



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 (H)

Senate Consultative Committee
February 2, 1978
Regents' Room - 11:00 a.m.

Information Items: (Professor Robinett)

1. Report of the Judicial Committee
2. Registration System Proposals
3. Meeting with the Regents on March 9

Action Items:

4. Approval of December 15 Minutes
(previously distributed)

11:30 a.m.

5. Discussion of the Review of the Vice President for Health Sciences
(Professor Lloyd Lofquist will meet with the committee at this time.)
6. Letter to President Magrath in Regard to Planning
7. Response to Professor Zaidi's Letter of December 19
8. Preparation of Agenda for the Meeting with President Magrath

BWR:11c
1/24/78



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 February 2, 1978

The All University Senate Consultative Committee convened its eleventh meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, February 2, 1978 in the Regents' Room in Morrill Hall.

Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Mark Bufkin, Ann DeGroot, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Harriet Lewis, Terry Marchiniak, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett (chairman), Philip Ryan, Barbara Stuhler, Michael Wagner, Douglas Watson, and Mahmood Zaidi. Visitors to the meeting were Greg Pinney of the Minneapolis Tribune and Maureen Smith of the Department of University Relations.

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Professor Robinett.

1. February 9 Meeting on the Morris Campus

* Professor Robinett asked members who had not already done so to contact the committee administrative fellow regarding transportation to and from the Anoka Airport on February 9. Members Bufkin, Holt, Stuhler, Wagner, and Zaidi will be unable to attend the meeting in Morris.

2. Vice Chairman of the Senate on Leave Spring Quarter

Professor Robert Holt, vice chairman of the Senate, will be on leave this spring quarter. Professor Robinett, as chairman of the Senate Consultative Committee, would normally be called upon to serve in his place. She asked for and received the committee's concurrence on her acceptance of this responsibility.

3. Report of the Judicial Committee

* Professor Robinett asked if all members of the committee had received copies of the Judicial Committee's report of opinions it has written on cases which have come before it. The student members had not, so copies will be sent to them.

* Professor Morrison said that the Tenure Committee has assembled the formal opinions it has written which cover a wider range of cases than those reviewed by the Judicial Committee. He offered to ask the Tenure Committee if it would be possible to abstract its opinions and distribute them to interested parties. Professor Zaidi commented that the Tenure Committee often refers its cases to the Judicial Committee for consideration. Professor Morrison expressed the opinion that individual faculty members are not always aware of the difference between these two groups. Also, someone had called him last week to inquire about the provision for a faculty advocate, having only recently heard of its existence. Professor Zaidi concluded the discussion by suggesting that a summary of cases might be more useful to the faculty in general, rather than a set of formal opinions.

4. Registration System Proposals

Due to a shortage of copies of the documents supporting the proposals, only Ms. Lewis and Professors Robinett and Zaidi had received copies prior to today's discussion. Professor Robinett said that the report indicates there is a need to implement the recommendations as soon as possible. The implementation of the suggestions will mean allocation of dollars. In light of the recent and probable future retrenchment, Professor Robinett felt that the committee should very carefully review the proposals. Ms. Lewis was concerned that if the proposals were implemented and funds allocated for this purpose, budget cuts to garner money to support this implementation might be made in the area of faculty positions. She felt very strongly that serious consideration should be given to cutting funds in such programs as the Campus Assistance Center or the Student Activities Center, rather than depleting the teaching staff of the University.

Professor Zaidi asked Ms. Lewis if she would be willing to prepare a written report to SCC on the contents of the registration system proposal documents; she said she felt that until the full committee had had a chance to discuss them, it would be pointless and inappropriate to prepare a one-person opinion at this time. She volunteered to lead a discussion of the proposals at the Morris meeting (2/9/78), after which a committee response could be formulated. Members Blake, Purple, Stuhler, and Wagner asked the committee administrative fellow to send them copies of the documents for review.

Professor Blake asked if the task force that had written the proposals had reviewed registration systems at other schools; Ms. Lewis said it had done so. Professor Morrison said that the Law School has been targeted as one of the first academic units to be put on the new system if it is activated. He felt that the task force making this recommendation had not taken into consideration the fact that the Law School usually has its students register in the fall for the full year. Professor Glick commented that he had been in contact with persons at the University of Denver and had asked them about their registration system. They told him that it is simply a matter of students' calling in their class requests. It was agreed that the University of Denver is considerably smaller than the University of Minnesota in terms of enrollment, thus making a direct comparison inappropriate; however, the possibility of the University of Minnesota's registration procedures evolving into such a simple method was welcomed. Ms. Lewis pointed out that the registration procedures suggested in the proposals still needed a lot of work before they would reach such a comparatively effortless level for the students at the University of Minnesota.

