



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 20, 1984  
12:30 - 3:00  
624 Campus Club

AGENDA

Approx.  
time

- 12:30 1. Introductions.
2. Approval of FCC minutes of August 27. (Corrections enclosed to FCC.)
3. Report of the Student Chair.
4. Report of the Chair.
5. Confirm schedule for the October 18 meetings on the Morris Campus.
6. Report of the Senate Finance Committee.
7. SCC confirmation of appointments to Senate Finance Committee: SCC rep. and chair of SFC - Deon Stuthman; SCC alternate - Irwin Rubenstein; Coordinate Campus faculty rep. - Wendell Johnson (UMC).
- 1:15 8. Reports from September Regents' meetings.
- 1:45 9. Assembly Steering Committee business:  
Board on advertising, promotions and sponsorships. Discussion. (Note: we hope to have present a representative from the Office of Student Affairs and from the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs.)  
Enclosure: Motion and Information from 1984 spring quarter Assembly meeting.
- 2:15 10. Proposed Minimum Standards of Academic Progress for Financial Aid Recipients, 1984-85. The Senate Committee on Student Academic Support Services forwards the document to be reported to the Senate this fall for information. (Federal law required colleges and universities to develop such standards.) Guest: Professor Elwood Caldwell, Chair of the Student Academic Support Services Committee. We hope also to have a guest from the Office of Student Affairs.  
Enclosure: Proposed policy, with cover memo from Norman Kerr, last year's S.A.S.S. chair.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/4/84

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
September 20, 1984  
12:35 - 3:10  
626 Campus Club

SCC members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Doug Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chair), Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Bruce Williams.

Guests for all or part of the meeting: Robert Barnett, Elwood Caldwell, Laura Slater Cavallo, Doug Iverson, Jacque Jodl, Donald Kahn, Vice President Keller, President Magrath, Robert Misenko, Carol Pazandak, Mary Jane Plunkett, Vice President Wilderson, MSA members.

Members and visitors introduced themselves.

1. Minutes. The FCC members approved the minutes of the August 27 meeting including additional editorial corrections distributed at the meeting.

2. Report of the Chair. Professor Merwin reminded participants that a discussion with President Magrath and Vice President Keller had been added to the agenda because the president had to be out of town on October 4, SCC's next meeting date. Schedules for the October 18 SCC meeting on the Morris campus were distributed and Professor Merwin invited suggestions for that agenda.

Professor Merwin is meeting individually with the chairs of a number of Senate committees and will convene the Facilitative Committee of the Senate (defined in the constitution as consisting of the chairs of selected Senate committees) this fall. He requested that SCC be the source of its own agenda to a fair extent and invited members to recommend items.

October 4's agenda will include consideration with Vice President Keller and a representative of Vice President Lilly of the policy proposals from the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation as well as a first examination of the SCEP report on the evaluation of teaching.

3. Report of the Student Chair. Paul Schulte, interim chair, reported on Mike Olmstead's resignation and announced that Douglas Melby had today been elected SCC student chairperson for 1984-85.

Mr. Melby reported that Charles Farrell will arrange the student part of the SCC's day at Morris. The October 5-7 Siggelkow Leadership Retreat will

feature Professors Shirley Clark and Marvin Mattson among seminar presenters. Development work continues on the Student Senate constitution. Student lobbying effort to the state is being reorganized.

4. Report of the Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman. The committee held a series of four meetings this summer when the legislative requests were being refined. Old and new SFC members and some SCC members took part. Professor Phil Shively, faculty legislative liaison, attended the fourth meeting. Professor Stuthman called attention to the University's new approach of making general rather than specific requests for legislative specials. If the approach works, more unmarked money will come to the University and the Finance Committee and others will want to judge the subsequent budgeting against the budgeting principles.

SFC sees the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR) emerging as a major funding source and hopes its funded activities will come closer to the University's mission.

5. The Senate Consultative Committee confirmed the following faculty appointments to the Senate Finance Committee: Deon Stuthman, SCC rep. and chair; Irwin Rubenstein, SCC alternate; Wendell Johnson, UMC, coordinate campus rep.

6. Reports from September Regents' meetings. The SCC heard summary reports from the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee where there was extensive discussion on the rate of salary increases for administrators (defended as market competitive) and where elements of the proposed new tenure code are of concern (programmatic considerations in granting tenure and in continuance, and the relative weighting desirable for professional service in the teaching/research/service balance.)

SCC also heard a summary report from the Physical Plant and Investments Committee, Committee of the Whole, and Board of Regents. The transitway, refinancing, recruitment project, and exploration of conversion to the semester system were major items.

7. (Assembly Steering Committee business.)

Board on Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships. Guests: Robert Barnett, Donald Kahn, Richard Purple, Frank Wilderson.

