



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 4, 1984
10:15 - 12:30
300 Morrill Hall

AGENDA

- 10:15
1. Report of the Chair.
 2. Relationship between student and faculty governance systems. Enclosure to FCC: relevant portion of SCC minutes of 5/17/84.
 3. Agenda for FCC-Regents' fall quarter meeting.
 - 3.5 University grievance procedures: update. Phyllis Freier.

DISCUSSION WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

- 11:00
4. Inloading of credit instruction: update. Enclosure to FCC: 6/15/84 Michael Root letter to John Howe conveying SCEP's assessment of the inloading issues together with the motion on inloading approved by the Senate in 1981.
 5. Library administration: division of responsibilities between the top two positions in the new organizational structure.
 6. University-Industry Relations Policy: status of development.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/18/84

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 4, 1984
300 Morrill Hall
10:20 - 12:30

Members present: Shirley Clark, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin, Chr.; Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman.

Guests for all or part of the meeting: Vice President Keller, Kate Parry, Carol Pazandak, Maureen Smith, John Turner, Vice President Vanselow, Assistant Vice President Wallace, Ann Burgard, second Daily reporter, photographer.

1. Report of the Chair. Professor Merwin.

A. Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Professor Mario Bognanno, FCC's unanimous choice, has been added to committee.* Associate Vice President Murthy continues on committee; Professor John Howe is the new chair. Committee's second meeting is today.

B. Intra-Senate communication. Professor Merwin is meeting individually with a number of Senate committee chairs. Later in October the Facilitative Committee will meet so chairs can report to one another the agendas of their respective committees. FCC members are invited to recommend items for that meeting. Professor Murphy noted that ten years ago it proved useful for the accreditation self-study team to meet with the Facilitative Committee.

C. Reception for President and Mrs. Magrath. On November 14 the faculty, deans, and Office of Academic Affairs will co-sponsor a reception in the library of the Campus Club. FCC's subcommittee of Professors Freier, Stuthman and Sorauf is coordinating the faculty's part of the program.

D. Tenure Code. Professor Merwin has discussed with Regent Krenik the possibility of a fall quarter Regents-FCC meeting on the morning of November 8 to continue discussion of the Faculty Senate's development of the current text.

E. SCC meetings on the Morris Campus, October 18. Agenda items:

- recognition of contributions of Professor W. D. Spring;
- availability of Judicial Committee's abstracts of cases;
- faculty-student governance relationship;
- Kerr Commission report issues (campus leadership, presidencies).

* Regents subsequently cancelled this addition, saying it would have made faculty too numerous on the search advisory committee.

F. Comparative salary data on faculty ranks and upper-middle administrative ranks-- subject reported from September Regents' meeting. FCC would like to note the concern to central administration and request a joint inquiry to see if any problem exists. Related question is degree of correlation between performance and compensation. Professor Merwin will take up the question with Vice President Keller.

2. Faculty-student governance: the Senate system.

Background. Last spring the SCC approved without dissent Professor Turner's motion "that the FCC and SCC consider further the notion of separating the faculty governance structure from the student governance structure with a view toward bringing the matter before the University Senate for discussion by that body." A key issue in that discussion was whether faculty governance would be stronger without the inclusion of students. It was noted at the time that students had some central accesses the faculty lacked, including official representation to the committees of the Board of Regents.

FCC discussion. FCC members expressed in several ways the view that the consideration should go to fundamental questions. Professor Freier said the committee should look deeply at the role of the faculty component and the student component of governance, and not just at our specific experience in implementing a governance system.

Professor Murphy saw the opportunity for creative restructuring if SCC takes the motion seriously. We should not simply take apart the existing form.

Professor Clark suggested SCC might want to examine the larger issues of university governance, as raised in recent major reports (Kerr, Reisman), along with examining this University's form of faculty-student governance. The recently published reports call attention to the long evolution of governance and the changes in power balance even within the last decade.

