

OPEN FORUM: A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS AND UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING

Thursday, Feb. 20, 1986

2:15 pm—Forum; 3:15 pm—University, Student, & Faculty Senates
followed by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

25 Law Bldg.—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
Regents Room—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

OPEN FORUM ON A COMMITMENT TO FOCUS

THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFIED & INCREASED PREPARATION STANDARDS

(one of the committees created to implement A Commitment to Focus)

Copies of the draft report have been sent to various University community members including the members of the University Senate, deans and department heads, and the MSA Forum. Copies of a *sample* Senate resolution drawn from the *draft* report will be distributed at the door. On behalf of the special committee, Professor W. Andrew Collins, chair, will talk about the report's recommendations, solicit your reactions and suggestions, and respond to questions.

The Senate Consultative Committee strongly encourages people to come to the forum and identify their concerns to the special committee so that the special committee can address these as they write the final resolution and final complete report.

DEON STUTHMAN, Chr.
Consultative Committee

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy submits the following comments and suggestions based upon the draft report:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has reviewed the draft report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Standards. SCEP commends the committee on the thoroughness of its report and is generally supportive of the recommendations made. However, there are some specific issues that SCEP believes deserve further attention:

1. Understanding the difference between admission standards and preparation standards is crucial for understanding the Committee's report, and the distinction that the Committee draws between the two generally is clear. It is not as clear, however, what effects the two sets of standards would have on students in certain situations. For example, under the Committee's recommendations, would an applicant who satisfied all the admission

standards of a given college, but few or none of the preparation standards, be admissible to that college? The wording of recommendation 10 suggests that the Committee might not object to a negative answer to this question. SCEP has serious doubts about the appropriateness of such an answer. It could lead to the transformation of what were intended to be preparation standards—standards that could be satisfied *after* admission to a given college—into *de facto* admission standards that would have to be satisfied before admission to any unit of the University other than General College or the Supportive Services Program (Duluth). SCEP believes this issue needs to be clarified and should be discussed in the Senate Forum.

2. SCEP would like more specific information on how implementation of the proposed preparation standards would affect financial aid for students who would have to satisfy some of these standards after entering the University. For example, what would be the effect of the proposed standards on an entering student who fell short of satisfying them in the way that current minority students typically do? (See Draft Report, p. 6)
3. The Committee notes that federal financial aid programs may change in the near future and that changes in these programs may provide good reasons for changing the proposed preparation standards. (See Draft Report, p. 10). SCEP applauds the Committee's willingness to have its proposals modified as a consequence of changes in the availability of financial aid. We suggest that an ongoing review process be established that will enable the University to respond appropriately and in a timely manner to future changes in the overall financial aid picture. Such a process should include regular reports to appropriate Senate committees on the effects of whatever preparation standards are adopted.
4. SCEP agrees with the Committee that a program of preparatory courses for students who do not meet all preparation standards must be carefully planned. (See Draft Report, p. 8) This planning should involve a number of units and should speak to the roles of specific departments and colleges, including the General College, in such a program.

WILLIAM H. HANSON
Chair

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 209, including the President, 148 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 60 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (105) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 140 affirmative votes at one meeting or 105 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 105 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members or alternates, the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 14 MEETING

Action (2 minutes)

II. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

STUDENT GOVERNANCE AMENDMENT

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate constitution be amended to add to Article III.1 the following: "Student body presidents of the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses shall, if not otherwise elected, serve as ex officio nonvoting members."

COMMENT:

Student body presidents as legitimate representatives of the whole student bodies do not now have formal input into University policy-making, whereas members of the Council of Academic Officers serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

TIM PRATT
Chair

III. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CLASSIFIED RESEARCH

Information

The Research Committee unanimously approved the following motion at its December 19, 1985, meeting:

"The Senate Research Committee recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota that a formal statement be issued by Research Equipment, Inc. (REI), which reaffirms the existing policy that REI will not be involved in classified research nor will it process classified data. We recommend that REI explore ways of making sure that every contractor is aware of these restrictions."

PAUL G. GASSMAN
Chairman

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

Questions shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall review them. Because a limited time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary for the committee to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The committee will also be guided by the breadth of interest in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topic and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may, if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question.

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

(Please feel free to use this item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Senate. The Senate is reminded that this entry in the agenda [not to be confused with the Senate's "Questions to the President"] may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.)