Background. At its 1984 spring quarter meeting, the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approved a policy on advertising, promotions, and sponsorships submitted by the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs. One element of the policy was the creation of a review board on implementation of that policy. The policy designated the Steering Committee to appoint two students and two faculty members to the review board. The Student SCC appointed two students last spring but the FCC has not yet made appointments in large part because members did not understand the job they would be asking colleagues to take on. SCC has also advised that in the future the Committee on Committees should be the appointing body.

Presentation. Vice President Wilderson spoke about the common practice of cooperation between students organizing campus events and outside businesses

as sponsors. The University, he said, wants to be sure that what the sponsors display on campus contributes in a positive way. Given the evidence and educational campaigns for caution in the use of alcohol and tobacco, the administration does not think the University should be in a position of promoting the products. The students, for their part, do not want to lose the sources of support they have worked hard to develop since the lost revenue for major activities could not be compensated for by internal funds.

Mr. Barnett added that a proposal arose <sup>last year</sup> and was submitted to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs (ACSA) to ban alcohol and cigarette advertising. ACSA responded that advertising per se was not the problem. The students had found the problem to lie instead in the requirements companies attached to the money they contributed (i.e., the degree of visibility of products and sponsor). The students asked for a University policy with which they could arm themselves, to show prospective sponsors the guidelines everyone was required to work within.

The motion to the Assembly outlined a policy but did not spell it out. The major role of the review committee, said Mr. Barnett, would be to resolve differences, should they arise. But it was also the hope of those drafting the policy that the review committee would develop some of the policy details. OSA would be happy to provide start-up staff support to the review committee as it established the procedures.

The Office of Student Affairs (OSA) is acting according to the new Assembly policy. Based upon their first example of negotiation with a sponsor they are very satisfied that the policy is the key element to success. In Mr. Barnett's opinion there won't be much work for the review committee.

Professor Kahn commented that a third task of the review committee is to help make the policy well known on campus.

Principles. Mr. Barnett distributed copies of a 12-point approach to co-sponsored activities agreed to by several national collegiate associations. He said the Student Organization Development Center (SODC) would discuss these points with student groups when they want to enter into co-sponsorships.

Discussion. Professor Sorauf stated his agreement with the need for a policy, and recommended broad-based faculty and student participation in developing the policy and guidelines, but administrative application of them. However, Professor Kahn replied that putting all review in the hands of administration would not be acceptable to students, at least not to the students of ACSA.

Mr. Shope told SCC that the students last year were reacting to a unilateral administrative initiative to ban alcohol and cigarette advertising. Therefore, student input should be a structured part of developing policies for entering into contracts; policy-making should not be assigned to OSA and SODC.

Two interpretations had in fact emerged in the meeting as to who is intended to develop the details of the policy. One message was that it would be the SODC for the all-University level and deans and directors for the various units; the other was that the review committee would play an important part. Professor Sorauf called it seriously unwise for a committee to both

write policy and apply it in an appellate manner.

Professor Stuthman concluded discussion of the item by emphasizing the need to clarify how the policy was or is being developed and to have people satisfied about how it gets developed. Professor Merwin called for further discussion before FCC appoints faculty members to the review committee.

8. Minimum Academic Standards for Financial Aid Participants.

Guests: Elwood Caldwell, chair, Senate Committee on Student Academic Support Services, and James Preus and Frank Wilderson of OSA.

Background. The Office of Student Affairs, responding to federal requirements, last year established a task force to develop academic standards for students on financial aid. The task force chair consulted at length with the SASS committee, and that committee, reported Professor Caldwell, is pleased with the degree of communication and consultation that took place.

Presentation. Professor Merwin asked Professor Caldwell to describe first his committee's thinking regarding two modifications it had recommended which have not been adopted. Professor Caldwell told SCC the committee regards its reservations as having been satisfied. SASS had thought the 15-quarter limit for graduate students would work against students who proceed directly from the baccalaureate degree to the Ph.D. program and against part-time students. However, it accepts the Graduate School's assurances of being content with the provision in the criteria for individual consideration of students enrolled in a longer-than-normal program.

The SASS Committee also had felt it would be a mistake to list the specific extenuating circumstances under which students might be permitted a continuation of financial aid even though they failed to meet the academic criteria. The believed the list would appear to be exclusive, while it could not be entirely so, and they believed its publication could invite students to tailor the explanations for their failure to fit the criteria. However, the Financial Aid Office has since said that while the list would define the policy for internal use, the specifics would not be publicized.

Discussion. SCC members argued that for a student to make a case he or she should know what the criteria are. Vice President Wilderson told the meeting he favored including the list with a note that the items are examples of the extenuating circumstances that would apply. He thinks the different viewpoints can be resolved.

Professor Caldwell explained that it was the attitude of both the Senate committee and the Financial Aid Office that the policy should be flexible enough to be worked on further during its first year of application. Vice President Wilderson noted that his communication to Provosts also indicates the need to be responsive to the practical realities of application.