Professors Stuthman and Rubenstein asked that the committee at the outset establish an understanding of what we hope to achieve with governance because only in that light can we assess how well we are doing.

FCC will retrieve the arguments of the 1960's when Senate structure was changed to include students and evoke the sense of that time.

DISCUSSION WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

At 11:00 Drs. Keller, Vanselow and Wallace joined the meeting.

3. Setting a thematic tone for the University. Vice President Keller.

As the University proceeds in its search for a new president and as we progress from a successful planning process to determine what it is we are planning for, Dr. Keller proposes a three part statement which characterizes the University, interprets the mission statement, and defines what the University should do.

In brief, the University of Minnesota is

- an international research university,
- a land grant institution, and
- a metropolitan University.

Each of these aspects of character carries with it a set of criteria for what the University determines as important to pursue. The sum of the three aspects make this an almost unique kind of institution. The definition is intended as a statement of goal, not a description of fully realized achievement.

Programs gain in importance as they relate to all three aspects-- if they are excellent. Some programs which address only one or two aspects are also of sufficient intrinsic importance to be a priority-- if we do them well enough.

Accessibility to graduate students, undergraduate students, and a commitment to meeting specifically minority needs are all consistent with our mission, Dr. Keller told FCC.

In response to a request for elucidation of the "metropolitan University" aspect, Vice President Keller noted

- dealing with a commuter student body,
- outreach and extension activity,
- coordination and cooperative ventures with other metropolitan institutions in the arts, culture, public affairs;
- the University's availability as a four-year institution in the metropolitan area and the only institution with the critical mass to provide certain opportunities.

Professor Rubenstein suggested that, given the diversity of the audience, including the term "national" as well as "international" to define the research university would make a clearer statement.

Professor Sorauf remarked that if the statements are to be useful in terms of planning, we must also recognize what we should not be doing. Deciding what we aren't going to do constitutes the most difficult part of our planning over the next several years, said Vice President Keller, and he gave examples:

- Research institutes, not joined to teaching, are not appropriate;
- Education without a research component has to be looked at to see if it is justified; for example, professional education should be of lower priority where not joined by the faculty to research;
- General education should become a lower priority where it does not serve a unique purpose.

The statement and the situation of the coordinate campuses, however, do not interfere with each other, the vice president said.

4. The Kerr Commission Report: Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities. Vice President Keller.

Dr. Keller noted the relevance of the panel's findings to this university's search for a new president. The report describes the plight of University presidents in an environment which has become less satisfying. FCC may see issues with applicability to this university, he said. Are there correctable problems having to do with governance? Some degree of tension is healthy and can generate constructive activity, but too much tension produces frustration. We face something of a year-long sales effort, he said, to make this university look attractive to someone we want to come here.

Dr. Keller and the FCC members agreed a University desire for leadership exists. But it is unclear what that means and in what environment leadership can be effected.

Dr. Keller shared his fear that Minnesota's presidential search will be jeopardized by the open meeting laws as has happened in some other states.

5. Inloading. FCC asked Vice President Keller his views on Senate and Senate committee positions.

Materials: Senate minutes of December 1981, May 1984, and letter from Educational Policy Committee chair Michael Root of June 1984.

Vice President Keller pointed out some contradiction between the SCEP policy approved by the Senate in December 1981 and the SCFA motion approved by the Senate in May 1984. The 1981 resolution did reflect nervousness regarding the possible loss of faculty income and did declare unsuitable any University-wide application of inloading. However, its recommendation #7 encouraged experimentation: "Academic units which perceive advantages in inloading should be encouraged to move in that direction during an experimental period of four years, with an evaluation of these experiments to be made by SCEP in the fifth year."

But the May 1984 motion from SCFA which the Senate approved without debate includes rigid guidelines the vice president believes cannot be justified and which would mitigate against experimentation. We cannot operate under a policy which says we cannot increase a faculty member's teaching load, said Vice President Keller, because there are inequitable practices now in which a faculty member teaches a substantially less than normal load in day classes and teaches two courses in Extension. And we cannot rule out changing the time of day faculty may be called on to teach.

