

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, April 29, 1993**  
**12:45 - 3:00**  
**Room 608 Campus Club**

Present: Mario Bognanno (chair), John Adams, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Toni McNaron, Harvey Peterson, James Tracy, James VanAlstine, Shirley Zimmerman

Regrets: Amos Deinard, Lester Drewes, Benjamin Liu, Irwin Rubenstein

Absent: None

Guests: Associate to the Provost Dennis Cabral, Nuri Hassumani (Academic Affairs), Vice President Anne Hopkins, Associate Vice President Josie Johnson

Others: Rich Broderick (Footnote)

[In these minutes: election of FCC/SCC chair, tuition policy, task force on diversity, Twin Cities Higher Education Partnership]

**1. Report of the Chair**

Professor Bognanno convened the meeting at 12:50 and began by reviewing information on salary increases at other institutions for 1993-94.

He then reported that the "lame duck" committee had met and was nominating Professor Garrard as chair and Professor Adams as vice-chair of FCC and SCC for 1993-94. The nominations were greeted with a round of applause; they were elected by acclamation.

Professor Bognanno then introduced Professor Harvey Peterson, newly elected FCC member from Crookston, replacing Professor Holm, whose term ends June 30.

**2. Tuition Policy**

Professor Bognanno then welcomed Vice President Hopkins to the meeting to discuss tuition policy.

Dr. Hopkins began by noting that the process of reviewing tuition policy started about a year ago, when increasing tuition rates were engendering considerable concern. There has been a Regents' policy on tuition, but it has not clearly guided University action. The proposal by the Governor and HECB also contributed to the discussion; they proposed moving to a "high tuition, high aid" policy (set tuition

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

higher, and increase financial aid to those unable to pay, in order to reduce the subsidy to those who can pay). About 30 University tuition policies have been consolidated, so that there is now order, if not coherence, to what currently exists.

Recent steps have included distribution of a tuition discussion paper to the Board of Regents, intended to focus discussion on the fundamental issues that underlie tuition. The Board discussed the broad issues, rather than who pays more or less. At the May Regents' meeting, a set of tuition principles will be proposed to guide policy in the future--this is an attempt to set a comprehensive policy, covering all students and all campuses, as well as deal with such issues as who pays for higher education. In June, the principles will be presented for action; at the same time, the Regents will be presented a budget plan, including a tuition plan that will identify who pays how much. The budget and corresponding tuition plan will be acted upon at the July Regents' meeting.

The SCEP discussion thus far has focused on rates, Dr. Hopkins reported, while discussion at the Provost's Council has deliberated who should pay for higher education, and the relationship of financial aid to that question.

Dr. Hopkins was asked if the Regents will take a position different from that of the Governor and HECB; she replied that the Board is anxious to be explicit about who it believes should pay for higher education--and that view should set the University's legislative strategy. The development of the principles is a response to the "high tuition, high aid" proposal, she related, and is also an attempt to be more explicit about what the University's position is.

The draft of the principles represents a change from current policy. At present, tuition is expected to reflect cost and there has been movement toward a uniform undergraduate tuition. The new policy would not call for uniform tuition, but would permit variations by campus and variations within upper division. Each campus, each year, would be expected to submit a plan that complies with the principles. Differentiation will be permitted, at the upper division level, by groups of colleges, although not by individual college. There will be no proposal to abandon uniform LOWER DIVISION tuition.

This institution does not have the tradition that tuition should be uniform, Dr. Hopkins commented in response to a query. At the five other institutions at which she has worked, the only tuition rates were graduate and undergraduate. The argument for uniformity is that education is a common good and selection of field should not be based on cost. She came to the University believing that is a good principle, but is now persuaded that it is not right for this university right now.