Professor Zaidi again asked that a written report on the proposals be prepared by the affected constituency (students) and suggested that, if Ms. Lewis unavailable to do this, the task should be assigned to some other student members of the Consultative Committee. Ms. DeGroot said she would form a subcommittee of student senators to prepare a written report, but that it would be impossible for the report to be prepared in time for the Morris meeting next week. It was decided that Ms. Lewis would lead a discussion on February 9 and that Ms. DeGroot would present the student report to SCC when it was completed.

5. Per Credit Hour Tuition - SCRAP's Resolution

Professor Robinett informed the committee of a resolution that was sent to the President by SCRAP on the per credit hour tuition proposal (Recommendation 37 of the Student Access Report). SCRAP had recommended to the President that this proposal be considered as soon as possible.

Professor Keller felt that no good argument had been advanced against banding which has definite educational merit. Professors Keller and Purple discussed the impact of a shift to the consumer of the cost of education. Professor Purple felt that there might be an initial rush to design programs with the least cost in mind but that individual faculty and students should respond to the situation in a responsible manner (if the per credit tuition hour proposal is adopted).

Professor Morrison thought that the per credit hour tuition proposal should be presented to the full Senate for a resolution, allowing time for expression of views from the Senate committees before a final vote on the resolution is taken. Professor Zaidi agreed that the full Senate should be involved and that SCRAP should be encouraged to take their proposal before that body. Professor Keller was concerned that this might not result in the desired free exchange of ideas, considering what often occurs when the full Senate discusses complex issues. He suggested that SCC send a letter to the President reaffirming SCC's stand on this issue as stated last year, namely that per credit tuition without the inclusion of some consideration of banding is educationally inappropriate.

Professor Keller also pointed out that in a class one might find students paying several different rates to receive the same instruction, depending on the student's college. In addition to this inequity, students in large lecture classes are less expensive to instruct than students in small seminar groups, yet both types of students could conceivably be paying the same rate for the instruction, again based on what college they are in.

Professor Holt suggested that marginal costs should be included in the determination of tuition rate proposals. For example, payments could be adjusted so that students could register in classes that are not filled and not pay appreciably more tuition; the converse of this is the situation where students must pay a premium to get into sought-after courses. Professor Keller objected to tying education to marginal costs and felt that this was looking at only a narrow part of the whole tuition rate problem.

* There was some discussion of the ramifications of SCC sending a letter to the President as SCRAP had done and the perceived sentiments of the administration toward per credit hour tuition. Professor Purple suggested that this topic (per credit hour tuition) be placed on the agenda for the next meeting with President Magrath.

* Professor Zaidi saw two issues emerging from the preceding discussion: The first issue is a substantive one -- banding vs. per credit hour tuition. The second issue is a procedural one -- how SCC should react to the letter SCRAP wrote to the President. Professor Zaidi said that SCC should take the issue of per credit hour tuition before the Senate for discussion, not for action, and that the Senate would in this way be made aware of any differences in the opinions of SCRAP and SCC on this issue. He also mentioned that any additional revenue from the proposal if it is adopted would be funneled into the general fund and would not go to the Graduate School, for instance, for fees collected from graduate students. He said that there is no study available for the undergraduate levels of tuition in the different colleges. Professor Zaidi then suggested that SCC could ask SCRAP to set up a task force to study this. Professors Keller and Purple responded that David Berg, Director of Management Planning and Information Services, has simulation models that can be used to project the costs of different tuition structures to students and to predict students' "consumer" behavior, i.e., will they or won't they take more or fewer credits under whichever system is used in the model. Professor Holt thought that there would be an increase in part-time

students if the per credit hour proposal is implemented. Ms. Lewis felt that the revenue issue was masked in the per credit tuition issue because of the rise in tuition rates.

MOTION
MADE

Professor Robinett called for a resolution on this issue. Professor Keller made a motion which Professor Blake seconded. The motion stated that SCC would send a letter to President Magrath reiterating the committee's statements of last year regarding the educational appropriateness of banding as part of the change in the tuition structure. Some discussion followed which centered around the issue of two Senate committees' communicating directly with the President, but doing so as separate entities presenting different views. The motion was passed with Professor Purple abstaining.