The consequences of inloading depend upon a number of factors, he said, as the 1984 SCEP position points out. This is precisely why the University needs to be allowed to experiment. Central administration wants to allow colleges to make proposals on how they would inload. He added that the University can only move forward on inloading where central administration can reimburse the college or department which inloads its summer session or extension offerings.

Professor Sorauf recommended gathering data via computer programming that tries out various combinations of specific changes so there can be a common basis for addressing the questions. For years people have been arguing under different sets of premises and assumptions.

Professor Rubenstein noted that the University under a semester system (currently being studied) would lose flexibility with respect to adjusting schedules for inloading. The interplay between the two questions should be watched.

Professor Sorauf encouraged the administration to make some statements of assurances regarding the faculty fears revealed in the SCFA motion, a suggestion Vice President Keller called constructive. Professor Sorauf added it's important to learn what concerns led to SCFA's development of their motion.

Vice President Keller cautioned that the Senate must be more careful with motions it passes since their wording takes on a permanence. In addition, he said, we need to allow experimentation. Often the suggestion of an idea leads to an assumption that something along those lines has already been done. We should increase each department's flexibility to do the best with its resources.

Professor Rubenstein recommended that whenever the central administration sees a problem in a Senate action, it go to the originating committee or to the Steering Committee and point out the difficulties.

Vice President Keller made it clear central administration does not want to disregard Senate action, but neither does it want to bind itself in ways that make no sense to it. Presently what central administration is doing regarding inloading is to continue experimenting, in line with the 1981 Senate resolution.

Follow-up. Vice President Keller will write the FCC regarding problems the administration sees in the SCFA policy. FCC will in turn discuss the matter with SCFA.

6. University-Industry Relations Policy.

Vice President Keller reported his understanding that Mr. Potami has sent the report he and other staff drafted to members of the original committee formed to develop a policy, for their consideration.

7. Library administration: division of responsibilities between the University Librarian and the person who will be hired for the new post of Director of Libraries.

The University Librarian will remain a line officer and chief corporate officer for the libraries and will report to the academic vice president. He will be involved in strategic and long-range planning. He will have responsibility for conceptualizing the future of the University libraries. Mr. Smith will continue to serve the University as a tenured member of the faculty. The review committee was highly complimentary regarding many of his talents and skills.

The Director of Libraries will be in charge of budget and personnel. He/She will report to Mr. Smith; all department directors will report to and meet with the Director. The Director will oversee the mechanisms of acquisition and the personnel practices, including promotion and tenure decisions.

The great challenge is to attract someone good enough to the position. Vice President Keller said an encouraging sign is that the University has attracted very good new people to the unit libraries, such as IT's.

The director must have and must be assured to have the authority as well as the responsibility intended for the position. Mr. Smith wants an excellent person and has an understanding with Vice President Keller of the division of responsibility and authority.

Professor Sorauf stated that the outside candidate will have to be persuaded his or her broad interests and professional interests in the job will be protected. It is reasonable to expect, for example, that the person will want a role in planning and in participation in national associations. Vice President Keller held open the possibility that the director's contract could be written as a memorandum of understanding signed by all the parties.

Professor Rubenstein asked if our libraries' relative personnel costs are still high and, if so, whether it is because of student pay rates. Vice President Keller said both are true. Student pay here, he said, is 60%-70% above that of other universities. Professor Sorauf noted that the higher-than-normal ratio of professional librarians to non-professionals is also relevant to costs.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
Recorder

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

September 27, 1984

Vice President Kenneth Keller
Office of Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Re: October 4 Faculty Consultative Committee meeting

Dear Ken:

Faculty Consultative Committee members look forward to discussions with you on the 4th, scheduled from 11:00 to 12:30. We propose three topics for the agenda:

1. Inloading of credit instruction. We would appreciate getting your reaction to the SCEP letter of June 15 (Professor Root to Professor Howe) which responds to the SCC's request for assessment. Could you also please bring us up to date on the current status of inloading in the various collegiate units and report what you project for the near future. We have invited Michael Root to join us, but because he is on leave we are uncertain as to whether he will be able to attend.

