



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klæber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

AGENDA (K)

March 9, 1978

Senate Consultative Committee

Room 326 - Coffman Union

12:00 p.m.

1. Interim Report on Outreach - Associate Vice President Linck
2. UMD Calendar 1978-79
3. Proposed Meeting with President Magrath  
Concerning the Consultative Process
4. Replacement for Vice Chairman of Senate for Spring Quarter



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klaeber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of March 9, 1978

The All University Senate Consultative Committee convened its fourteenth meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, March 9, in Room 326 of Coffman Memorial Union.

Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Mark Bufkin, Ann DeGroot, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Harriet Lewis, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Philip Ryan, Barbara Stuhler, Douglas Watson, and Mahmood Zaidi (Associate Chairman). Visitors to the meeting were Alison Oresman of the Minnesota Daily and Maureen Smith of University Relations.

Professor Zaidi called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. He announced that the committee chairman, Professor Robinett, was out of the country and thus unable to attend this meeting.

1. Interim Report on Outreach

Associate Vice President Albert Linck and Thomas Benson, Staff Consultant, Academic Affairs, had been asked to attend this meeting of SCC to discuss with the committee the recommendations contained in the document entitled: "Outreach at the University of Minnesota: Interim Report of a Study in Progress" (dated November 1977). Dr. Linck is chairman of the study group and Mr. Benson coordinated the preparation of the interim report.

Dr. Linck distributed copies of an outline of the contents of the interim report which is a variation on the table of contents shown in the report (see attachment to these minutes). Dr. Linck provided some history on the development of the interim report, saying that President Magrath had requested the formation of the study group and had charged this group with the preparation of an interim report which would be published in advance of the creation of a final recommendation of the study group to the President on outreach activities at the University. Enough time was to be allowed between the publication of the interim report and the development of the study group's final recommendations for responses to come in from 1) parts of the University community that would be affected by such recommendations, and 2) those who wished to comment on the issue or otherwise provide input to the study group for use in its deliberations on the issue.

Dr. Linck and Mr. Benson have met several times with the University Committee on Summer Sessions; apparently the interim report had not specifically dealt with the "fourth quarter" of instruction at the University so UCSS provided a perspective to the study group on this area of consideration for inclusion in the final recommendations. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) had invited the study group members to come to one of its recent meetings to discuss the interim recommendations. Dr. Linck said that as yet they have not been invited to speak to the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning (SCRAP).

They have also been invited to meet in the near future with the University Committee on Extension and Community Programs. Dr. Linck explained that this committee had been asked two years ago to participate directly in the study group but had declined, preferring instead to stay involved by serving in a "key, pivotal role" as the committee charged with reviewing community involvement.

Dr. Linck then reviewed the routing process for the interim report. He said that it had gone to the colleges in January, then back to the deans in late February with a request that they discuss it with their respective faculties. Dr. Linck noted that a comment made by Professor Phyllis Freier at the March 2 meeting of the University Senate had made it apparent that not all faculty members are aware of the report, however.

With respect to the involvement of the coordinate campuses, Dr. Linck reported that there is only one coordinate campus member on the study group (Professor Roy Hoover of UMD) who adds the perspective of the coordinate campuses in general but is not expected nor considered to be a representative of all four coordinate campuses. The study group has met with faculty and administrators from Duluth, Crookston, and Waseca at the invitation of these campuses. (The study group has asked these constituencies to draft comments on the interim report for its consideration.) Professor Glick (SCC faculty representative from UMD) said that he had been unaware of the presence of the study group on his campus and asked who had represented UMD at the meeting. Dr. Linck said that they had met with the academic officers' group and UMD's Committee on Resources and Planning.

Dr. Linck provided some more background information on how and why the study group on outreach came into being. He said there had been an inquiry from the legislature concerning the coordination by the University of its outreach programs with those of other Minnesota institutions. Since there is no statewide plan for such efforts, the study group was formed to prepare a report on what is being done now and what might be done in the future. Some of the delay in getting the study group's work on interinstitutional coordination underway was due to the change in leadership on the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). There was some time lost due to the changeover from one chief administrator to another; someone from the new executive director's staff will be working with the study group and other interested parties as they study the problems and issues of statewide coordination. It is President Magrath's feeling that it is very important to begin dialogue with other schools in the state to assess what is being done now in terms of outreach and to plan for the future, Dr. Linck reported.