One problem, it was pointed out, is that there are six different ways to enter the College of Biological Sciences, with six different tuition rates. And there are variations in rates by cost and market pressure, observed another, such as the increases at Morris. Those increases, Dr. Hopkins remarked, were to protect Morris from significant budget cuts. Support for uniform tuition comes primarily from a few colleges that are concerned about low enrollment caused in part by different entry points and different tuition rates. The point is hard to establish, because there has been such chaos in tuition. While it has become less confusing, the University is not all the way to straightening it out, and most agree that a differential between upper and lower division makes sense.

At the lower division level the University has different competitors; how much does the University wish to price tuition so that good students go to community colleges?

The administration would like tuition to be cost driven and orderly. Whatever is done with tuition, colleges will be asked to close loopholes so that students will not be able to "play games" with tuition.

Professor Tracy related that the SCEP discussion had concentrated on differences in rates, although SCEP recognized that rate-setting depends on larger principles. This is a frustrating issue to deal with, he observed. SCEP agreed that it makes sense to differentiate between upper and lower division. It reviewed its own discussions of uniform undergraduate tuition in 1990, and the principal argument made in its favor at the time was that an increased lower division rate would encourage students to attend community colleges. Inasmuch as the University does not now want that to happen, the argument no longer holds. Dr. Hopkins also made the point, Professor Tracy recalled, that the drop-out rate is much higher the first two years, while if a student reaches the junior year, the probability of graduation increases significantly--so lower tuition at the lower division level could encourage students to stay.

There was no agreement at SCEP on whether or not there should be different upper division rates, Professor Tracy continued. The discussion in part reflected the colleges from which SCEP representatives come.

There are, in all of this, different kinds of equity. On the one hand, one can argue that a student should not pay more in major X than in major Y (and it is not always clear that graduates of major X will make more money than graduates in major Y). If students are not getting more of an education in different fields, why should they pay more?

SCEP, he commented, will wish to talk about the principles again before they are presented to the Board of Regents for action.

There are two kinds of issues at hand, Dr. Hopkins then told the Committee. The most important one is NOT about setting rates, but rather about how big a pie there will be and who pays for higher education. The University does not control the answer to the questions, but it should take a position on them.

If tuition rates are flattened, how will the University handle queuing problems when program seen as attractive get a lot of students--and others have fewer? At present it appears there is a sort of balance between supply and demand. Dr. Hopkins said that any tuition rates not now flattened would not become so under the tuition principles. Lower division will remain all the same, as is now the case. One could, however, change the lower division RATE, and thus the subsidy.

The proposed policy would probably not have a great impact on student behavior, Dr. Hopkins said, because there would be no major change in student costs. There is little data to suggest that the cost of tuition affects student behavior, except at the extremes. She also pointed out that if the principles allow variation, and then something occurs in the tuition plan that the University or units do not like, they

can be changed. If a particular unit is hurt by a part of the tuition plan, it is the plan that should be changed, not the principles.

The University seems to vacillate on its position about increasing or decreasing the number of freshman and sophomores. The University has not vacillated, Dr. Hopkins averred, although perception of the University's position has changed. The University intended to decrease its student population and it reduced the number of freshmen to do so. As one looks at the distribution of students now, there are a greater number of juniors and senior--and the cost-effectiveness of offering a four-year education is diminished. It is the President's view, Dr. Hopkins told the Committee, that the dominant undergraduate population at the University should be those who are here for four years--but that transfers should be permitted. Students should be recruited here as freshmen and then go through as quickly as possible--that has always been the model. When the freshman population was reduced, the mix of classes (freshman, sophomore, etc.) changed; a lot of students will now be graduating. No good university, she observed, has this profile of students.

Asked about graduate and professional tuition issues, Dr. Hopkins said it should be linked to cost, but to what extent is not clear because the University cannot price itself out of the market. The University has never tried to incorporate the market or the value of the degree--individual gains--in its tuition, although it has used the principle to relate tuition to instructional costs (such as in nursing). She agreed that the market plays a stronger role at the graduate and professional level and that the principles do reflect that fact.