2. New administrative structure of University Libraries. Following our preliminary discussion with you and the President on September 20th, we would like to learn in more detail from you about the division of responsibilities intended between the two top positions.

3. Status of University-Industry Relations Policy development. Probably this project is nearing completion. We wonder whether the task force has yet had the opportunity to meet and comment on the report Tony Potami has been drawing up.

Please let me know if you would like to add other items to the agenda.

Cordially,

Jack
mp

Jack Merwin, Chair,
Faculty Consultative Committee

JM:mp

cc: President Magrath
Vice President Vanselow
FCC members



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

October 3, 1984

Professor Jack C. Merwin, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
c/o College of Education
210 Burton Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Jack:

Thank you for your letters of September 27, 1984 outlining some agenda items for the October 4 meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee and Senate Consultative Committee. I would be pleased to discuss the topics you list for the Faculty Consultative Committee. However, I should note that your first agenda item dealing with inloading of instruction makes no mention of the Faculty Senate action of May 17, 1984 on the above subject. Indeed, the letter of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy makes no mention of it either. I assume that you would like to deal with the current Senate position as well, particularly since it appears to make some statements that are not totally consistent with the earlier Senate action of December 3, 1981.

With respect to the Senate Consultative Committee agenda, I notice that you will be discussing the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Policy proposals. As I indicated to you in an earlier discussion, I have very serious concerns about these proposals. I cannot be present at your discussion but I would like to comment on the policies when I am with you.

In the morning session with the Faculty Consultative Committee, if time allows, I would like to add two agenda items. The first is an overview of some approaches to establishing an identity for the University which I hope to pursue during this next year. The second is a discussion of the recent Kerr Commission report and its meaning for the University of Minnesota. I realize that most of you will not have yet seen the report in its entirety, but I have enclosed a copy of the report in the **Chronicle of Higher Education** which is quite substantive.

I look forward to our discussions on Thursday.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:trc
Enclosure



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Philosophy
355 Ford Hall
224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

June 15, 1984

Professor John Howe
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
West Bank

Dear Professor Howe,

In your letter to Mario Bognanno, Irwin Rubenstein and me of March 20, 1984, you asked SCEP to consider the educational advantages and disadvantages of Regularization and Inloading. At a number of its meetings this spring, SCEP considered this matter, and the point of this letter is to share the results of the Committee's consideration with you and with the other members of the Consultative Committee. I enclose with this letter a copy of the December 3, 1981 University Senate motion on Inloading which this years committee fully supports and wishes to reaffirm.

1. The costs and benefits of Regularization and Inloading vary depending on at least six factors: a) the audience for whom the inloaded course is intended, b) the staff by whom the course will be taught, c) the courses that will be lost or "unloaded" when a course is inloaded, d) the gain or loss of SCH's, e) the effect on support services of the inloaded course, f) the effect on faculty availability for advising, governance and other forms of participation in department, collegiate and University activities of inloading a large number of courses.
2. Unless Inloading leads to an increase in teaching load or to an increase in the size of the faculty, as courses are inloaded, other courses will be dropped or unloaded. The net effect of this could be a loss rather than an increase in student credit hours, if service courses are unloaded or a loss to an undergraduate major program, a graduate program or a faculty research program, if advanced but lower enrolling courses are unloaded. For example, if the Philosophy Department were to Inload the elementary logic courses it teaches in summer session or in extension and make the responsibility for their instruction part of the teaching load of faculty on B appointments, then, unless the size of the faculty were to increase or the teaching load of the present faculty were to increase, courses that the department offers at present would have