MOTION
PASSED

6. Regents' Meeting with SCC Faculty Members - March 9

* Professor Robinett announced that the faculty members of SCC would be having
* their quarterly meeting with the Regents on Thursday, March 9 at 5:30 p.m. The
* faculty members were asked to meet at 4:00 p.m. at the Campus Club to review what
* will be discussed with the Regents. (This meeting will follow the regular SCC
* meeting scheduled for that afternoon at 3:15.) Possible agenda items were discussed.

7. Change in Meeting Time - March 9 SCC Meeting

* The SCC meeting previously scheduled for 12:30 p.m. in Room 626 of the Campus
* Club was rescheduled for 3:15 p.m. in the East Wing of the Campus Club on March 9.

8. May Meeting of SCC on Duluth Campus

* Professor Glick had suggested at an earlier meeting that the committee meet on
the Duluth Campus sometime in the spring; he asked the committee to choose the date
for the meeting. After some discussion, Thursday, May 18, was chosen. Professor
* Glick will confirm this date with those on his campus.

9. Approval of 12/15/77 SCC Minutes

MOTION
PASSED

The minutes were approved as submitted. Professor Zaidi complimented the committee chairman and the committee secretary on the quality of the minutes for this year's meetings.

10. SCC Letter to Vice President Kegler on
Planning Council's Issue/Action Papers

Professor Robinett distributed for information copies of the January 30, 1978 letter from SCC to Vice President Kegler which presented the committee's reactions to the Issue/Action Papers. Professor Zaidi suggested that Vice President Stein should receive a copy of SCC's letter; Professor Robinett told him that copies had been delivered yesterday to Vice President Stein and Professor Adams. (Professor Carl Adams chaired the subcommittee of the Planning Council that prepared the Issue/Action Papers.)

11. Professor Zaidi's (UCBRBR) Letter of 12/19/77

Professor Robinett distributed copies for information of the proposed changes in the language of the attachment to the 12/19/77 letter from Professor Zaidi as chair of UCBRR. Professor Keller had modified the wording to provide more clarity and to reflect UCBRR's ability to act, rather than simply to consult or advise.

MOTION
MADE

Professor Zaidi asked that a formal motion be made so that there would be a record of SCC's recommendation to adopt the proposed language changes. Professor Keller made a motion which Professor Blake seconded. Some discussion followed before the vote was taken.

Professor Holt raised the issue of UCBRBR's relationship to the Legislature. He felt that there was a need for a more formal relationship, one that would enable UCBRBR to approach the Legislature independent of the parent committee (SCC). He also commented that there was likely to be more contact between individual faculty and the Legislature in the future. Professor Zaidi interjected that a Legislative Relations Advisory Committee composed of some of the members of SCC had already been involved in working with Vice President Kegler in this area. At this point, Professor Robinett asked for an update from the LRAC subcommittee. Professor Keller said that there has been very little activity so far and that the next meeting has been scheduled for late in February. Ray Faricy, one of the state legislators, will meet with LRAC at that time. Ms. Lewis reported that the Graduate Student Legislative Relations Advisory Committee will be meeting with Mr. Faricy on February 13.

Professor Zaidi asked that SCC members of LRAC keep in touch with UCBRBR. He expressed concern that the role of UCBRBR vis à vis the Legislature should be clarified. For example, he said, recently a dinner meeting was held where legislative staff, legislators, University administrative staff, and LRAC members were present, but he, as chair of UCBRBR, had not been invited and felt that perhaps he should have been. Professor Zaidi commented that he hoped that UCBRBR would be invited to such meetings in the future. He concluded his remarks by saying that UCBRBR will publish an annual report to the Senate of the committee's activities for the preceding academic year.

MOTION
PASSED

Professor Holt returned to the issue of UCBRBR's relationship to the Legislature. He felt that if UCBRBR will be testifying before the Legislature, it should then change its relationship to SCC. He asked to have the motion repeated. Professor Keller did so and said that Professor Holt's concern was a valid one and deserved more discussion. Professor Holt remarked that SCC has "a peculiar relationship with the President and the Regents," referring to the special, confidential exchange of ideas that occurs at SCC meetings with President Magrath and the Regents. Professor Keller, last year's SCC chair, was asked how he approached the Legislature when testifying on behalf of SCC. He said that SCC was represented as a body of elected faculty and students and that the special relationship SCC enjoys with the President and the Regents was not emphasized. The vote was called and the motion passed by voice vote.

