasons:

- + Pressing need to ensure institutional quality and leadership through development of programs, facilities, and services and through support of real dollar increases in salaries over the coming two biennia.
- + Adjustment to expected decline in enrollment.
- + Adjustment to expected decline in state subsidies per student resulting from the state's fiscal problems.
- Fiscal adjustments to be large enough to cover potential retrenchment as well as some high priority reallocation.
- Certain major fiscal adjustments (reductions and enhancements) to be achieved as early as 1983-84.
- Fiscal adjustments to be programmatic to the greatest extent possible, that is, they will be based on program and service priorities.
- * Fiscal adjustments to be targeted, not across-the-board, to the greatest extent possible.
- * Individual units to be given fiscal targets towards which they are to move in specified steps.

GENERAL AGENDA SETTING QUESTIONS
FOR COLLEGIATE AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS

I. POTENTIAL PLANNING ISSUES

I.1 Conditions: What significant changes are appropriate (if any) in assumptions your unit is making about the major factors that affect its performance? How do these changes influence your unit's plans?

I.2 Goals/Priorities: What refinements in existing program priorities (4/82) or significant new candidates for program elimination/reduction/reorganization or expansion are desirable in light of new information/broader consultation/revised budget targets? How do these program priorities relate to priorities for development activity and improvement or addition of facilities?

I.3 Evaluation: What is your unit's current assessment of the quality of its programs? With regard especially to graduate and research oriented programs, how do you interpret the recent National Academy of Sciences and American Council of Education rankings for programs related to your unit? Are any special steps necessary to develop or preserve the quality of programs in your unit?

II. POTENTIAL OPERATING/BUDGETING/IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

II.1 Program Change Implementation: Are there any difficulties in implementing program decisions from the first cycle of planning? Is the implementation on track in budgetary terms?

II.2 Efficiency: Have you evaluated workload and productivity for your unit and for the faculty/staff in your unit? Are there significant changes of policy or facilities that are desirable with regard to improving the efficiency of your unit? In particular, how have you addressed the question of 9- or 12-month appointments?

II.3 Operating Policies: What success has your unit had in implementing personnel policies relating to affirmative action, separation pay and early retirement, and retraining of faculty/staff? To what extent has your unit developed flexibility in the commitment of its funding resources?

III. POTENTIAL DECISION PROCESS ISSUES

III.1 Participation: Have sufficient opportunities been afforded for faculty/staff/student participation in unit decision making?

III.2 Format/Schedules, etc.: Are there any major problems related to the formats and schedules of the planning process?

III.3 Information: Are there any significant problems with the availability and quality of information used to support decisions in the planning process?

GENERAL AGENDA SETTING QUESTIONS
FOR SUPPORT UNITS

I. POTENTIAL PLANNING ISSUES

I.1 Conditions: What significant changes are appropriate in assumptions your unit is making about the major factors that affect its performance? Specifically is demand for your service changing? Are fees likely to be changed significantly? Will changes in outside environmental factors impact the delivery of services by your unit?

I.2 Service Priorities: How will the services offered by your unit be affected by the budget targets for your unit in the second cycle of planning? Are changes in the mission of your unit appropriate? How will changes in the level or quality of services from your unit affect other programs and functions?

I.3 Evaluation: What is your unit's current assessment of the effectiveness of its programs or the quality of its services? Are any special steps necessary to develop or preserve the quality of programs in your unit?

II. POTENTIAL OPERATING/BUDGETING/IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

II.1 Retrenchment Implementation: Are there any significant difficulties in the implementation of recent budget retrenchments?

II.2 Efficiency: Have you evaluated workload and productivity for your unit and the individual staff in your unit? Are there significant changes of policy or facilities that are desirable with regard to improving the efficiency of your unit?

II.3 Operating Policies: What success has your unit had in implementing personnel policies related to separation pay and early retirement and retraining of staff? To what extent has your unit developed flexibility in the commitment of its funding resources?

III. POTENTIAL DECISION PROCESS ISSUES

III.1 Participation: In the development of services and the fee structure for services are the users consulted in the development process?

III.2 Format/Schedules, etc.: Are there any major problems related to the formats and schedules of the planning process?

III.3 Information: Are there any significant problems with the availability and quality of information used to support decisions in the planning process?

PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL THEMES

QUALITY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS:

- To maintain and wherever possible strengthen research activities of the University.
- To ensure a University environment that attracts, retains, and supports high quality faculty, staff, and students.

OBJECTIVE: TO IMPROVE SUBSTANTIALLY THE QUALITY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH.

DISCUSSION: One of the best ways, perhaps the best way, to address the question of quality in an institution such as the University of Minnesota is through its graduate programs and research. Briefly stated, Minnesota cannot be a high-quality institution without high-quality graduate education and research. The University has many graduate programs and many faculty members of national and international distinction. A trend has been apparent over the past two to three decades, however, which gives cause for concern: a number of graduate programs which used to rank among the top ten to fifteen in the country have slipped in the rankings. To some extent, this may be due to the emergence of new strong programs elsewhere. However, also in terms of more objective criteria, Minnesota appears to have lost ground in the past two to three decades; most of our graduate faculties are considerably smaller than those of the institutions with which we compete; our salaries compare less favorably than in the past with those of many of these institutions, both public and private; and considerably greater numbers of undergraduates are taught by our faculties than by those in institutions with which we compete. A few exceptions to the downward trend suggest that these factors, while important, do not totally determine the quality of graduate programs; strong leadership has resulted in important gains against the odds in some instances. In order for us to safeguard our most important characteristic, that of quality, it is important that we fully understand the factors that produce quality as well as the factors that inhibit it. Having understood these factors, we must take systematic steps towards ensuring that quality programs are maintained and that programs which offer an opportunity for quality improvement are enhanced.

PROPOSED STEPS:

- 1.) Formulating a strategy for dealing systematically with the question of quality, including the identification of means for evaluating it as well as factors that influence it.
- 2.) Redesigning the existing graduate program review process so that problems of quality can be quickly identified and remedies proposed.

QUALITY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

-2-

- 3.) Ensuring that proper emphasis is given to the quality of graduate education in collegiate and departmental planning.
- 4.) Exploring the feasibility of acquiring additional resources for the improvement of quality.
- 5.) Giving priority to proposals that address questions of quality, including biennial requests, reallocation of funds, and outside fundraising.
- 6.) Amending, or seeking to have amended, policies, rules, and regulations that hinder the development of quality; formulation of new policies.

OUTCOMES AND TIMING:

<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Timing</u>
Redesign of graduate program review process	April 15, 1983
Strategy paper	Oct. 1, 1983
Unit planning	
Policy amendments; new policies	Oct. 1, 1983
Additional resources	Nov. 1, 1983
Selecting targets of opportunity	Dec. 1, 1983

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY OF THE STATE

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS:

- To develop and maintain sound mechanisms for assessing and responding to the needs of the citizens of the state.
- To maintain programs with outstanding records of response to the needs of our constituents.
- To capitalize on opportunities to improve programs that address important societal needs.

OBJECTIVE: TO IMPROVE SUBSTANTIALLY THE UNIVERSITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE'S ECONOMY, ESPECIALLY IN THE AREAS OF TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT.

DISCUSSION: By virtue of its mission, quality, size, and location, the University is in a unique position to aid the development of the Minnesota economy through its teaching, research, and service programs. Many segments of the University are involved in such development and transfer of knowledge and skills (for example, agriculture, forestry, physical sciences, health sciences, engineering, and management). These areas of the University have a long-standing reputation for responding to the needs of the Minnesota economy. However, the University could provide more aggressive leadership within the state for a concerted effort to improve the economy of the state, especially through the development and transfer of technology and management skills. This is fully consistent with our long-term view that the University is a wise investment for the citizens of Minnesota.

The research programs of the faculty are in many instances related to economic development. In addition, the University could take other steps to promote the transfer of knowledge and skills. Part of the transfer is instructional both to the general public and to specific clientele. The Agricultural Extension Service is a good example in one area of this role. Another aspect may involve creating an environment that attracts certain development projects into a symbiotic relationship with the University. Still another aspect may be the provision of facilities and services that are necessary to support entrepreneurship.

PROPOSED STEPS:

- 1.) Formulating a strategy for dealing systematically with the question of the University's contribution to the state's economy in the areas of technology and management.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY OF THE STATE

-2-

- 2.) Exploring the feasibility of entering into cooperative arrangements with business and industry to further research and economic development and the transfer of knowledge and skills.
- 3.) Giving priority to proposals that address the University's contribution to the state's economy in the areas of technology and management, including biennial requests, reallocation of funds, and outside fund-raising.
- 4.) Amending, or seeking to have amended, policies, rules, and regulations that hinder the University's contribution to the state's economy in the areas of technology and management; formulation of new policies.