Participants were receptive to Professor Freier's recommendation that "credits or time requirements completed" be substituted for "credits completed" to allow for different kinds of program requirements.

DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH AND VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

Subjects: the administrative transition and some continuing issues.

The president and vice president described arrangements for the transition from Dr. Magrath's presidency to Dr. Keller's acting presidency. President Magrath said the structure and the people involved make for a very stable transition arrangement. There need be no loss of momentum on the University's agenda. The planning process continues, the recommendations of the task forces are public, and the Regents have approved the biennial request which includes very specific items arising from University priorities and planning. He underscored the planning-biennial request-budgeting linkage. The capital request fundamentally reflects the University's priorities.

The sixth vice presidency, which was tentatively re-titled Vice President for Planning and Academic Support Activities, will remain vacant and its future will depend upon the new president. The five vice presidents work together closely and collaboratively, and the other four are highly supportive of Vice President Keller in both his Academic Affairs role and his upcoming acting president role.

The president addressed the needs of the Office of Academic Affairs, and lauded the appointment of Rama Murthy to replace Associate Vice President Linck whose loss from the University was a serious one. Rick Heydinger is serving on a term basis as Assistant Vice President. Vice President Keller has decided not to replace himself with an interim or acting vice president in Academic Affairs, but the president has urged Dr. Keller to consider seriously bringing in a faculty member with special expertise to assist. Central administration, the President told SCC, is understaffed as it enters a demanding time which includes the legislative session with some new leadership.

Vice President Keller told SCC he would give first priority to the role of president, speaking out and giving direction, and will delegate much of the Academic Affairs functions to his associates and assistants.

The budget and staff of former Vice President Hasselmo's office are being delegated to Academic Affairs for the year to do Cycle III planning. They must make sure the structure is in place to carry out the planning, which occurs especially at the college level.

Other positions. Filling the new position of Assistant Vice President for Information Processing is nearly settled after a national search. The officer, who has given acceptance orally, will report to Academic Affairs. (University Libraries will not report to this officer.)

Deanships. President Magrath noted that, with the exception of the College of Biological Sciences, which has an acting dean, the deanships are all filled or essentially filled. Vice President Keller reported that he has organized the deans into three all-University councils with responsibility for developing some proposals. He has asked the council concerned with graduate affairs to consider the biological sciences at the University, taking into account the comments contained in the Holt Task Force on Graduate Education

and Research. He does not anticipate any major reorganization but will hold off starting the search for a new CBS dean until any question of restructuring is worked out, perhaps about the end of winter quarter.

Communicating to the University about the transition. The president supported Professor Stuthman's suggestion for an all-University letter describing fully the transitions in central administration-- because it is important that the whole University community also be persuaded, as is the SCC, that the transition is well planned for.

University Libraries. Professor Sorauf remarked that there is the potential for confusion over the boundaries and relationships between the newly created position of Director of Libraries and the newly defined position of University Librarian which Eldred Smith will continue to hold. He inquired about the relationship between the two jobs and cited the need to make the job of Director of Libraries sufficiently attractive to get top applicants.

Vice President Keller said that, among other responsibilities, the Director would be given a lot of budgeting power. He said he has discussed extensively with the University Librarian the degree of independence of the new Director of Libraries and the division of their roles. The University Librarian will continue to represent the University externally, such as by serving on several national boards. The University Librarian should also set the large conceptual direction for the libraries. The search for the Director and work to change the library governance structure will proceed simultaneously.

Biennial Request. Vice President Keller said the University is getting a lot of support in St. Paul for its proposal to use the income from the Permanent University Fund to endow chairs.

The president said there is much positive response to the University's requests. However, there is also an atmosphere favoring tax reduction and holding agencies to fixed percentage increases. The University and the Commissioner of Finance differ on what base year to use for the average cost funding formula, but the state is willing to discuss it with the University.

Capital Request. Asked about capital request issues and the possibility of raising the bonding limit, the president said the University is asking for an appropriation above the legislated limit on the Electrical Engineering/Computer Science building. Again, fiscal conservatism could be influential.

Intercampus transitway. The president explained that the legislature in its last session refused to fund the University's part of the matching funds, but that the item had not been a high University priority. It would be a mistake, he said, to make it a policy not to undertake in some other way any request the legislature turns down. The University is working with the mayor of St. Paul and with neighborhood groups in hopes of arriving at an acceptable plan.

Refinancing. Vice President Keller said the University is forgoing interest and not actually borrowing, and that the refinancing plans can increase the University's flexible income by roughly \$2 million.

Recommendation for a semester system for the Twin Cities campus.  
Vice President Keller reported that the task force the President has appointed will visit campuses that have converted to a semester system. Professor Merwin voiced the hope that some of those would be campuses as complex as our Twin Cities campus.