to be dropped to make room. If the department dropped one of the two large enrolling elementary logic courses it offers each quarter in the day school, it would lose at least some SCH's, for it cannot be expected that all of the students who would have enrolled in the day course will enroll in the course in summer or extension. The situation would be much the same if the department eliminated one or more day school offerings of its other l-xxx courses. On the other hand, if the department were to drop low enrolling courses, e.g. our senior seminar, our graduate seminars, or our lower division honors courses or courses in intensive writing, the department would have to reduce its graduate or undergraduate major program, reduce its contributions to the CLA Honors Program or turn away from its commitment to the improvement of student writing. It would also increase the proportion of instructional effort committed to elementary or entry level courses and deprive the faculty of opportunities to bring their teaching and research together, for it is in upper division courses that this marriage of interests is most likely to prosper.

3. The greater the similarity in audience for the inloaded and unloaded courses, the fewer the educational disadvantages of Inloading and Regularization.
4. The more specialized the audience for the inloaded course, the greater the educational disadvantages of Inloading and Regularization.
5. The fact that the effects of Inloading and Regularization vary greatly from unit to unit and context to context recommends that inloading and Regularization should not be centralized or uniform, that they should be optional and tried first in large service courses.
6. If Inloading is not required, then units will need to be given incentives to inload. One incentive is to have some proportion of the tuition dollars go to units that inload.
7. It is difficult to Regularize summer session courses given the present format of two five-week sessions. Many faculty would maintain that it is not possible to teach a ten-week course in five weeks and maintain the same academic standards and expect the same academic achievement. On the other hand, there are specialized audiences that are best served by a five-week session and one ten-week session may result in a loss of SCH's.

John Howe
June 15, 1984

- 3

In short, SCEP believes that there is no single question of Inloading and Regularization but a cluster of difficult questions. Answers to these questions must be sought before policies are adopted. As a result, SCEP reaffirms the December 3, 1981 University Senate motion on Inloading and supports full participation of the Senate and its committees in the formulation of University policy on Inloading and Regularization.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Root

Michael Root
Chair, Senate Committee on
Educational Policy

MR/sw

cc: John Wallace
Ken Keller
Mario Bognanno
Irwin Rubenstein
Fred Lukermann

5/17/84

V. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
REGULARIZING INSTRUCTION GUIDELINES
(5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate endorse the following guidelines on regularizing instruction:

- A. Protecting Individual Faculty Rights
 - 1. The minority interests among faculty and those of individual faculty members should be protected through such schemes as "grandparenting;"
 - 2. No individual faculty member should be forced to abandon his/her regular B-term (fall, winter, and spring) appointment and the benefits related thereto; and
 - 3. Regularization should not be the cause for increasing a faculty member's teaching load.
- B. Insuring Collaborative Processes
 - 4. A program to regularize instruction should not be compulsory. College-wide initiatives should be the product of negotiations with the department housed therein;
 - 5. Democratic processes, at a departmental level, should govern the development of regularization plans;
 - 6. Regularization plans at the departmental level should be motivated through a system of rewards and cost minimizing considerations.

INFORMATION:

The prospect of declining enrollments has led University administrators to consider new ways of maintaining revenue levels and the University's commitment to a broad and diverse set of course offerings. These administrators have been weighing the advisability of folding summer session and "for credit" extension classes into the regular course offerings of colleges. Technically, credit hours earned during the summer terms and through extension classes are credited as Summer Session and CEE hours, respectively. These credit hours receive little, if any, state subsidy. However, by "regularizing" these same course offerings the hope is that state funding will follow. Questions regarding prospective funding levels remain unanswered.

There is no all-University policy to guide the regularization process. Each college and department is free to proceed with its own plan for regularizing instruction. However, there are a number of faculty welfare issues that are tied to this process. A short listing will help to illustrate this point:

- 1. Who will teach these courses? Will the summer term and extension courses be "in loaded" into a department's set of regular teaching responsibilities? If so, will teaching loads increase?
- 2. Will resources associated with the regularization of instruction flow directly to the affected departments? If so, may the departments (a) hire new faculty, (b) continue to permit incumbent ("needy") faculty to teach on an "overload," second income, basis or (c) continue to hire graduate student instruction or temporary faculty?
- 3. Will faculty in the affected colleges/departments lose control over the time of day they must teach and over the discretionary use of their summer time?