Dr. Hopkins then reported briefly on the forum on teaching and learning--and emphasized that it will seek to communicate effectiveness in teaching, not innovation; if it works, it will be followed through with workshops. She also identified the issues that the committee on teaching and learning will focus on--a committee that she and Professor Tracy will co-chair. The President and the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee will appoint the committee. The committee will be driven by at least two factors: the President's concern that there has not been enough effort devoted to modernizing teaching and the need for help in developing approaches to effective teaching.

It was agreed that there should be a joint meeting of this Committee and SCEP, probably in June, to talk at greater length about the committee on teaching and learning.

Professor Bognanno thanked Dr. Hopkins for joining the meeting.

### **3. Task Force on Diversity**

Professor Bognanno welcomed Associate Vice President Josie Johnson and Dr. Hassumani to the meeting. Dr. Johnson began by explaining the background of the President's Task Force on Diversity, whose mission was to help focus on the problems confronted by minority students and faculty and which was chaired by Dean Richard Skok. The members of the task force were selected by the President and were representatives of the various units of the University. The task force divided itself into subcommittees that studied different issues for a period of two years and made recommendations. The report distributed to the Committee represents the collection of those recommendations (64 were submitted to the President over the life of the task force), and identifies the responsibility of various offices in implementing the recommendations.

Dr. Johnson said she appreciated the opportunity to inform the members of the Committee about the recommendations of the task force. In sharing this information, Dr. Johnson said she trusted that the members of the Committee would encourage the faculty to help promote and implement the task force recommendations. She recognized that little will get done without the help of the faculty and solicited the views of the Committee on how to proceed.

The units are being asked to respond to the report so they can assist in the implementation of the recommendations. The President, she reported, has said it is time for action; there has been much talk, and it is now time to act.

One Committee member observed that in her college and field, the "pipeline" is so empty that there is a "feeding frenzy" when a minority faculty member becomes available. The only way to address that problem in the short run is to get capable people into doctoral programs--and then make them so happy they do not leave. That is not the usual way of doing business at a research university, but it may be the only course open. Did the task force discuss this issue, or speak to the question of bridge funding and recruitment of students?

Dr. Johnson said she recognized the pipeline problem but said it is not the only issue. Since 1988 the University has recruited 159 faculty members of color--and lost 59 of them. She is trying to understand the environment and support these faculty members receive. Graduate study issues are serious, and her office is considering ways to help recruit and support students. Bridge funding is limited to faculty members on the tenure track. She said the University is trying to understand all that it has done in terms of recruitment and retention of faculty and students of color--there are many good activities, but the record is not great.

The University can bid up the price of minority faculty members, said one Committee member, or it can do more to keep them. It can also enter a partnership with junior and senior high school teachers in order to present to 11-15-year-olds the opportunities that the University provides to students and so they see it as a place to come. It could improve the linkage to students through counselors so that time is spent on academic issues (rather than school troubles). There is much such activity in the sciences, Dr. Johnson responded, and some in education and the social sciences. The University needs to learn if those programs work. She told the Committee that the University is also not offering financial support similar to that offered to minority students at places such as Wisconsin, Illinois, Stanford, Ohio State, and so on. The University cannot compete--it doesn't have the necessary financial assistance for either majority OR minority students.

Dr. Johnson, in response to a question, said there are plans to interview some of the 59 minority faculty who left. What is known now is anecdotal. There is a lack of satisfaction among minority faculty with their college or the sense that they were recruited because they could bring diverse experiences to the unit--but that once here, those experiences are not valued as they were during recruitment. She agreed that some of the factors cited could apply to the faculty at large, and should be investigated--some things are simply part of being a stranger to the institution or a junior faculty member. That which is universal needs to be separated from that which is specific to minority faculty.

