

Minutes
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
March 31, 1988

Present: John Clark (chair), John Clausen, Jean Congdon,
Roland Guyotte, Steve Joul, Amy Kaphingst,
Ian Maitland, Marvin Mattson, Jim Moller,
Crystal Schlosser

Absent: Gary Nelsestuen, Gene Piche, Aron Pilhofer

Guest: Assistant Vice President Robert Kvavik

1. Comments by the Chair

Professor Clark reported that the Senate Consultative Committee had voted unanimously to forward to the Senate the two recommended policy changes (automatic conversion of "I" to "F" after one quarter and the 50-minute class hour). He also informed the committee about SCC discussion of the 1:1 ratio between class contact hours and credits; the concerns they had were about space, teaching load, and number of classes students would be required to take.

Assistant Vice President Kvavik told the Committee that he would have ready tomorrow five position papers on converting to the semester system which could be distributed to the members of SCEP. Mr. Engstrand (filling in as staff) related that SCC had concluded the issue should be referred to SCEP and SCFA for review and action this spring and that it would then be forwarded to the Senate next fall. Dr. Kvavik emphasized to the Committee that the arguments and concerns from Academic Affairs had been driven completely by educational considerations, not by such things as the State Fair meeting times and parking requirements.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved unanimously.

3. Discussion of the Study Abroad Report

Dr. Kvavik reviewed briefly some of the reasons the report is structured the way it is; in particular, he pointed to the complexity and irrationality of the present administrative structure controlling study abroad. Comments on the number of recommendations were as follows.

1. Why does the report call for 3,000 students to study abroad? Ans: It is a practical, political argument; that is the number of students from abroad who come to the University of Minnesota. Dr. Kvavik also said that

proposal was structured in such a way that it remains closely tied to liberal education so that study abroad is not relegated to summers and a fifth year in college.

3. Where study abroad programs work well they are tied to an oversight committee which keeps the link with academic programs and keeps it under faculty and student control.
4. Is the present number of participants suppressed because of the way study abroad is currently organized?
Ans: Yes; the programs are run all over the place, done in different ways, and require a lot of staff and money that are wasted.
8. This is an attempt to achieve a balance between centralization and spontaneity from faculty-initiated programs.
9. Is this intended to encourage significant higher education abroad? Dr. Kvavik said that it is. The objective is to put together an attractive financial package for students and to build up international education. We must have students do things they are not now prepared for, and we must put them into the curriculum; a foreign language is critical. It is intended that the departments serve as the entrepreneurs; the central office is intended to take away from the front end costs associated with getting a program set up.
11. There are some great opportunities in other countries. We don't envision a large group of Minnesota students being all together in one country. But we will investigate consortia arrangements, anything that meets educational outcomes goals.
12. How will we get young faculty involved? Dr. Kvavik said the tenure clock cannot be stopped; some faculty are told not to do anything about study abroad until they have tenure, which is unfortunate. How will this be inserted into the promotion and tenure system? Dr. Kvavik said the faculty will have to push it; the value of it must be accepted at the college and department level. Professor Clark wondered if SCEP ought not pull this out and issue a Committee recommendation about rewards for international educational work.
13. The academic credential part of this is informational; the decision will rest with the departments and colleges.

17. There is \$400,000 new monies recommended in the Academic Priorities document; this money would be combined with the existing (scattered) resources.

Other points raised were that there had to be adequate preparation for students so they know what they're to do once they get abroad and that there had to be some explanation of the program for possibly nervous parents, perhaps in the form of a brochure.

It was moved to endorse the report. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of AIDS Task Force recommendations

Dr. Moller reviewed the contents of the report for the Committee. The three items on which the Committee had been asked to act were the recommendations for a coordinator's office, for the conduct of evaluation research, and for the conduct of a baseline survey of information.

On the first recommendation, the Committee discussed whether or not there might be some office already at the University that could serve the coordinating function. It was also pointed out that the responsibility for research funding rested primarily with the faculty; they go to the agencies for money, and there are any number of faculty who are doing AIDS research. One Committee member also inquired about the extent of the institutional responsibility to deal specifically with AIDS, noting that there are a number of other diseases and practices which lead to preventable deaths.

Committee members asked if there is a need to know the statistics of the disease at the University, or has such information about similar institutions been gathered elsewhere? To what extent has information about AIDS been so widely disseminated already that we can assume people know much about the disease? After continued discussion of the points raised in the report, the Committee concurred that some sort of coordination was needed but that present structures and research should be sufficient. It was agreed that "a lukewarm" response of the Committee would be forwarded to Professor Shively along with a question about whether or not a representative from the Task Force should be asked to appear before it; there was no one to play the role of advocate and the Committee members did not feel they had the fullest information to make informed decisions about the recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted

Gary Engstrand