OUTCOMES AND TIMING:

<u>Outcomes</u>	<u>Timing</u>
Strategy paper	April 15, 1983
Policy amendments; new policies	April 15, 1983
Cooperative arrangements	June 1, 1983
Selecting targets of opportunity	June 1, 1983

STUDENT EXPERIENCE

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS:

- To maintain and improve the University's arts and science core.
- To ensure a University environment that attracts, retains, and supports high quality faculty, staff, and students.

OBJECTIVE: TO MEET MORE EFFECTIVELY THE INTELLECTUAL, SOCIAL, AND PHYSICAL NEEDS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S STUDENTS, ESPECIALLY UNDERGRADUATES, AND TO PROVIDE AN INTELLECTUALLY STIMULATING ENVIRONMENT.

DISCUSSION: For more than a decade, the University has had to cope with unprecedented enrollments, especially at the undergraduate level. The next decade offers the prospect of a reduction in the number of undergraduates to levels for which the University's programs are more properly designed and funded. This is thus an opportune time to focus on needed improvements in curriculum, in means and methods of instruction, in student services, and generally in the environment in which learning is to take place. The problems differ from campus to campus, but all segments of the University with significant undergraduate clientele should share in the revitalization that somewhat smaller numbers will make possible. Projects that are already underway should be properly supported, and the insights and experiences gained should be shared on an institutionwide basis. (Examples include CLA's "Report on the B.A. Degree," UMM's Title III project, the SCC's teaching project, the special leaves funded by the Bush Foundation, and the "active learning" program funded by the Northwest Area Foundation.) In the area of curriculum and instruction, important steps involve the tightening of liberal education requirements, new methods of delivering instruction under the distribution requirements, evaluation of teaching, and special learning opportunities such as honors programs and programs for educationally disadvantaged students; the question of remedial instruction, which is being addressed by a task force appointed as part of the first planning cycle, should receive continued attention. Attention should also be given to the international dimension of instruction, and to the needs of our international students. In the area of student services, every type of service from the first contact with potential students to career counseling and placement should be considered, with special attention given to the question of centralized vs. decentralized service. The impact and potential of computerization within certain services should be investigated and the findings incorporated into a universitywide plan on communication, computation, and information systems.

PROPOSED STEPS:

- 1.) Formulating strategies for dealing systematically with questions of curricular and instructional development; teaching evaluation; special learning opportunities; remedial instruction; international education;

STUDENT EXPERIENCE

-2-

prospective students/admission; advising/counseling; career development/placement; and financial aid.

- 2.) Conducting a study of the alternatives for improving the physical facilities related to the student learning environment, including instructional space and study/lounge space.
- 3.) Conducting a study of how existing dormitory space is used in support of the students' learning experience, and of the feasibility of providing additional dormitory space through contracting with private developers.
- 4.) Giving priority to proposals that address the improvement of the undergraduate experience, including biennial requests, reallocation of funds, and outside fund raising.
- 5.) Amending, or seeking to have amended, policies, rules, or regulations that hinder the development of a stimulating learning environment; formulation of new policies.

OUTCOMES AND TIMING:

Outcomes

Timing

Strategy papers

- curricular/instructional development
- teaching evaluation
- special learning opportunities
- remedial instruction
- international education
- prospective students/admissions
- advising/counseling; career development/placement
- financial aid

Instructional and lounge space

Dormitories

Policy amendments, new policies

Selecting targets of opportunity

THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS:

- To maintain and wherever possible strengthen research activities of the University.
- To maintain and improve the University's arts and science core.
- To capitalize on opportunities to improve programs that address important societal needs.

OBJECTIVE: TO ENHANCE THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY'S PROGRAMS OF TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE.

DISCUSSION: The objective relates directly to a characteristic of the institution as stated in the University's Mission and Policy Statement, which says that the University "...in the broadest sense is an institution of worldwide responsibility, scope and impact..." (Adopted by the Board of Regents, 11 July 1980). The objective is supported by public statements and writings of President Magrath, and the need to achieve the objective is documented in many recently published reports: 1) on the sorry state of international knowledge, awareness and understanding among U.S. college students, and 2) on serious global problems facing us. The creation of knowledge and training of students needs increasingly to be international in scope. Specifically, we need to promote curricular development, faculty development, and student exchange that improve the international character of the University; we need to improve the administrative structure related to international education; and we need to introduce policies and incentives that support activities related to international and cross-cultural study.