Discussion turned to the lack of opportunities for minority faculty, and faculty generally, to come together to talk about issues or activities. These opportunities have disappeared, for various reasons, and have not been replaced. Now individuals get together as interest groups rather than collegially; what should happen because faculty are faculty--and thus members of an academic community with shared values--is now attempted through rules and regulations rather than accomplished through those shared values. A lot of minority faculty leave for the same reason that all faculty leave: They don't like it. That one is a minority, Dr. Johnson observed, simply adds one more factor.

Committee members then noted the need for support for graduate students of color and identified the varying practices in the departments represented on the Committee. Asked if there were a possibility of central or collegiate matches for outside funds for support for graduate students, Dr. Johnson noted that some of the "poorer" units in the University (e.g., Education) have provided the support, and thus demonstrated a commitment to diversity. In budget hearings with the units, they are being asked to identify funds in their budgets for diversity, rather than always trying to rely on Academic Affairs. Two years ago Senior Vice President Infante asked academic units to include sensitivity to diversity in their budgets; those efforts are now being evaluated. Units should be encouraged to build diversity activities in their budgets, she added, and should be recognized for doing so, not penalized.

Problems noted by Committee members were support for first-year graduate students and a lack of students interested in a field. Dr. Johnson acknowledged again that there is a pipeline problem and told the Committee the University needed help in thinking about new ways to address it. It is not closed, however, and she said she is asking departments to do the best they can. When it is discovered that progress has not been made, one must ask why. One issue, suggested a Committee member, is climate; that can be a critical factor in retaining minority faculty. Another Committee member pointed out that a lot of new Ph.D.s have not been provided the skills necessary to survive and obtain tenure in a research university.

Professor Bognanno thanked Drs. Johnson and Hassumani for joining the meeting.

#### **4. Twin Cities Higher Education Partnership**

Next Professor Bognanno welcomed Dennis Cabral, Associate to the Provost, and asked him to provide a review of the Twin Cities Higher Education Partnership.

Dr. Cabral explained that in late January, the University, the three public higher education systems in the state, and the Higher Education Coordinating Board reached agreement to promote collaboration between the systems in order to address changing educational needs and better use state resources. The emphasis will be on bachelor's degree programs that are more practitioner-oriented.

Specific endeavors are underway, as are examination of needs and the strategies to meet them; the agreement is open-ended.

There are a number of items "on the table," he explained to the Committee.

- A summer program between IT and Hennepin Technical College for sophomores in IT engineering programs to spend 10 weeks (without credit) in a coop program; it has been found that employers tend to hire students who have been in such a program.
- A proposal will be presented to the Board of Regents for a bachelors degree in information networking, with North Hennepin Community College. It has become known that there are increasing demands in industry for telecommunications training and this is a step to meet that demand. There will be a faculty curriculum design committee to develop the program; a larger faculty assembly to approve curricula. The University will rely on the people involved to govern it. The delivery of the program will be through Continuing Education and Extension; because the program is yet amorphous and developing, it should not be tied to a University college. Approval will be sought for the program as an experiment, and it will be revisited to learn if it should continue.
- A Bachelor of General Business Studies has been proposed, also to be offered through CEE with advice from the Carlson School of Management. This program is in a preliminary stage, and would be offered with Inver Hills Community College.

These two programs, Dr. Cabral emphasized, are not traditional 2+2 arrangements, not two years there and two years at the University. Most courses will be at the community college site, taught by adjunct University faculty.

The concept behind these degrees, Dr. Cabral explained in response to a question, is collaboration to pool resources and to respond to are as of need not currently being met . They will provide a different kind of entry-level employee, and can also be used by current employees to upgrade their skills.

It is clear what the benefits of these programs could be, and how the University could be involved, said one Committee member. A concern, however, is what the relationship between the two pools of students will be, one of which would not meet normal entrance requirements. Dr. Cabral agreed that there could be two different sets of students.

Discussion then turned to the relationship between the University and the other systems as well as the source and nature of the delivery of four-year education in the Twin Cities.

Asked about the demand for the programs, Dr. Cabral said they could start any time because students are lining up to enter them. And faculty at both the University and the community/technical colleges are interested.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand