



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
614 Social Sciences  
267 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING AND DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

February 2, 1984  
300 Morrill Hall  
10:15 - 12:00

AGENDA

- 10:15 1. Minutes of 1/19 (two sets enclosed).
2. Report of the Chair.
- 10:30 3. Report on Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty. Professor Merwin.
- 11:00 4. Implications of Graduate tuition increases.  
Guest: Dean Robert Holt.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
614 Social Sciences  
267 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND  
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

February 2, 1984  
300 Morrill Hall  
10:15 - 12:15

Members present: Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe (Chr.), Marvin Mattson, Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, Donald Spring, John Turner.

Guests: President Magrath, Vice President Keller, Vice President Vanselow, Dean Robert Holt, Jim Borgestad, Douglas MacFarland, Maureen Smith, Kate Parry, Julie Clausen, John Hughes, several graduate students.

1. Report of the Chair. Professor Howe.

A. Consent Decree events. The Minneapolis Star and Tribune on February 1 reported that special master Viola Kanatz had found Rajender complainant Linda DeBeau-Melting should be granted tenure. A number of people have termed that a drastic decision. Judge Lord's ruling on the finding is imminent. He has not previously reversed a recommendation from a special master.

FCC discussed the dilemma in which the University finds itself. Professor Turner said the case should be appealed all the way, But, he commented, this event is just a phase of a quality problem the University keeps encountering because of mistakes made long ago. Because the criteria for promotion and tenure in the libraries have always been vague, it is easy to win a comparative case. Many major universities do not have faculty status for librarians. To have it devalues faculty rank. (Minnesota has stopped putting librarians on faculty track for new hires.)

Professor Rubenstein remarked that the decision has implications for universities nationwide and sets a very dangerous precedent.

Professor Spring commented that pursuing this case would gain wide publicity and that the University would get broad support nationally on the principle at stake.

B. The mailing list/ mailing foul-up which delayed distribution of the Tenure Code.

Professor Howe referred to letters in the circulating file from Lester Metz, Director of Printing and Graphic Arts, to whom Mr. Howe wrote, and Vice President Lilly, to whom President Magrath had forwarded a copy of Mr. Howe's letter to Vice President Keller. Professor Howe has spoken with Mr. Metz about the part

Addressing and Mailing played in the job, and will speak with Mr. Lilly, whose letter indicates an active interest in increasing the versatility of the University's computer systems and in meeting the faculty's needs. We do not want foul-ups when we try to carry out faculty business, said Professor Howe.

C. Senate Library Committee. Professor Howe will meet February 3 with John Chipman, Chairperson of the Senate Library Committee to discuss its work, how SCC might be helpful to it, and to which vice president the Libraries might best report.

The evaluation report on the review of the University Librarian has been submitted to Vice President Keller.

D. Faculty group on distribution of special salary monies. The group met January 30 with Vice President Keller regarding the distribution of market impact monies. It was the sense of the participants that this process was a more difficult and less clear-cut task than that of identifying especially meritorious units.

Professor Rubenstein contrasted this year's process-- with the Academic Vice President formally and visibly taking on the task of distribution-- with the usual private way of deans discussing their circumstances with the Vice President. He asked whether the faculty group had yet discussed what is the best method. One element of the current process is that it has explicitly drawn in legislative support. But should we do it differently another time?

Professor Turner suggested the FCC might discuss this year's processes with Vice President Keller.

Compounding effects? Professor Spring asked if anyone was watching closely for the pyramiding effect the Finance and Consultative Committees were concerned about from the beginning-- that the same people and/or the same units would benefit from two or even three of the special funds. Professor Howe replied the effects are being monitored and there does not seem to be troublesome overlap.

Professor Freier told FCC she is bothered that people under some deans may not have gotten equally fair treatment; deans all received the same, fair letter from the vice presidents, but responded in different ways. Professor Howe noted that some college submissions did not meet the stipulations of the market impact instructions and so could not be considered.

Professor Rubenstein noted that this process is then also bringing to a broader audience the question of whether or not deans are representing their constituencies well.

Professor Howe told FCC he has expressed to Vice President Keller the concerns shared by the faculty group members plus his own additional concerns about the market impact process and outcomes.