The task force will develop a set of actual plans and report to the president next spring. The president will take the report to the regents and the consultative bodies for a direct discussion of the issues identified.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Department of Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

October 29, 1984

TO: Jack Merwin, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee (SCC); Assembly Steering Committee  
FROM: Elwood Caldwell, Chair, Student Academic Support Services Committee (SASSC)  
SUBJECT: Minimum Standards of Academic Progress for Student Financial Aid Recipients, 1984-85

On May 3, 1984, my predecessor as chair of SASSC forwarded jointly to your predecessor as chair of SCC and to Vice President Wilderson the then-proposed statement of policy having the above title, with the recommendation that Vice President Wilderson implement the policy as soon as possible and the request that SCC submit it to the Senate as an information item no later than fall quarter, 1984.

However, the above recommendation and request were accompanied by another recommendation that two parts of the policy be given further consideration. These were, respectively, the fifteen quarter maximum financial aid eligibility for doctoral students in Section C, and the detailed nature of the list of extenuating circumstances justifying probationary status as given in Section D.

On September 20 I discussed the above matters with your committee, along with Vice President Wilderson and Student Support Services Coordinator Jim Preus. On the 15-quarter issue, I had determined by discussion with Student Financial Aid (SFA) staff that they interpreted the 15 quarters as counting from admission with a PhD degree objective, not from the admission for MS which is typical of most students in most graduate programs. Thus the limitation would affect only a small minority of students whose cases could be considered on their merits under the general exception clause in Section C. Graduate School staff confirmed that the 15 quarter limitation would affect very few students, even under conditions of part-time study, and expressed satisfaction with it as stated. The consensus of SCC seemed to be to accept this further clarification.

On the detailed list of extenuating circumstances, SFA staff had indicated subsequently that it was not their intent that this be printed for wide distribution, but rather that it indicate to SASSC the guidelines they proposed to use. This would have satisfied the question raised last year by SASSC. However, some members of SCC felt that there should be at least a brief explanation of what was meant by extenuating circumstances. This was agreed to by Drs. Wilderson and Price, with the understanding that the revised wording be reviewed by SASSC prior to resubmission to your committee.

This was done. Revised wording proposed by SFA was considered by SASSC at its first meeting of the quarter on October 18, and approved with no substantive change.

Jack Merwin  
October 29, 1984  
Page Two

Accordingly, we now resubmit the complete policy statement as implemented for 1984-85 by Vice President Wilderson per our previous recommendation, incorporating the new wording in Section D with other minor changes of a non-substantive nature. It has the unqualified approval of SASSC, which requests that you submit it to the Senate as an information item so that there will be opportunity to react during the first quarter of implementation.

The minutes of SASSC's October 18 meeting recording the above action are not yet available, but will be routed to you and to Marilee Ward in due course. In the meantime, I hope this memo will serve to dispose of this one item of carryover business from 1983-84.

EFC:mf

cc: Frank Wilderson  
James Preus  
Marilee Ward



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Department of Genetics and Cell Biology  
250 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108-1095  
(612) 373-3640

May 3, 1984

TO: John Howe, Senate Consultative Committee  
Frank Wilderson, Vice President for Student Affairs

FROM: Norman Kerr, Chair,  
Student Academic Support Services Committee

At its meeting on April 25, 1984, the above committee discussed the *Task Force Report on Satisfactory Academic Progress Standing for Financial Aid Recipients*. The task force was chaired by Darlene Ayers-Lynch, Assistant Director, Office of Student Financial Aid, Twin Cities. She had distributed the report to representatives of all colleges and gave us a summary of their comments. Following the meeting, Darlene incorporated most of our recommendations into a revised and shortened proposal, which is appended. The motion which follows was written by me in the form you see here after Ms. Ayers-Lynch incorporated most of our suggestions into the revised draft.

I had hoped (until 10:00 am May 3) to present our motion and the revised proposed policy to the Senate at its May 17 meeting as an information item. I decided not to do so both because I believe the Vice President and the Consultative Committee might prefer to read the report first, and because the May 17 Agenda is so long and so crowded that the proposal might be overlooked. I do urge that it be presented to the Senate, for information, no later than fall quarter, 1984. Thus the Senate will have an opportunity to react to the proposal during its first quarter of implementation.

"The Student Academic Support Services Advisory Committee passed the following motion at its April 25, 1984 meeting:

The Committee wishes to commend the Task Force on Satisfactory Progress Standards for Financial Aid Recipients, and, especially, its Chair, Darlene Ayers-Lynch, for a superb report. The Committee recommends that Vice

President Wilderson implement the policy recommended as soon as possible. It requests the Consultative Committee to submit the proposed policy to the Senate as an information item so that it can be widely studied and discussed.