SCFA considered these and related questions having to do with faculty welfare. The committee met with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Subsequently, SCFA agreed upon the preceding short list of factors that should serve as a minimum set of guidelines that colleges and departments should follow if/when they engage the strategy of regularizing instruction.

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair

Approved

Senate Minutes, Dec. 3, 1981

INFORMATION:

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Faculty: ~~W. Donald Spring (UMM), Marvin Mattson (UMC)~~. Students: ~~Beatrice Anderson (UMD), Dennis Kronebusch (UMW), Keith Jacobson (UMM), Rick Linden, T. J. Groich (UMC)~~.

~~COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES~~ Faculty: Richard Eisenberg (UMD), James Gremmels (UMM).

Accepted

V. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

INLOADING OF INSTRUCTION

(15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following recommendations:

(1) The University should maintain a strong commitment to outreach and service to the larger community.

(2) The University should pursue a policy of integrating the curricular offerings of day school, Extension, and the Summer Session, with increasing responsibility lodged in the colleges and departments.

(3) Since there is no necessary connection between outreach and inloading of instruction, the two issues should be separated.

(4) The University should not make significant reductions in opportunities for faculty members to receive additional compensation for overload teaching, especially in a time of declining real income for the faculty.

(5) The University should not implement a policy of uniform or mandatory inloading at this time. Because of the diversity of units within the University, a uniform policy may never be desirable.

(6) In the event that a uniform system of inloading is eventually implemented, it should be on the full-cost model, which would be more expensive than the present system.

(7) Academic units which perceive advantages in inloading should be encouraged to move in that direction during an experimental period of four years, with an evaluation of these experiments to be made by SCEP in the fifth year.

COMMENT:

I. Background

In November 1978 the Study Group on University Outreach, chaired by A. J. Linck, presented its report. At a meeting held November 1, 1979, the Senate endorsed the principles set out in this report but withheld approval of the operational proposals and in particular the recommendation that "over time, the University should incorporate instruction now on overload, e.g. CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, into the regular workload of the faculty, either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty." The Senate then asked the Committee on Educational Policy to examine the impact of various methods of implementation on faculties, students, and programs.

Dr. F. T. Benson of the Center for Educational Development was assigned to assist SCEP in conducting this study. A pilot questionnaire was used during fall and winter quarters 1980-81 to elicit opinions from faculty in two sample units. During the spring quarter 1981 the questionnaire was sent to faculty members in fifteen units, chosen so as to be reasonably representative; to chairpersons of 143 academic departments; and to ten deans. Results of this survey have now been tabulated and analyzed in a report presented by SCEP by Dr. Benson and Darwin D. Hendel.

II. The Survey

Copies of this report, which runs to more than one hundred pages, have been deposited with the Clerk of the Senate and in the office of the Vice President for Academic

Affairs so that interested faculty members may examine them. While a brief summary cannot represent the full range of information obtained and opinions expressed, it is possible to suggest some of the chief points which emerge.

Most faculty members surveyed do not believe that there is a present need for inloading, although a somewhat higher percentage think that it may become necessary in the future if enrollments decline. Faculty members are especially concerned at the prospect of losing the additional compensation now available for overload teaching in Extension and Summer Session. Many believe that their workload would increase and the overall quality of education would decline if all instruction were inloaded. Department chairpersons generally shared the views of other faculty members, although they were somewhat more enthusiastic about inloading and somewhat more frequently inclined to view it as needed. The six deans who responded expressed a unanimous belief that inloading was necessary and desirable. Five of them believed that it would be more expensive than the present system, however.