12. SCC Draft Letter -
Response to UCBRBR on Establishing Budget Priorities

Members of the committee were asked to comment on the SCC draft letter to UCBRBR which was in response to the 12/19/77 letter from Professor Zaidi to all Senate committees to set priorities for UCBRBR to consider when reviewing the biennial budget request for the University. (The draft was based on a motion passed at the January 12, 1978 SCC meeting.)

MOTION
TO RE-
CONSIDER

A question was raised concerning how the committee should proceed in order to reconsider the motion incorporated in the draft letter. It was decided that someone who had voted in favor of the motion which was passed at the last SCC meeting would have to move to have the motion reconsidered. Professor Blake so moved and a discussion of the question began.

Professor Zaidi restated his comments of January 12, namely that SCC was proceeding in a piecemeal fashion to consider individual cases as they were presented to it, rather than looking at all requests and then making an overall recommendation to UCBRBR. He called for a delineation of the principles which SCC feels should guide UCBRBR's budget deliberations, academic considerations having primacy in such guidelines. He was concerned that too much attention is paid to making proposals it is felt will be supported by the Legislature and not enough emphasis is placed on academic principles when deciding which proposals will be presented to the Legislature.

In regard to the portion of the letter which refers to the Educational Development Program, Professor Robinett reminded the members that Professor Purple and Mr. Ryan, concurrently members of SCC and SCEP, had been asked to take the matter to SCEP. Professor Purple said that SCEP already has the item on its agenda and that Professor James Werntz of EDP will be speaking to that committee soon. He remarked that the EDP funding issue is only part of a larger issue and that, for example, University Without Walls (UWW) is also requesting funding support.

Professor Zaidi commented that documentation would be extremely helpful for UCBRBR in considering the recommendations of SCC when they are incorporated with the recommendations of the other Senate committees (all Senate committees were asked to establish priorities for UCBRBR - see 12/19/77 letter).

Professor Zaidi then pointed out that since SCEP is charged with monitoring the educational mission of the University, this would be the appropriate committee to make a recommendation to UCBRBR concerning the Educational Development Program. Professor Robinett agreed that committees with specific charges should deal with this issue rather than SCC, which should concern itself with general issues. Mr. Wagner also felt that SCC's role did not encompass deciding to support or not support individual programs. Ms. Lewis reminded the committee that EDP was "a child of the Senate," and as such is appropriately the concern of Senate committees. She also responded to Professor Zaidi's earlier comment on SCC's "piecemeal" effort, saying that anything done by SCC or SCEP is bound to be piecemeal because of the structure of the University. Professor Stuhler made the suggestion that SCC could send a resolution on EDP to SCEP stating that EDP's request was worthy of consideration but that SCC was hesitant to make a decision in isolation, so was referring the matter to SCEP.

There was some more discussion on how to reword the draft letter. Professor Blake made a motion with some suggested wording changes but the motion was not seconded in favor of the creation of a subcommittee to draft a response to UCBRBR's request for budget priorities. Professor Robinett and Professor Zaidi will constitute the subcommittee. SCC members will receive a copy of the final draft at the next SCC meeting. A motion was passed in support of this subcommittee; Professor Morrison went on record as voting against the motion.

*
MOTION
PASSED

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m. The next meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee will be held on February 9 on the Morris Campus.

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



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

January 30, 1978

Vice President Stanley B. Kegler
232 Morrill Hall

Dear Vice President Kegler:

The Senate Consultative Committee welcomes the increased University interest in planning. We have reviewed the Issue/Action Papers, which the Planning Council issued November 7, 1977 and submit our comments on them to you. They fall into two categories. The first is a series of general principles which we believe are important in any academic planning structure. The second is a set of reactions to specific items in the planning document.

General Principles

- A. The Senate Consultative Committee believes that University planning should be a unified University activity. Planning should emphasize University goals and missions and not particularly the goals or missions of different vice presidencies or other administrative units. While we recognize that existing administrative units must be involved in preparation and implementation of plans, we do not believe that their input should ordinarily be primary or decisive. The University should remain free to eliminate these administrative units, if they no longer mesh with sensible overall planning, or to reduce their size. Planning based within the functional vice presidencies may not lead to this result.
- B. The Senate Consultative Committee believes that the decisive voice in the long-range planning of the University should be academic. In the first instance, this means that planning should be primarily vested in an administrator with academic background and experience, so that academic values can have their imprint both on the general thrust and on the detailed supervision of planning.
- C. We further believe that the role of the Senate in planning should be strengthened. This could be accomplished by an increased involvement of the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning in the overall planning procedure, or by the establishment of formal Senate representation on planning bodies. A joint committee, modeled after the University Committee on the Biennial Request and Budget Review and involving the affected groups, including students, could provide a model which might well serve this function.
- D. The Senate Consultative Committee also believes that planning should, in the first instance, focus on middle-range objectives, in the five- to ten-year frame of reference. For this reason, we believe that it would be a mistake to allow planning to be mired in the almost perpetual preparation of biennial requests and allocation of funds available. Preparation of requests, and allocations thereafter, should be derived from and in accordance with such objectives.