The Committee recommends that two parts of the proposed policy be given further consideration:

Section C, beginning on page 3 concerns graduate students. The Committee is concerned that a maximum of fifteen quarters for students pursuing a Doctorate may be unduely restrictive. Many doctoral candidates become employed full-time while doing research for their dissertation. They may wish to take a leave of absence from their employment for a few months when writing the final draft and defending their dissertation. During this time they may need to apply for a Guaranteed Student Loan so as to support themselves. The Committee notes that these students almost certainly would not have been receiving financial aid during the fifteen quarters; nevertheless, fifteen quarters (5 years) represents their maximum eligibility for aid. The Committee realizes that the proposed policy is the recommendation of the Graduate School, but believes the Graduate Faculty need to be consulted before a fifteen quarter period as a graduate student becomes the final policy.

Section D, page 3: The Committee recommended that the seven reasons *not* be stated, and that the preliminary paragraph be reworded as follows:

"Students who fail to meet the annual minimum requirements as defined in B may continue to be eligible for financial aid if they can present evidence of extenuating personal or academic circumstances.

"Probationary status is not automatic. . . ."

PROPOSED MINIMUM STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS  
FOR  
FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS  
1984-85

"Section 484 of the Higher Education Act (HEA), as amended, requires that a student be maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study he or she is pursuing according to the standards and practices of the institution in which he or she is enrolled in order to receive financial aid under the student financial assistance programs authorized under Title IV of the HEA."

These minimum standards may not be consistent with the requirements set forth by the colleges or schools within the University regarding either academic progress or the requirements to complete a degree. Neither do these minimum standards control the students' classification of good standing, probation or termination within the colleges or schools.

In order to establish or continue eligibility for financial aid these minimum standards will apply to the students' entire academic record at the institution regardless of whether the students had received financial aid for the previous periods of enrollment. The standards require that students complete a prescribed number of credits within a quarter/academic year with a minimum G.P.A. Additionally a maximum time frame is established for eligibility of financial aid. It is expected that students will complete the educational objective (e.g. degree, certificate) within the prescribed maximum time frame.

These standards are established for students who are receiving financial aid from one or more of the following programs:

1. PELL Grant
2. National Direct Student Loan (NDSL)
3. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)
4. Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL)
5. Auxiliary Loan (PLUS)
6. College Work-Study Program (CWSP)
7. Minnesota State Scholarship and Grant In-Aid Program
8. Minnesota Part-Time Grant Program
9. Health Professions Loan (HPL)
10. Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL)
11. Nursing Scholarship and Loan Programs
12. University Scholarships, Grants and Loans

The following sections describe the minimum standards for undergraduate, graduate and non-degree seeking students.

A. Frequency of Monitoring

Academic progress of financial aid recipients will be monitored a minimum of once per academic year. If the student enrolls for less than the full academic year, only those quarters for which he or she registers will be reviewed. More frequent monitoring may occur at the discretion of the individual campuses. Monitoring will occur at a minimum at the end of the Spring Quarter.

## B. Credits Completed

The enrollment status (full-time vs. part-time) is determined by the actual number of credits for which students register. This includes credits that may subsequently be dropped but for which a grade of "W" is assigned. Full-time status for undergraduates is defined as registering for 12 credits or more per quarter. Part-time status is defined as registering for less than 12 credits. (Financial aid recipients must register for a minimum of 6 credits per quarter). Full-time status for graduate students is registering for 8 credits or more per quarter. Part-time status is defined as registering for less than 8 credits per quarter unless specified otherwise on the Graduate Student Status Form.

Students are expected to complete the minimum credits with grades or A,B,C, D,S.

### Minimum Annual Requirements

<u>Student Category</u>	<u>Credits Completed</u>	<u>*G.P.A.</u>
Undergraduate (FT)	year 1 - 24 cr. Beyond year 1 - 36 cr.	2.0
Undergraduate (PT)	18 cr.	2.0
Undergraduate (FT) Certificate/Assoc. Degree	Same as FT Undergraduate	2.0
Undergraduate (PT) Certificate/Assoc. Degree	Same as PT Undergraduate	2.0
+Graduate Masters Degree	24 cr.	2.8
+Graduate Doctorate	24 cr.	2.8
#Professional	Varies	Varies
Non-Degree Seeking Students	18 cr.	2.0

## C. Maximum Time Frame

Undergraduates - Students who are pursuing a Bachelor's degree and who have attempted more than 216 credits will not be eligible for financial aid. Students who are pursuing a Certificate or Associate's Degree and who have attempted more than 108 credits will not be eligible for financial aid.

\* The minimum GPA can be either annual or cumulative.

+ Graduate students may enroll as Thesis only or in any program of under 6 credits per quarter for a maximum of 6 quarters. The 24 credit requirement would be waived in this instance.

# Students enrolled in the professional schools (Dental, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine) are expected to maintain satisfactory academic progress as defined by the individual schools.

Graduate students - Students who are pursuing a Masters Degree are not eligible for financial aid beyond nine quarters of enrollment. Students who are pursuing a Doctorate are not eligible for financial aid beyond fifteen quarters of enrollment. Non-Degree Seeking Students - There is no maximum time frame for eligibility of financial aid for this category of students because there is no defined educational objective (e.g. degree or certificate). Students in this category are typically eligible for GSL and PLUS only.