PROPOSED STEPS:

- 1.) Formulating a strategy for dealing systematically with questions related to the international character of the University, taking into consideration the recommendations of the recent report on "International Students at the University of Minnesota."
- 2.) Ensuring that proper emphasis is given to international education in collegiate and departmental planning.
- 3.) Implementing a proposal for the physical consolidation of major units concerned with international education.
- 4.) Exploring the feasibility of acquiring additional resources for selected research and exchange programs.

THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY

-2-

- 5.) Amending, or seeking to have amended, policies, rules, and regulations that hinder the development of international education; formulation of new policies.

OUTCOMES AND TIMING:

Outcomes

Timing

Strategy paper

Unit planning

Physical consolidation

Policy amendments; new policies

Additional resources

COMMUNICATION, COMPUTATION, AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL:

- To maintain and wherever possible improve the efficiency with which the institution carries out its responsibilities as a leading university responsive to the needs of its constituencies.

OBJECTIVE: TO ENSURE ORDERLY CONSIDERATION AND REASONED ADOPTION OF THE CHANGES THAT NEW COMMUNICATION, COMPUTATION, AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MAKES POSSIBLE, INCLUDING APPLICATION TO TEACHING AND RESEARCH AS WELL AS TO ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND FUNCTIONS.

DISCUSSION: There can be little doubt that the technology in the areas of communication, computation, and information is changing rapidly. Further, the University is by its nature in the information business and thus could be affected dramatically by the changes in technology. A review of issues in this area that was initiated during the first planning cycle should be continued and completed, establishing appropriate goals, organization, and fiscal strategies for guiding the University's actions. The review and the recommendations should include the centralized systems available through the University Computer Center and the Administrative Data Processing Center as well as decentralized use of computers elsewhere in the institution.

PROPOSED STEPS:

- 1.) Formulating a strategy for dealing systematically with changes in communication, computation, and information technology.
- 2.) Exploring the feasibility of entering into cooperative arrangements with businesses involved in the development of the relevant technology.
- 3.) Creating incentives for the implementation of cost-saving adaptations, especially in administrative areas, and improvements in quality at constant cost through the use of new technology.
- 4.) Amending, or seeking to have amended, policies, rules, and regulations that hinder the implementation of desirable technological changes.

Contracts -

how connected to tenure track or tenured -

Copsey

propose a model proposal?

Unger -

Is there a process whereby the Regents could express concerns and amendments to the Senate before Senate passes.

Shekter -

New business -

Looking at "our" agenda as compared to others -

Committee is rubber stamping a lot of internal actions

Items such as on-going reports from Tenure

Administrative Argumentation (Keeler says it will come up in next few months)

Major personnel items - (up-dates on major searches)

Set of policies even if just for information -

Solicited

Suggestions for appropriate topics for agenda

Search Committee to be formulated by Deputy V.P. Ag. - ^{working on} now job description

Numbers of administrators / college -

Hear from Counsel about his philosophy of preventive law

Grievance procedures (faculty review)

Appropriate discussion of dep. V.P. of IAFHE before search

~~(one other from the trigger)~~ Better ~~new~~ review of contract -
not necessarily for action

COMMUNICATION, COMPUTATION, AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

-2-

OUTCOMES AND TIMING:

Outcomes

Timing

Strategy paper

Cooperative arrangements

Creation of incentives

Policy amendments; new policies

Faculty and Staff Affairs :

Honorary appointments

Board's part time appt. + length of that appt.

Emeritus prof not kind when being a jr. prof would be option
Leaving the U. just 3 years - 1/2 out of academia

Civil Serv. Classification

Planners + Coordinating planners

Tenure Code - Update

Gave 1945 (?) Code

Gave 1973 proposal

Issues that Senate Committee has been working on -

Simplification + removal of procedures -

Plus coupling rank and tenure

Important changes to reduce liability in instances of error

tenure issue - clear that committee will want to look at

definition of circumstances in removal of tenure -

(what is a financial exigency in this institution -?)

3rd class of reasons in ABVP guidelines -

Planned changes in program ← programmatic change in direction

Feb - 1 month to finish draft -

help with time table - ask for time table for Senate consideration
(not simultaneously?) Discussion about financial exigency -