Specific Items

(The Roman numeral indicates the Issue/Action Paper and the Arabic numeral indicates the specific recommendation being commented upon.)

It is difficult to formulate responses to all of the specific recommendations contained in the planning document. They are formulated at widely disparate levels of generality, requiring a highly specific response in one instance, but only the most general reply in the next.

- I-1. The Committee welcomes the initiative in this respect. We shall seek to evaluate committee relationships and processes.
- I-2. Responsibility for determining who speaks for the Senate on what issues is, of course, the responsibility of the Senate and not of the administration. The Senate Consultative Committee, as the steering committee of the Senate, exercises that function. We are prepared to respond to any specific inquiries in this regard.
- I-3. It is important to involve the established Senate committees in the approval and revision of policies. This should not preclude the use of faculty members of the University in task forces or other working groups to assist in the formulation of such policies and procedures. In response to the concluding sentence of the proposal, we suggest the following specification: Any task force set up outside of the Senate structure merely makes proposals on behalf of the administration. Any proposal of such a task force must then be submitted to the appropriate Senate committees for consultation. The inclusion of faculty members or students in such a task force does not itself constitute consultation.
- II. (This comment applies to all five recommendations.)
We refer to our general principles articulated above. We do not believe that planning should focus this strongly on the individual vice presidencies; indeed, we fear that this will undermine overall planning goals.
- III-1. We welcome the President's decision to assign primary planning responsibility to the Vice President for Administration. We believe that this satisfies some of our concerns stated in General Principles A and B above.
- III-2. We would hesitate to integrate short-range budgeting and long-range planning as is suggested in this proposal. We recognize the inter-relationships, but fear that the immediacy of the two-year process would overwhelm the longer range goals. We reemphasize our view that planning must, and budgeting should, be divorced from functional vice presidencies, if overall goals are to be accomplished.
- IV. We have no comment on these recommendations.

Specific Items (cont'd)

- V. We disagree emphatically with this recommendation, because we see it as perpetuating a fractionalized planning process within the University. We also see it as imposing additional costs on the institution which are not warranted by any result which may be obtained.
- VI. We welcome this recommendation. Resource allocation should primarily be made on the basis of ultimate institutional utilization. As the University changes, substantial reallocations between functional units may become necessary. The present structure of primary allocation by vice presidency hinders this development.
- VII. These are matters of internal organization of the Planning Council, about which we have no comment.

We wish to add one further comment. The Planning Council appears to have omitted from its position paper one very significant element. The systematic programmatic reviews which have been undertaken within the past few years should be integrated into academic planning of the University on an ongoing basis. They should be one of the bases for the expansion, contraction, and alteration of the course of the University and its constituent elements. It is the omission of concern for academic values which leads us to have concern about the planning document as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

Betty

Betty W. Robinett, Chairperson
All University Senate Consultative Committee

BWR:llc

cc: President C. Peter Magrath
Vice President Henry Koffler
Members of the All University
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

January 18, 1978

TO: President C. Peter Magrath

FROM: Vice President Frank B. Wilderson, Jr.
Vice President Donald P. Brown

RE: Registration System Improvements

Enclosed is a proposal for a major development effort to improve the University's registration system. It was prepared by a team which we (and Walt Bruning) appointed in September, 1977. The proposal has been reviewed by CAO and college staff members and has been well received. The report itself has not been distributed.

We recommend approval of the four basic recommendations in the report:

- 1) to approve the system in principle outlined in the report.
- 2) to seek operational funds (\$200,000/year) in the 1979-81 biennium.
- 3) to approve a plan for managing the project.
- 4) to review a detailed project workplan when it is prepared in the next step in development.

We would like an opportunity to bring the proposal to the attention of central officers at the Thursday or Monday meeting and seek agreement as soon thereafter as practical.

If approved, we recommend the proposal be summarized for the Student Concerns Committee at the February meeting of the Regents.

FBW:sr
Enclosure