The University presently has a statement of philosophy on outreach that, even though it is still tentative and subject to the responses of faculty, places the University slightly ahead of the rest of the state schools and colleges. The Regents' mission statement also refers specifically to the outreach responsibilities of the University. This statement identifies some of the changes to be made and indicates the broad, philosophical direction the University should take with respect to outreach. Mr. Benson interjected that the study group coalesced early in regard to the adoption of a basic philosophy and quoted from page six of the interim report:

The Study Group's basic policy concerning outreach is that outreach functions should become an integral part of the faculty's professional responsibility in the University and that, over time, faculty activity, University organization, funding, and the reward structure should be modified to reflect this responsibility.

Mr. Benson went on to say that the University must determine if there are outreach activities that are not essential to the mission of the University and should not be a primary focus of the University's efforts. Such activities should not be major consumers of resources.

Mr. Benson wanted to emphasize that there is a need to integrate instruction so that all educational offerings are coordinated through long-range academic planning that is congruent with the total planning efforts of the colleges or academic units which offer these types of courses. He said that the study group felt this would provide the most effective utilization of resources. He projected that what is now considered overload for faculty will eventually be inloaded as part of the faculty member's total workload. For example, non-credit courses that are taught would, over time, be inloaded. He noted, however, that a definition of what constitutes non-credit instruction is needed before this can be done.

Mr. Benson turned his attention to the area of interactive research that the report mentions. He said that this type of activity should be given recognition as a legitimate contribution of the faculty to the University. He concluded with the statement that the study group had raised the question of how this type of research and other outreach activities should be funded but had not attempted to deal extensively with this problem in the interim report.

Professor Zaidi opened the discussion for questions. Professor Holt addressed a question to Dr. Linck: Did Dr. Linck feel that the inclusion of outreach responsibilities for all faculty (as projected in the recommendations in the interim report) would present a climate conducive to traditional research activities that many faculty wish to engage in, and would this perhaps mean that over the next few years the composition of the faculty at the University would change to reflect the shift in emphasis advocated in the report? Dr. Linck responded that the University must consider its overall role in the state as a provider of educational services. However, he said, the report was not intended to imply that all faculty would be participating to the same extent in the outreach efforts of the University. He gave the example of a department of ten faculty members deciding as a group who among them would be responsible for the outreach effort; for example, three of the ten might be assigned to this area of instruction. Dr. Linck stressed that the department must acknowledge the responsibility for outreach and then decide how this will be fulfilled by its faculty.

Professor Zaidi interposed a comment at this point that SCC would like to be able to meet with Dr. Linck and Mr. Benson at some future time to discuss still further the implications of the recommendations of the interim report since there was only a limited amount of time available today, much of which had been taken up with the explanation of the history of the study group and the procedures for preparing the report. Dr. Linck said that there were some time constraints, but that this could probably be done. He said that President Magrath had asked the study group to report to him by the end of March on the reactions to the interim report; however, responses from Senate committees could be submitted to the study group during the early part of spring quarter. Professor Zaidi remarked that this report considers issues which are basically planning issues and therefore SCRAP should also have an opportunity to review it.

Ms. Lewis asked if the plans proposed in the report would mean an increase in enrollments. She quoted a comment made by a student senator last week to the effect that "extension is our (the University's) future." Dr. Linck observed that some see inloading as a strategy to raise the total full-time equivalent (FTE) student count; however, he said that the study group had not proposed this approach for that reason. Dr. Linck stated that there are some sound educational reasons to support inloading.

Mr. Ryan said that he understood the final report would be published at the end of spring quarter. He asked who would be responsible for reviewing this area of concern from year to year. Dr. Linck said that the final report would have to be reviewed and then approved before it is published. He went on to say that he was not sure which committee SCC would want to suggest for this responsibility. Mr. Ryan said that his main concern is that since the report proposes a ten-year plan, some continuity should be maintained over that time span.

Professor Morrison said that there were several comments he wanted to make: Would the University of Minnesota end up looking like the University of California at Berkeley or the University of Toledo? He felt that those institutions that offer both day and evening programs are less attractive to faculty. He asked how the study group would feel if the evening classes ended up being staffed by the most junior faculty at the University? Also, admission of students into programs by some collegiate units would have to be looked at carefully. Professor Morrison said he saw the interim report as a "retrenchment document." How will the University keep itself from being raided? He said that the figures at the end of the report were not clear -- could some of these funds be used to transfer faculty from "B" to "A" appointments and build in a research component? Could some faculty take twelve-month appointments as the Agricultural Extension Division now does? He was also concerned about the inloading of non-credit instruction, saying that this is really a research issue; if this is done, the University could start to look very unattractive to many faculty members, both those currently employed and those considering employment at the University. He remarked that a document on research activities at the University that was prepared by Professor Jack Darley alleges that the University encourages faculty to engage in such service endeavors as non-credit instruction but then does not support these efforts. He concluded his comments with the observation that the interim report on outreach seems to push for the creation of an administrative level office that would be in charge of the coordination of the outreach efforts of the University.