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE RESEARCH RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) is a project to research, develop, and deploy a space-based missile defense system which has been suggested as a method of nuclear deterrence; and,

WHEREAS, the implications of SDI are an acceleration of the arms race and the destabilization of the strategic balance; and,

WHEREAS, along with the rights preserved by academic freedom come responsibility, in that the participation of University faculty in SDI research is a *de facto* political and institutional endorsement for SDI and a reflection on the University of Minnesota;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Senate urges the University of Minnesota to refrain from participating in research specifically for SDI.

AUDREY SPEISS
Senator

VII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

EMMA M. BIRKMAIER
1908-1985

F. GERALD KLINE
1937-1986

HUNTINGTON BROWN
1899-1985

RICHARD L. KOZELKA
1899-1985

OSWALD H. BROWNLEE
1917-1985

RALPH E. MILLER
1908-1985

BERRY CAMPBELL
1912-1985

HELEN M. SLOCUM
1909-1985

HENRY J. GRIFFITHS
1910-1986

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE
Thursday, Feb. 20, 1986
(immediately following the University Senate meeting)

The voting membership of the Student Senate totals 60, including the Student Consultative Committee.

6. Rank funding adjustment
7. 19-year-old drinking age legislation

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 14 MEETING
Action (2 minutes)

TIM PRATT
Senator

II. STUDENT LOBBYING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Information & Discussion (10 minutes)

1. Bonding Bill: Waseca physical education facility, Waseca campus center, Twin Cities recreational sports facility.
2. Higher Education Reauthorization Act
3. Financial aid cuts
4. Modification of independent student status: move appeals process from state to campus level; change method with which farm assets are evaluated; lower age level to 19
5. Modify average cost funding

III. OLD BUSINESS

IV. NEW BUSINESS
(5 minutes)

V. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Thursday, Feb. 20, 1986
(immediately following the Student Senate meeting)

The Senate constitution provides that all members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 14 MEETING
Action (2 minutes)

II. TENURE COMMITTEE
(15 minutes)

A. TENURE PROCEDURES
Information

The Tenure Regulations require the Senate Tenure committee and the Academic Vice President to adopt procedures for departments and colleges to use in considering candidates for tenure. The Regulations require that these procedures be reported to Senate and to the Board of Regents for information, but no action by either body is required. (This parallels the procedure which was used under the old Tenure Regulations, when the Vice President adopted documents like the Koffler-Ibele Memorandum after consultation with the Tenure Committee, but without any formal interaction with the Senate.)

To save printing expense, copies of the new Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty are being circulated by mail to members of the Faculty Senate. Others who wish to obtain a copy may do so by contacting Marilee Ward, Clerk of the Senate, 424 Morrill Hall. The Academic Affairs Office will also be circulating copies to departments.

The new Procedures merely implement the requirements set forth in the Tenure Regulations themselves. The Tenure Committee has adopted them after a long series of public hearings, the circulation of two drafts to members of the Senate, consideration of comments received in writing, in the public hearings, in a recent Senate meeting, and in individual communications with members of the committee.

The committee believes that the new Procedures reflect the same concerns that motivated the Faculty Senate in its discussion of the Tenure Regulations, the need for quality and accountability in personnel decisions, the requirements of fairness and due process when considering individuals, and the appropriate balance between departmental autonomy and the need for certain broadly based standards.

With the adoption of these Procedures, the long process of revising the Tenure Regulations and its subsidiary documents comes to an end. The committee views the conclusion of that process with a certain degree of relief. We are also confident that our successors on the committee will carefully examine the operations of the Regulations and these Procedures as they are fully put into effect and make those modifications which may, from time to time, be necessary. We encourage you to report your actual concerns about the operation of the tenure system to members of the committee.

FRED L. MORRISON
Chair

B. EVALUATION LETTERS, TENURE CANDIDATES
Information & Discussion

The Tenure Committee has received several suggestions from faculty members relating to the process of obtaining letters of evaluation of candidates for tenure from outside referees. Some of these suggestions have recommended that the University no longer require such outside evaluations in tenure decisions. Others have asked that the University seek some protection of those letters from discovery by the tenure candidates through the "open files" law.

Before making recommendations to the Senate and administration, the Tenure Committee would like to have a sense of views which are held by the faculty generally. Accordingly, the committee asks that there be a brief discussion of the following questions, without any formal motion or resolution at this time, to aid it in its deliberations. In addition, the committee is holding two public meetings so that faculty members may express their views on Friday, February 21, 3:00-5:00 p.m., Room 1314 Social Sciences Building, West Bank, Minneapolis campus, and on Tuesday, February 25, 12:00-2:00 p.m., Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club, Coffman Union, Minneapolis campus.