Students enrolled in a program of study which extends beyond the average credit requirements (e.g. 135 credit Undergraduate Development Certificate in Electrical Engineering) may be considered on an individual basis, for financial aid beyond the maximum time frame as defined in the above. The extension beyond the time frame does not apply to students who have extended their program of study because of a failure to register for or satisfactorily complete course requirements for graduation.

#### D. Probationary Status

Students who fail to meet the annual minimum requirements as defined in B may continue to be eligible for financial aid if there is evidence of one or more of the following extenuating circumstances:

1. Documented illness (personal or family)
2. Documented family stress (e.g. divorce, death of a family member, chemical dependency)
3. Academic difficulty that is precipitated by a <sup>e</sup>verifiable disability. This situation applies to handicapped students who may have periodic reoccurrences of an illness that are disability related. OSFA will accept documentation from a physician and/or University staff who work with handicapped and disabled students.
4. Evidence of inadequate academic preparation. OSFA will accept Advisor's statements or letters from other support services units.
5. Enrollment for only a portion of the review period.
6. Close calls. Students who fail to meet the minimum requirements by a small margin (e.g. 2.0 with 34 credits)
7. Change in major or program which results in a delay of the completion of the degree or certificate.

Probationary status is not automatic. Individual student circumstances will be reviewed via the appeal process. Extenuating circumstances will be considered a maximum of 4 quarters.

During the probationary quarter(s) students are expected to complete the minimum requirements as previously outlined. Performance will be monitored at the end of each probationary quarter. Once students meet the minimum requirements, they will be removed from Probationary Status. Credits completed while on probation count toward the maximum time frame as described in C.

#### E. Cancellation of Eligibility for Financial Aid

Students' eligibility for financial aid will be cancelled for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Failure to meet the minimum quarterly/annual GPA and credit requirements as described in B.

2. Exceeds the maximum time frame (credits attempted or quarters enrolled) as described in C.
3. Failure to meet the minimum requirements during a probationary quarter.

F. Reinstatement of Eligibility for Financial Aid

If financial aid is denied because of insufficient academic progress, students must complete the equivalent of 1 quarter of the minimum number of credits with the minimum G.P.A. as defined for each category of students within 1 quarter of enrollment at their own expense. (e.g. If the student typically registered as a full-time undergraduate, h/she would be required to complete 12 credits with a 2.0 G.P.A.).

Once students have demonstrated that they can satisfactorily complete the number of credits and achieve the necessary G.P.A. for that particular enrollment period they are once again eligible to receive financial aid for as long as they continue to meet the minimum requirements and do not exceed the maximum time frame for eligibility.

Financial aid granted after the reinstatement will be based on availability of funds and current University funding policies.

G. Appeal Procedures

Students who believe that their circumstances merit consideration may appeal the cancellation of their eligibility for financial aid. The appeal procedures may vary for each campus. Students appealing an OSFA decision must provide the appropriate supporting documentation to validate the reason for the appeal.

H. Grades of N,I,W,X, and V

Grades of N,I,W,X, and V do not count toward fulfilling the minimum requirements. Special consideration may be given to "X" grades. This exception will be handled on an individual basis and with documentation from the instructors verifying that the credits will be completed by the end of the following quarter.

Failing grades (e.g. N,F) will be included in the calculation of the G.P.A.

I. Summer Enrollment

The summer session(s) will be treated as the equivalent of one academic year quarter for those students who are enrolled in year-round or 12 month programs.

Undergraduate students enrolled in regular nine month programs may not use the summer session(s) as a "catch-up" period except in those instances where they attend at their own expense.

The summer session(s) for graduate students will be the equivalent of 1/2 a quarter. Graduate students enrolling at their own expense may also use the summer session(s) as a "catch up" period. However, all periods of enrollment including summer will count toward the maximum time frames of 9 and 15 quarters.

J. Transfer Credits

Credits earned at a previous institution that count toward the degree or certificate at the University will be taken into account in determining the maximum time frame for eligibility.

Example: A student earned 90 credits at a Community College. The student was accepted at the University as an advance standing student (Junior). The 90 credits would count toward the 216 credits that the student was permitted to attempt as an undergraduate.

However, the level of academic performance (e.g. G.P.A.) at the former institution will not be considered when making the initial eligibility determination for transfer students. It will be assumed that they are in good standing.

K. Repeat and Credit by Exam Courses

Repeat courses that have already been completed with a D grade or better will not be counted toward fulfilling the quarterly/annual credit requirements if students choose to repeat the courses to improve the grades.

Credit by exam is not included in credits attempted for a given quarter and is, therefore not counted toward fulfilling the quarterly/annual credit requirements. However, if these credits count toward fulfilling degree or certificate requirements, they will be taken into account when determining the maximum time frame for eligibility.