Dr. Linck responded to the issue raised by Professor Morrison of the attractiveness of outreach activities to faculty. He said that these activities are not necessarily of the type that would include, for instance, 4H sponsorship, but range all the way to a top surgeon offering instruction to a group of colleagues. Professor Zaidi said this was not made explicit in the report.

Professor Keller said he wanted to go on record as being in support of in-service teaching. He asked if anything had been gleaned from the study conducted in the Department of Geography which now has its faculty on "J" appointments (a system where faculty members make a commitment to teach six out of eight quarters in two years, rather than teaching fall, winter, and spring quarters each year). Specifically, he wondered whether non-credit teaching could be supported so there would be some opportunity for income which would be in addition to the regular teaching salary. He said that some faculty members value such opportunities as a way to make their rather low regular salary tolerable. Dr. Linck agreed that there are many who count on this source of additional income and that it would have to be phased out over time. In response to Professor Keller's question about the experiment in the Department of Geography. Dr. Linck said that the department had had to work out the new "J" classification to handle the spread of the teaching commitment over two years instead of the usual one year. Because of the flexibility allowed under this classification, some faculty members did not elect to teach for the first six months of the two year period, so were being paid even though they were not working, technically speaking (these same faculty would then be expected to teach for the next six consecutive quarters without a break, during which time they would be "earning" the pay received for these quarters as well as the first two quarters when they were not teaching).

Professor Keller then asked Dr. Linck what percentage of the faculty are currently involved in teaching through extension or summer sessions. Dr. Linck said that he did not know the exact percentage. Professor Stuhler (SCC faculty representative and Associate Dean in Continuing Education & Extension) said that there is no transfer of student credits between extension and day school, except where there is an in-loading arrangement.

Professor Holt said that he supports the efforts exemplified in the work of the Agricultural Extension Division, saying that this type of outreach has made substantial contributions to the well-being of the people of the United States over the past fifty years. He endorsed the financing of a similar effort for the liberal arts. Professor Blake (SCC faculty representative from the College of Agriculture) said that he has participated on an informal basis in outreach efforts through talks with farmers but has never been directly compensated for this work and felt that this type of "instruction" has also never been included in his teaching load. Dr. Linck responded to Professor Holt's comment by citing the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) as an example of outreach through the liberal arts. Professor Holt did not entirely agree, however, stating that CURA only involves approximately two percent of the faculty in liberal arts, whereas the Agricultural Extension Division involves nearly 85% of the faculty in agriculture.

Professor Glick asked Dr. Linck if it was the study group's assumption that research done by faculty involved in outreach would be seen as the same as the rest of the faculty's research efforts in terms of evaluation and compensation. Dr. Linck replied that teaching is what needs to be evaluated. He said that part of the research efforts of faculty is extending these research efforts into the area of outreach. Professor Stuhler commented that the Agricultural Extension Division would not have existed except through the "power of the purse." Professor Zaidi reminded the committee that it would have another opportunity to explore the financial implications of the recommendations in the report when it reviews the Biennial Request. He said that at first glance the report seems to be following the principle of incremental budgeting. Also, he said he hopes to see a discussion of the relationship of the dollar request to stable or declining enrollments at the University.

Ms. Lewis shifted the dialogue to a discussion of the changing student population and the attendant changing needs of these users of the University's services. She said that there are an increasing number of students who hold full-time jobs but who wish to continue their education, so late afternoon and evening classes are very attractive to them. Mr. Ryan observed that the interim report shows that there are a larger percentage of currently enrolled students who are over twenty-one years of age. He said the definition of a "traditional" student is unclear. He was also concerned that if faculty are increasingly involved in teaching the "non-traditional" student through extension or summer session work, programs already in place at the University might suffer because of the faculty time taken away to teach students in these other areas of instruction. Dr. Linck responded that the report was not meant to imply that existing faculty would necessarily assume the full responsibility for outreach; however, he noted that there might be a shift in teaching assignments to this area as a result of declining enrollments in some units.

Professors Glick and Zaidi commented on the issue of increasing the quality of outreach instruction and at the same time being careful to maintain the quality of the total instruction offered by departments. It was Professor Zaidi's opinion that there is sometimes a "division of labor" within a department so that some faculty end up teaching principally extension and others teach day classes. He also felt that the departments should have increased involvement in setting the fees for extension courses. Also, as far as the Graduate School programs are concerned, he

thought these should be monitored the same as those in the day school. Of concern to him also was that the interest in outreach may be related to the recent fluctuations in enrollments rather than to the concept of outreach itself.

Dr. Linck said he wanted to continue the discussion at a future date, especially on how the faculty might best be able to respond in detail to the proposals and how guidelines might be written on the manner in which outreach should be accomplished. Professor Barber (SCC faculty representative from UMM) said that these were very difficult problems of academic administration and that something beyond mere guidelines might be necessary; he suggested that perhaps a handbook on outreach might be more helpful. Dr. Linck added that some sort of modeling would have to be done which would show the form outreach activities might take at the University.

\* Professor Zaidi thanked Dr. Linck and Mr. Benson for their contribution to the committee's understanding of the proposals contained in the interim report on outreach and extended to them an invitation to meet again with the committee after SCC has had time to consider what was discussed today. He added that the interim report might be a topic of discussion for the Facilitative Committee.

## 2. UMD Calendar

Professor Zaidi distributed materials on the UMD calendar to those who had not already received them. He then conveyed to the committee Professor Robinett's request that the committee discuss the impact of the implementation of this new calendar on the other University campuses. Professor Glick said that the UMD Campus Calendar Committee had done some research on this and had confirmed that some people will be adversely affected by the implementation. Professor Zaidi said that the change was in response to the expressed needs of the students who felt they were being hampered in their efforts to find jobs or participate in graduate programs at other institutions. Locally, the UMD students have been competing with students from other schools that start and finish earlier than the University of Minnesota at Duluth.

Mr. Bufkin (SCC student representative from UMD) thought that there would not be a significant influx of people from the Twin Cities simply as a result of the change in calendar, since such students could stay in the Twin Cities and attend other schools here that start on an earlier schedule. He confirmed that the UMD students feel they need the earlier calendar in order to be able to compete locally for jobs, although he agreed there may still be some loss of income at the end of the summer because of the early start of the school year. He said that the Biology Department had been concerned about the change in calendar, especially in relation to the problem experienced by botany classes in regard to the greenhouses. He said there have been some reservations expressed by both faculty and students about the split winter quarter, but this seems to be a necessity if the academic year is to be based on quarters rather than semesters. Professor Zaidi asked if there was any sentiment to change over to the semester system. Professor Glick said that the calendar is a two-year experiment, after which time such issues can be explored. Professor Holt agreed that it would be better to wait the two years and then look back over the ramifications of the earlier calendar, discussing at that time any implications for the future.

\* Mr. Ryan said that the Twin Cities students did not want to wait two years before discussing the possibility of an earlier calendar. Some students are concerned that the only alternative to the present calendar is the semester system. He asked if anyone knew the status of the Twin Cities Campus Calendar Committee study on student preferences. Since no one knew, the SCC administrative fellow was asked to research the status of the survey in terms of how the money that was allocated for the project

is being spent, what the projected dates are for completion of the study, and when the results will be published. Mr. Bufkin commented that the UMD Calendar Committee had worked on the change in calendar over the past five and a half years; he suggested \* that group be contacted for additional information and to ask them if they will share share the data they have collected.

Professor Glick remarked that the University of Minnesota is the last major university to change over from the late start. Professor Zaidi said there are some schools that still start late but finish early and that the Canadian system finishes even earlier.

3. March 23 Meeting with President Magrath

\* A meeting with President Magrath to discuss the consulting process has been scheduled for Thursday, March 23. Professor Zaidi asked the committee members to indicate a preferred time for the meeting. Ms. Lewis said that she thought she might be the only student representative present since the meeting would fall during spring break. Those members who knew they would be out of town or otherwise unable to attend the meeting conveyed this information to the chairman. Professor Blake, one of the members who would be out of the country, expressed some concerns he had about the consulting process and SCC's relationship with the President; he asked \* that these sentiments be conveyed to the President at the meeting on March 23. His comments elicited some remarks from some of the other members of SCC on how they saw the relationship of SCC to President Magrath and how they felt the consulting process itself might be improved.

4. Replacement for Vice Chairman of the Senate for Spring Quarter '78

Professor Zaidi clarified with the committee and ex-officio member Professor Holt (currently the Vice Chairman of the University Senate and TC Campus Assembly) the committee's position in regard to the appointment of a Vice Chairman, Pro Tem, of the University Senate and TC Campus Assembly. The committee wished to place on record its agreement with the will of the Senate as expressed in a motion passed at the March 2, 1978 meeting that President Magrath is to appoint a person to this position after consultation with SCC. Furthermore, the committee agrees that, if asked, Professor Betty Robinett, SCC Chairman, will agree to serve in this capacity for spring quarter.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee will be held on Thursday, April 6, at 11:00 a.m. in the Regents' Room.