III. Recommendations

Following extended discussions and study of the survey, the Committee on Educational Policy makes the above recommendations.

APPENDIX

Table 1

The need for inloading: Responses of department chairs, faculty, and deans compared. "The term 'inloading' describes the arrangement in which instruction now on overload, e.g. CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, would be incorporated into the regular workload of the faculty—either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty."

Item	Department Chairs		Faculty		Deans	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BELIEF IN NEED—PRESENT	61		185		6	
Yes	25	41.0	52	28.1	6	100
No	25	41.0	77	41.6	—	—
Uncertain	11	18.0	56	30.3	—	—
BELIEF IN NEED—FUTURE	62		186		6	
Yes	27	43.5	74	39.8	6	100
No	14	22.6	47	25.3	—	—
Uncertain	21	33.9	65	34.9	—	—
MODELS FOR INLOADING	45		141		6	
Full-Cost Inloading	20	44.4	52	36.3	4	66.7
Partial-Cost Inloading I	3	6.7	6	4.2	—	—
Partial-Cost Inloading II	4	8.9	18	12.7	1	16.7
Geography Department Arrangement	2	4.4	21	14.8	1	16.7
Redefinition Model	16	35.6	45	31.7	—	—

*Three deans indicated this model as a pre-condition for full-cost inloading.

Full-Cost Inloading: The full cost of inloading present overload CEE and Summer Session instruction is calculated at "day school" rates minus tuition income. Additional funds are sought from the Legislature and/or through internal reallocation.

Partial-Cost Inloading I: Faculty member teaches CEE or Summer Session courses as part of regular load and the department is compensated at CEE or Summer Session rates.

Partial-Cost Inloading II: CEE students register in "day school" classes and the department receives a portion of the tuition income and all of the Student Credit Hours.

Geography Department Arrangement: CEE and Summer Session provide position money in exchange for courses formerly on overload, e.g., six courses a year and an integrated curriculum.

Redefinition Model: Faculty member's load is defined in terms of total instructional and service activities, i.e., both credit and non-credit instruction and other forms of service rather than credit instruction only.

Table 2

Predicted effects of inloading: Responses of department chairs, faculty and deans compared

Item	Department Chairs		Faculty		Deans	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>FACULTY INCOME</u>	55		166		6	
Would increase	1	1.8	7	4.2	—	—
Would decrease	31	56.4	114	68.7	2	33.3
No effect	23	41.8	45	27.1	4	66.7
<u>TOTAL FACULTY WORKLOAD</u>	58		166		6	
Would increase	26	44.8	84	50.6	1	16.7
Would decrease	6	10.3	22	13.3	—	—
No effect	26	44.8	60	36.1	5	83.3
<u>SCHEDULING OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES</u>	59		174		6	
Would be less difficult	7	11.9	16	9.2	3	50.0
Would be more difficult	41	69.5	116	66.7	2	33.3
No effect	11	18.6	42	24.1	1	16.7
<u>INSTRUCTIONAL EXCHANGE</u>	56		162		6	
Less difficult	5	8.9	19	11.7	—	—
More difficult	19	33.9	55	34.0	2	33.3
No effect	32	57.1	88	54.3	4	66.7
<u>RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FACULTY AND STAFF IN DEPARTMENTS</u>	54		164		5	
Would improve	5	9.3	10	6.1	1	20.0
Would deteriorate	21	38.9	54	32.9	1	20.0
No effect	28	51.9	100	61.0	3	60.0
<u>OVERALL QUALITY OF DEPARTMENTAL INSTRUCTION</u>	55		171		6	
Would improve	13	23.6	28	16.4	3	50.0
Would deteriorate	22	40.0	59	34.5	1	16.7
No effect	20	36.4	84	49.1	2	33.3
<u>AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY ADVISING</u>	52		171		5	
Would improve	7	13.5	20	11.7	2	40.0
Would deteriorate	23	44.2	81	47.4	1	20.0
No effect	22	42.3	70	40.9	2	40.0
<u>AVAILABILITY OF COURSES TO STUDENTS</u>	58		169		6	
Would improve	18	31.0	58	34.3	5	83.3
Would deteriorate	19	32.8	54	32.0	—	—
No effect	21	36.2	57	33.7	1	16.7