Prepared by: Darlene Ayers-Lynch  
Assistant Director, Office of Student Financial Aid  
May 2, 1984

Annual Report to the University Senate  
Student Academic Support Services Advisory Committee  
April, 1984

The Committee met six times during the academic year. It focused its attention on an analysis of the Office of Student Financial Aid. Two aspects of financial aid were discussed: (1) Packaging guidelines, and (2) Academic Progress Standards.

Financial aid is available from a bewildering array of sources including the Federal Government, the State Government, and internal University funds. Each student's needs are first determined using a formula. From this total need the amount an individual is expected to contribute by self-help (employment and/or Guaranteed Student Loans) is subtracted; an individual must have a need greater than this amount (\$1440 for freshmen; \$2800 for advanced undergraduates) to remain in the pool. A maximum of 32% of remaining need or \$2280 (for undergraduates this represents tuition and fees) is awarded by a combination of gifts and loans. (Work-study assistance is in addition to the above.)

Should the amount of available funding be insufficient to meet needs as defined above, the Committee recommended that aid should be reduced as follows:

(1) As a first step, the percentage of need awarded and the maximum award should be reduced concurrently, such that the percentage that the maximum award represents of usual undergraduate total need would be reduced at the same rate that the percentage of need awarded was reduced.

(2) At the point where the minimum amount awarded to upperclassmen reaches \$700 and the minimum amount awarded to freshmen reaches \$350, the amount of need necessary to enter the pool should be increased to sustain these minimum awards. Some thought might be given to raising the freshmen minimal need amount more rapidly than that for upper classmen.

The Federal Government requires that we develop academic progress standards for a student to be able to continue to receive financial aid. The Committee has endorsed a *Proposed Minimum Standards of Academic Progress for Financial Aid Recipients* policy and has forwarded the proposal to the Consultative Committee with the recommendation that they be published as an Information Item in the Senate docket.

Norman S. Kerr, Chairman



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

September 17, 1984

President C. Peter Magrath  
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

I am happy to learn from Dianna Gardner that you and Ken will be able to join the Senate Consultative Committee on the 20th at 2:00. We look forward to discussing jointly, as you propose, the upcoming administrative transition. Our meeting is in room 626 of the Campus Club.

Cordially,

Jack Merwin, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

October 3, 1984

Professor Richard L. Purple, Chair  
Assembly Committee on Business and Rules  
Department of Physiology  
5-267 Millard Hall

Dear Rick:

Thanks for your kind offer to have the Committee on Business and Rules consider the matter of further policy and implementation needs regarding Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships.

During the discussions at the September 20, 1984 meeting of SCC, of the charge to be given to the Committee on Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships, three elements of a proposed charge were identified by Vice President Wilderson and his associates as 1) develop policy details, 2) help make the policy well known on campus, and 3) serve as an appeals board. Since you were present, you will recall that there were reservations expressed about a single group carrying out all three of these functions.

The Assembly Steering Committee would appreciate the thinking of your committee on this matter. If your committee agrees that the three functions recommended for this new committee should not be carried out by a single group, it would be helpful to know where in the judgment of your committee they might best be assigned.

The Steering Committee will look forward to the guidance of the Committee on Business and Rules on this matter.

Sincerely,

Jack Merwin, Chair,  
Assembly Steering Committee

JM:mp

cc: Vice President Wilderson  
Professor Donald Kahn

Enc.: SCC draft minutes of 9/20/84  
Assembly action of 4/19/84

STUDENT AFFAIRS  
ADVERTISEMENT, AND PROMOTIONS POLICY  
(10 minutes)

**MOTION:**

That the Assembly approve the following recommended policy on advertisements, promotions, and sponsorships:

1. When academic units plan to enter into a jointly sponsored activity or program with non-University groups, the appropriate dean, or director, or their designee, shall be responsible for review and approval of the proposed event.

2. When non-academic units plan to enter into a jointly sponsored activity or program with non-University groups, the appropriate director shall designate a suitable officer to review and approve the proposed event. In the case of registered student organizations, the director of the Student Organization Development Center shall be responsible for such review and approval.

3. In the case of a co-sponsored activity, where the non-University co-sponsor donates funds, materials, or services in excess of \$500, approval of an agreement shall be obtained prior to entering into the agreement with a non-University co-sponsor, according to 1.) or 2.)

4. We further recommend that the University administration establish a Review Committee on Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships to monitor the the practices of jointly sponsored activities. This committee may also serve to hear appeals, clarify procedures, and disseminate information about existing policies to the appropriate officers.

The membership in this Review Committee shall consist of:

2 students selected by the Assembly Steering Committee;

2 faculty members selected by the Assembly Steering Committee.

1 person designated by the office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations.

No member of this Review Committee shall be a person responsible for review and approval of these activities at a unit level.