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda L. Compton  
Administrative Fellow  
Senate Consultative Committee

Attachment:  
Outline of the Interim Report  
of the Outreach Study Group





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
DULUTH

Office of the Provost  
515 Administration Building  
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

LC

February 20, 1978

TO: Vice President S.B. Kegler  
FROM: Robert L. Heller  
SUBJECT: New UMD Calendar

Attached are copies of the approved UMD calendar for academic years 1978-79 and 1979-80 along with summer session dates for 1979 and 1980.

The Calendar Committee, in cooperation with UMD administrators, has worked diligently to develop a calendar which is functional and incorporates what is believed to be the best features of an early in-early out calendar.

I have discussed with Jeanne Lupton the special arrangements (e.g., payroll, insurance coverage, etc.) that will have to be handled differently for UMD faculty this year. Jeanne said that she would see that all the necessary arrangements are made.

If there are any special things we should handle on this campus, please advise. If I do not hear to the contrary, I will assume these details will be handled by Central Administrative offices in a routine manner and through normal channels.

RPH

RLH/jq

Enclosures

cc: C. Peter Magrath ✓  
D. Brown  
H. Koffler  
F. Wilderson  
L. French  
J. Lupton

APPROVED  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH

CALENDAR FOR 1978-79

Fall 1978

Sept. 1	Friday	Orientation for Faculty
Sept. 4	Monday	Labor Day Holiday
Sept. 5/6	Tuesday, Wednesday	Registration
Sept. 7	Thursday	Classes Begin
Oct. 12	Thursday	Classes Excused
Nov. 16	Thursday	Last Day of Instruction
Nov. 17/18/20/21/22		Final Exams
Nov. 22	Wednesday	End of Fall Quarter
Nov. 23	Thursday	Thanksgiving Holiday

Winter 1979

Nov. 29	Wednesday	Registration
Nov. 30	Thursday	Classes Begin
Dec. 21	Thursday	Last Day of Classes
Dec. 25	Monday	Christmas Holiday
Jan. 8	Monday	Classes Resume
Feb. 19	Monday	Classes Excused
Feb. 23	Friday	Last Day of Instruction
Feb. 26/March 2,	Monday-Friday	Final Exams
Mar. 2	Friday	End of Winter Quarter

Spring 1979

Mar. 12	Monday	Registration
Mar. 13	Tuesday	Classes Begin
May 21	Monday	Last Day of Instruction
May 22/26	Tuesday-Saturday	Final Exams
May 26	Saturday	Commencement
May 28	Monday	Memorial Day Holiday
May 31	Thursday	End of Spring Quarter

1/17/78

APPROVED

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH

CALENDAR FOR 1979-80

FALL 1979

September 1	Saturday	Orientation for Faculty
September 3	Monday	Labor Day Holiday
September 4/5	Tuesday/Wednesday	Registration
September 6	Thursday	Classes Begin
October 11	Thursday	Classes Excused
November 15	Thursday	Last Day of Instruction
November 16/17/19/20/21		Final Exams
November 21	Wednesday	End of Fall Quarter
November 22	Thursday	Thanksgiving Holiday

WINTER 1980

November 28	Wednesday	Registration
November 29	Thursday	Classes Begin
December 20	Thursday	Last Day of Classes
December 25	Tuesday	Christmas Holiday
January 7	Monday	Classes Resume
February 18	Monday	Classes Excused
February 22	Friday	Last Day of Instruction
February 25/29	Monday-Friday	Final Exams
February 29	Friday	End of Winter Quarter

SPRING 1980

March 10	Monday	Registration
March 11	Tuesday	Classes Begin
May 19	Monday	Last Day of Instruction
May 20/24	Tuesday-Saturday	Final Exams
May 24	Saturday	Commencement
May 26	Monday	Memorial Day Holiday
May 31	Saturday	End of Spring Quarter

APPROVED

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH

SUMMER SESSIONS

1979

First Term

June 11, Monday: Classes Begin  
July 4, Wednesday: Independence Day Holiday  
July 13, Friday: End of Term

Second Term

July 16, Monday: Classes Begin  
August 17, Friday: End of Term

1980

First Term

June 9, Monday: Classes Begin  
July 4, Friday: Independence Day Holiday  
July 11, Friday: End of Term

Second Term

July 14, Monday: Classes Begin  
August 15, Friday: End of Term

1/17/78