## 2. Report of the Committee on Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty.

Professor Merwin told FCC the special committee had considered asking that the SCC or the President be requested to charge the task force to reconvene, probably in the spring of 1985, to see which of the recommendations the President

thinks feasible to implement have been accomplished by that time; however, the committee did not make that request. Professor Fredricks suggested SCC make the charge to reconvene.

Professor Rubenstein recommended that implementation of each of the recommendations be assigned specifically for accountability and given a target date. Professor Merwin said the committee had discussed these possibilities, but had decided it could not realistically make exact assignments.

Professor Fredricks recommended that if the task force is charged to reassemble for the purpose of evaluating progress, and find the progress inadequate, they then be charged with further defining the expectations for additional implementation.

FCC approval. There was general comment that the recommendations were realistic and sensible. Many of them grew from the faculty survey response. Professor Turner affirmed the particular importance of continuing vitalization in a period of small faculty turnover.

Professor Freier said success in implementation will depend on the spirit in the University. She urged that central administration conduct workshops in which they would give deans pep talks on supporting faculty and ways to give that support.

President Magrath has asked Professor Merwin if he would meet with the deans group and Professor Merwin has said that he would.

Professor Merwin described as striking the trend in dissatisfaction from the 1980 to the 1983 survey, even allowing for the external factors upon higher education that are wholly beyond our control. In 1983, 21% of the faculty responded that they were dissatisfied. The task force has no way of sorting out to what extent this University is part of a national trend.

FCC agreed it would like to place this report on a future agenda with President Magrath.

### 3. Implications for the Graduate School of Higher Tuition.

At 11:00 the guests joined the meeting for Dean Holt's presentation. President Magrath introduced Hamlin law professor Douglas MacFarland, currently an intern here in academic administration.

Professor Howe introduced the subject by noting the graduate tuition increases have been much on the minds of several consulting bodies since last summer. FCC has thought it would benefit from the opportunity to talk with Dean Holt about the changes, and about perceptions and misperceptions of those changes.

A. The Situation. Dean Holt said there are three origins to the current situation, but that their consequences are closely related.

(1) Per-credit tuition. Some years ago the decision was made, after faculty and administration consideration, to put tuition on a per-credit basis. An immediate problem arises at the Ph.D. level where there is no credit requirement across the University.

Currently, after the first round of tuition increases, units are scrambling to adjust the number of credits they or their students have to pay for. Dean Holt described some bizarre manipulations and circumventions. This consequence raises havoc. Instructional costs remain the same, but on paper students are enrolled in fewer credit hours and the tuition income is below what it ought to be. Student credits are being driven toward zero and the cost per credit toward infinity! Incentives are presently all wrong. Therefore, we have to adjust the structure of tuition.

(2) State policy on tuition as a uniform proportion of cost. The state's objective is for students to pay 32% of their educational costs by next year. Graduate School students were paying 18% of cost. If the University has to average 32% of cost, and the Graduate School were held much below that average, other units would have to pay well above the average. That is one good reason to move graduate tuition well towards the target of 32%.

(3) Enrollments. We are moving into a period when the number of graduating seniors is declining, but this University and all graduate research universities continue to need the same number of graduate students. Competition for graduate students is fierce. If we are to remain competitive and have good morale among the graduate students already here, we have to increase financial aid.

B. The Choices. Dean Holt outlined a number of changes the Graduate School is considering. It has made no decision as yet on the exact changes and their schedule. He emphasized repeatedly that it is the transition periods that are the difficult times.

(1) Changing the structure of tuition for fall of 1984, it is hoped, in one of the following ways:

(a) Minimum course requirement for the Ph.D. Problem: range among units is now from about 40 to 150. University even has masters' degree programs requiring 70 credits.

(b) Dual tuition rate.

(i) A single payment for any full-time student (defined as one taking, for example, between 6 and 15 credits, and not including dissertation tuition) plus a part-time rate. This dual rate might be combined with a residence requirement for the Ph.D. on the number of quarters required as a full-time graduate student (perhaps totalling 2 years).

Problem: difficulties in making accurate comparisons among diverse programs.

(ii) Per-credit tuition for part-time students up to some maximum, and the full-time rate above that.

In setting the full-time fee, the Graduate School must be careful not to hit hardest on students who take only 8 or 9 credits because of their work as TA's.