5. The Review Committee shall report to the administration and/or the Assembly as necessary.

**INFORMATION:**

The University of Minnesota is a publicly supported institution of higher education, maintained by the State to further the educational and cultural opportunities of all its citizens and to advance the general welfare through research, teaching, and public service. The fundamental purpose of this University is clearly focused on education in the broad sense of the word.

In this light, it is natural that the University recognizes that the activities and purposes of non-University groups often coincide with or complement those of the University itself. In such circumstances, the University has allowed non-University groups to use University facilities and/or to enter into joint sponsorship of University programs including major campus and student activities such as the University Homecoming, Campus Carnival, and some conferences and concerts.

The Regents of the University have approved policies which specify the University's interests in and the conditions under which use of University facilities is permitted for non-University groups, and the principles which govern jointly sponsored programs (see for example policy on Use of University Facilities, approved by the Board of Regents—July 11, 1975, available from Secretary of the Board of Regents, 373-0080). Despite these policies, questions do arise about the appropriateness of certain promotions and sponsorships as well as the suitable use of revenues so generated. Traditionally, authority and responsibility for implementing the relevant Regents' policies has been vested in the specific University units or organizations involved in jointly sponsored programs. However, there appears to be a need to improve and clarify approval mechanisms currently in place to provide for appropriate review of jointly sponsored activities. Everyone agrees that constitutional guarantees (for example, the First Amendment to the Constitution) must be fully protected.

**DON KAHN**  
Chair

Approved

A. The University's Interest in Co-Sponsored Activities

Although no University policy exists which exclusively addresses co-sponsored student activities, several Regents' policies (in particular, the Policy on Use of University Facilities) do exist which have strong implications for jointly-sponsored events. Consequently, the following criteria serve as additional guidelines for co-sponsored student activities. Further, incomplete attention to or severe departure from these guidelines will serve as the basis for non-approval of proposed co-sponsorship agreements:

1. The University will not enter into co-sponsorship of any program or activity in which the educational or public service implications are not evident and which does not relate appropriately to the missions of the University.
2. The University, by the very nature of the functions for which it exists as a publicly-supported institution of higher education, should not enter into joint sponsorship of any project or program that is to result in profits or private gain for the non-university group.
3. The University cannot be a co-sponsor with any non-campus group for political, racial, or sectarian gatherings.
4. Whenever non-university groups share in the use of University facilities, it is with the approval of the University, and all conditions of that co-sponsorship are to be set by the University.
5. Upon entering into co-sponsorship or any program or activity the University assumes the full responsibility and authority for all pertinent details, such as setting of hours, selling of tickets, pricing of tickets, supervision of buildings, etc. It reserves the right to approve all copy for advertising as well as all news releases.

B. Co-sponsored Activities which Involve the Consumption and/or Marketing of Alcoholic Beverages

The University of Minnesota has a special interest in health and welfare of its students, staff and faculty. Because of this interest, the University endorses the following guidelines pertaining to the marketing of alcoholic beverages on the campus, including marketing which may occur through co-sponsored student activities. These guidelines have been developed and are recommended by the American College Personnel Association, the Association of College and University Housing Officers International, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Again, severe departure from these guidelines may serve as the basis for non-approval of proposed co-sponsorship agreements:

1. Alcohol beverage marketing programs specifically targeted for students and/or held on campus should conform to the code of student conduct of the institution and should avoid demeaning sexual or discriminatory portrayal of individuals.

2. Promotion of beverage alcohol should not encourage any form of alcohol abuse nor should it place emphasis on quantity and frequency of use.

3. Beverage alcohol (such as kegs or cases of beer) should not be provided as free awards to individual students or campus organizations.

4. No uncontrolled sampling as part of campus marketing programs should be permitted and no sampling, or other promotional activities, should include "drinking contests."

5. Where controlled sampling is allowed by law and institutional policy, it should be limited as to time and quantity. Principles of good hosting should be observed including availability of alternative beverages, food and planned programs. The consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits should not be the sole purpose of any promotional activity.

6. Promotional activities should not be associated with otherwise existing campus events or programs without the prior knowledge and consent of appropriate institutional officials.

7. Display or availability of promotional materials should be determined in consultation with appropriate institutional officials.

8. Informational marketing programs should have educational value and subscribe to the philosophy of responsible and legal use of the products represented.

9. Beverage alcohol marketers should support campus alcohol awareness programs that encourage informed and responsible decisions about the use or non-use of beer, wine, and distilled spirits.

10. If permitted, beverage alcohol advertising on campus or in institutional media, including that which promotes events as well as product advertising, should not portray drinking as a solution to personal or academic problems of students or as necessary to social, sexual, or academic success.

11. Advertising and other promotional campus activities should not associate alcohol beverage consumption with the performance of tasks that require skilled reactions such as the operation of motor vehicles or machinery.

12. Local off-campus promotional activities, primarily directed to students, should be developed with the previous knowledge of appropriate institutional officials.