IMPACT ON TYPES AND LEVELS OF COURSES OFFERED

	62	189	6			
Would change	15	24.2	62	32.8	2	33.3
Would not change	27	43.5	57	30.2	3	50.0
Would have positive effect on curriculum planning	14	22.6	42	22.2	4	66.7
Would have negative effect on curriculum planning	10	16.1	46	24.3	—	—
Would not affect curriculum planning	23	37.1	43	22.8	1	16.7

STUDENTS WHO WOULD BENEFIT

	62	189	6			
Regular day students	4	6.5	18	9.5	1	16.7
CEE students	34	54.8	109	57.7	2	33.3
Summer Session students	23	37.1	60	31.7	1	16.7
No difference	13	21.0	44	23.3	2	33.3

WOULD SERVE STUDENT GROUPS NOT NOW BEING SERVED

	55	168	5			
Yes	26	47.3	77	45.8	5	100
No	29	52.7	91	54.2	—	—

DIFFICULT TO OFFER INSTRUCTION ON CURRENT CEE/SS FORMAT

	57	176	6			
Yes	32	56.1	70	39.8	4	66.7
No	25	43.9	106	60.2	2	33.3

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG DEPARTMENTS

	55	164	5			
Improve	4	7.3	18	11.0	1	20.0
More difficult or unproductive	10	18.2	30	18.3	—	—
No change	41	74.5	116	70.7	4	80.0

STANFORD E. LEHMBERG
Chair

Approved

VI. AMENDMENTS, UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AND RULES
(5 minutes)

BYLAWS, Article I, Item 8, change to read (addition is underlined):

... provided these Rules are not in conflict with the Senate Constitution or Bylaws of ~~the Senate~~ of the Senate.

BYLAWS, Article II, Item 6 becomes Item 7. New Item 6, which is moved from Rules for Committees of the University Senate, Procedures:

Committees of the Senate shall have a policy of open meetings. Closed or executive sessions may be held only after approval by a two-thirds majority of the committee members present and voting and only when personnel matters are discussed, when quasi-judicial functions are carried out, or when closed sessions are required to protect the rights of individuals. Under this rule, all regular sessions of the All-University Honors Committee shall be considered close or executive sessions. Meetings shall normally be listed in the Minnesota Daily and/or in the Daily Bulletin.

BYLAWS, Article IV. B. Committee on Committees, under Membership add a paragraph:

The chair shall be elected by committee members from among their number for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position.

*Search Committee for Director of Office of
Equal Opportunity*

Vivian Jenkins Nelsen

Administrative Director, Humphrey Institute

Clint Hewitt

Associate Vice President, Physical Planning & Physical Plant

Sara Evans

Associate Professor, Department of History

Bilin P. Tsai

Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, and Associate
Dean, College of Science & Engineering, UMD

Flo Wiger

Coordinator/Director, Minority Special Student Affairs

Guillermo Rojas

Chair and Associate Professor, Chicano Studies

n.b. A copy of the above list was circulated within the SCC meeting. Members were invited to write comments on the search committee composition. Several did so.

Min. Daily 11-7-84

THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
AND THE
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
CORDIALLY INVITE THE FACULTY AND STAFF OF THE UNIVERSITY TO A

RECEPTION
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1984
4:00 - 6:00 P.M.
CAMPUS CLUB LIBRARY
FIFTH FLOOR, COFFMAN MEMORIAL UNION
FOR PRESIDENT C. PETER MAGRATH
AND DIANE SKOMARS MAGRATH

IN APPRECIATION FOR A DECADE OF LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE
TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
AND TO EXTEND BEST WISHES AS THEY MOVE TO A NEW LEADERSHIP ROLE