(iii) Let students who have completed their residency take courses at the part time rate.

Whatever the tuition structure, it has to raise the same aggregate tuition as was to be raised this year. We first need to get good estimates, Dean Holt said.

C. Financial Aid. We have to watch carefully our combination of tuition increases and student aid to see if the result is declining numbers of students. Dean Holt predicted that once the transition is handled, if we can solve the student aid problem the situation will be stable.

The shocks are differential in the system, he said, and we have to be attuned to them and buffer them. He cited some examples of problems with various specific programs.

Relief has to take the form of financial aid rather than low tuition, Dean Holt told FCC. To compete, the percentage covered by the University has to go up.

Professor Howe defined the tension between the need to compete for the best graduate students and the need to keep overall numbers high enough to have sufficient students paying high tuition. Dean Holt told FCC that the University has a satisfactory acceptance rate from top prospects, but a low acceptance rate from the middle caliber of students. To get more of them we need to offer them more aid, such as part-time fellowships, as other institutions are doing. The University is presently suffering from a perception problem; prospective students fear their tuitions will go up while they are here. Tuition fellowships would help us to get such students. We have to increase the percentage of students getting any kind of financial aid.

The only way to reduce average Graduate School costs is to abolish programs, he said, and many in the meeting were quick to agree such savings would be negligible.

D. Other Considerations.

Professor Freier voiced concern about the draw-down on faculty research grants paying higher tuition, with the result that fewer graduate students can be paid from them. Dean Holt said he was well aware of this problem and has a committee to address it in conjunction with other issues outlined above.

He then commented that the distinctions between the public and private research universities are beginning to disappear and that the legislature is beginning to understand that. He is working to get out to the public backgrounding material on that subject. There is reason to think we can deal with the need for better support from NIH and others. He also noted there are pressures for a flat cost-of-education allowance in federal aid schemes pending in Congress.

Professor Rubenstein suggested that the University cut its set of problems by freezing for a while changes in the percentage of instructional cost graduate students pay. Dean Holt replied that doing so would provoke rebellion from the students who are now paying 40-50% of their instructional costs. Vice President Keller added that such a change would also halt the increased student aid coming into the system.

Dean Holt observed that we can't make rules to cover situations and must instead set the structure so the incentives are right for people to do what we want them to do.

President Magrath remarked on the need for visible credit to faculty who advise on thesis; that will come, Dean Holt noted, through the thesis credits as soon as we get beyond the set of students grandfathered in.

Because Wisconsin and Michigan do not have thesis credit tuition and we do have it, we have to set our residence requirement lower than theirs.

Non-degree candidates. Dean Holt said he wanted to permit a lower tuition rate for people who are not degree candidates, for example, people making career changes and trying programs out. He would like a "coursework-only tuition." He would also prefer that public school teachers upgrading themselves not be repelled from the University and drawn toward other institutions because of the different tuition rates.

Professor Mattson asked about aid for self-sufficient students and about making charges comparable to future earning capacity. Dean Holt stated that marketability of the degree is one important factor to take into account on financial aid decisions.

Professor Freier asked that we question the very policy of per-credit tuition for graduate students because it does not take into account all the value that accrues to the University from having graduate students. Dean Holt remarked that David Berg in assessing the data has actually thought of all the possible ways of looking at costs and benefits that people are raising.

Timing. President Magrath noted the need to have a public plan soon which will address the problems. Dean Holt said we want to change the tuition structure and set next year's tuition by the end of this month. By June we will have outlines of what we will look to the Legislature for.

The Legislature's appropriation (responding to the University's next biennial request) relating to graduate education will be made in late spring of 1985, so the University cannot do much for the fall of 1985. The graduate enrollment crunch hits in 1986.

We hope we can ride out this year and next by significant improvement in the way we recruit.

Professor Howe asked whether the rate at which we move up towards 32% of cost is manageable. Dean Holt said he wants a fairly steady slope in that change, rather than to hold down the increases now and have a sharp jump for 1986.

In conclusion, he noted that Minnesota is probably going to have about the lowest non-resident tuition rate in the country, which will make us competitive nationwide, while our resident tuition will be relatively high.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,  
SCC Executive Assistant