1. Should the University seek an exception from the "open files law" which permits tenure candidates to review letters of evaluation, as well as other documents in their files? Some faculty members have suggested that the provisions of the Minnesota law, which apparently requires that letters of evaluation be available to the candidate, inhibit referees from giving candid opinions. In some instances they suggest that referees will not write at all. What is the experience of various sectors of the University in this regard? Would the advantages of more candid recommendations be outweighed by disadvantages of loss of fairness and due process if the rule were changed? Would it be advisable for the University to seek an exception to the law for external letters of evaluation?

2. Should the University require outside evaluations before making tenure decisions? The University requires departments to seek outside evaluations and to submit them with the tenure recommendations. Some faculty members have questioned the value of these outside evaluations. Some departments apparently find it extremely difficult to obtain them. Are outside evaluations valuable in tenure deliberations? Do they serve as a useful check on decision making? Are they worth the cost in terms of time and effort?

The committee requests that faculty members address questions discussed above during the period allowed for discussion in the Senate meeting, or that they address their comments and concerns to the new chair of the Tenure Committee, Professor Sam Krislov, Department of Political Science.

The committee is also considering the question of the extent to which the University does (and should) provide legal defense and indemnification for faculty members who are sued by dissatisfied candidates (or outside evaluators who are so sued for writing less-than-satisfactory evaluations of their performances. This is a question which requires an administrative response, rather than a discussion by the faculty.

FRED L. MORRISON
Outgoing Chair
SAM KRISLOV
Incoming Chair

III. ADJOURNMENT

University Senate meeting, Feb. 20, 1986

copy for [unclear] in his press conference of Jan 25 and 27

ITEM OF NEW BUSINESS - A resolution of support

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following resolution:

The University Senate supports the position taken by President Keller with regard to the charges of alleged sexual misconduct brought against certain University of Minnesota athletes in Madison, Wisconsin.

Substitute

In essence, the President stated that the overriding consideration in this matter must be the well-being of the victim, and the well-being and reputation of the University.

The University community shares in the need to sustain that reputation with responsible, mature behavior that reflects respect and concern for others.

This message, conveyed by President Keller, is strongly endorsed by the University Senate as an expression of the position and purpose of the University of Minnesota.

NORMAN GARMEZY
Senator

The President expressed his concern ~~articulated~~ a message of concern for the victims of sexual assault ^{and} a commitment to help in addressing the problem of sexual assault on our own campuses, and an obligation to ensure that intercollegiate athletics and its participants ~~and~~ serve and enhance the reputation of the University.

The President's comments were several. He expressed his concern for the victims of sexual assault, indicated his commitment to help in addressing the problem of sexual assault on our own campuses and the obligation to ensure that intercollegiate athletics and its participants serve and enhance the reputation of the University.

The entire University community shares in the need to sustain that reputation with responsible, mature behavior that reflects respect and concern for the

Feb. 20, 1986

University Senate - NEW BUSINESS, AMENDED RESOLUTION ON

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE RESEARCH

(Additions are underlined; deletions have lines through them)

WHEREAS, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) is a project to research, develop, and deploy a space-based missile defense system which has been suggested as a method of nuclear deterrence; and,

WHEREAS, the implications of SDI are an acceleration of the arms race and the destabilization of the strategic balance; and,

WHEREAS, ~~along with~~ - the rights preserved by academic freedom need to be balanced with the recognition ~~come responsibility, in-~~ that the participation of University faculty in SDI research is a de facto political and institutional endorsement for SDI and will ~~a-~~ ~~reflection-~~ on the University of Minnesota;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Senate urges the University of Minnesota to refrain from participating in research specifically for SDI.

-AUDREY SPEISS-

LISA STEIDL

Senator

for Information

Insert on p. 14.

27. Procedures for Promotions Procedures for considering promotions should parallel those for consideration of candidates for tenure.

Consideration for promotion must take place whenever the unit recommends a probationary Assistant Professor for tenure. A separate vote on promotion must be recorded and forwarded.

Consideration for promotion may also occur whenever it is initiated by the department head or by the faculty senior in rank to the candidate. The candidate may request that a review take place at any time, but the faculty senior in rank will decide whether to conduct it.

The body which makes the recommendation consists of all members of the regular faculty of the department senior in rank to the candidate. (Both tenured and probationary faculty senior in rank may vote.) Adjunct and nonregular faculty senior in rank may be consulted, but have no vote, unless an exception has been provided by analogy to that provided in part 13. Otherwise, the procedures of parts 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17 apply.

Promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor of Instructors where granted tenure is mandatory under Section 6 of the tenure regulations.

Insert on pp 8-9.

13. Who is eligible to vote. Only members of the tenured faculty of the department may attend or participate in the meeting. Exceptions to this rule may be requested in writing, stating the name(s) of the individual(s) and the reasons for authorization for all such exceptions. All members of the tenured faculty may participate, regardless of rank. If the department head is a member of the tenured faculty, he or she may participate and vote, but has no additional tie-breaking vote.

PROPOSED MOTION

Regarding the Report of the
Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Standards

For Information - February 20, 1986

MOTION:

That the University Senate endorse establishment of unified preparation requirements for students entering Twin Cities, Morris, and Duluth colleges of the University of Minnesota to pursue baccalaureate degrees. These standards require evidence of competence commensurate with four years of study in English; three years in social studies, mathematics (including geometry and intermediate algebra), and science (including one biological and one physical science); two years in a foreign language; and one year in the arts (music, dance, drama, or art). These preparation requirements should become effective for students entering in Fall, 1990 (in the case of foreign languages, Fall, 1992) in order to allow for extensive communication of requirements to school districts and high-school students in Minnesota and major feeder schools in other states. The Senate Consultative Committee should report to the Senate (a) at least one year in advance of these dates on the status of preparations for implementing these requirements; and (b) no later than two years following implementation on the impact of the requirements.

COMMENT:

The Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Standards believes that increasing and unifying preparation standards will improve the quality of teaching and learning at the University, thus improving access to a quality education for all students. The draft report of the Special Committee includes implementation recommendations that reflect the Special Committee's extensive review of potential impact of increased and unified preparation standards on access to the University and on academic and student-services programs. A key recommendation is that a transition period of five years be allowed before the proposed preparation standards become requirements. During that time, the University should undertake an extensive public relations and communication program to inform school districts and the people of the state of the new standards and to provide consulting and technical assistance where needed to help schools make the necessary curricular and academic-advising changes to prepare students to meet the standards. In addition, during this period the University faculty should review and revise the University curriculum to meet the needs of students who are more uniformly prepared to work at advanced levels.

W. Andrew Collins
Chair

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SELF-STUDY REPORT**

**North Central Association Accreditation Review
April 1986**

This Self-Study Report comprises an important part of the decennial accreditation review of the Twin Cities campus by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education). The University has been accredited by the North Central Association continuously since 1913. In October 1984, then President Magrath appointed the present North Central Association Accreditation Advisory Committee to prepare for the on-site team visit in April 1986, and charged them with the task of conducting an institutional self-study that goes beyond meeting the official requirements for accreditation. The Advisory Committee was directed to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Twin Cities campus with special emphasis on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. These three areas were selected because of the unique character of this institution in the State and because of the special planning efforts since the last review in 1976.

When Kenneth Keller assumed the presidency of the institution in 1985, he proposed an overall framework for the University's future called A Commitment to Focus, based on previous planning, which was subsequently endorsed by the Board of Regents. The North Central Association Advisory Committee believes that its report, "A University at the Crossroads: Self-Study Report for the 1986 North Central Association Accreditation Review," complements A Commitment to Focus by outlining the current status of programs, faculty, services and facilities, and by suggesting enhancements necessary if the goals articulated in A Commitment to Focus are to be realized. In addition, the committee believes that the Self-Study Report will provide a basis for assessing the success, ten years hence, of the University's efforts toward becoming one of the top five public institutions in the country, an avowed goal articulated by President Keller.

other Big Ten public universities); recently collected data from departments on issues ranging from visiting professorships to special incentives for faculty development; summaries of academic personnel records of relevant faculty characteristics (e.g., institutions from which faculty received their doctorates); characteristics of undergraduate, professional, and graduate students on the Twin Cities campus; summaries of evaluative studies of University faculty (e.g., sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences) and students (e.g., Former Student Survey Project); special focus group discussions with students and faculty; and the experience and opinions of University faculty and administrators on topics ranging from the libraries to the availability of secretarial support for research and instruction.

CONTENT OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The resulting Self-Study Report contains three sections. The first section includes an introduction and institutional overview, a summary of the University's responses to the last accreditation review, and a description of significant changes since the 1976 review, among other general topics. The second section provides the University's response to the criteria for accreditation mandated by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools: the general institutional requirements and the evaluative criteria. The third section provides a detailed framework for describing the unique character of the University: its comprehensiveness; the planning process; the undergraduate education mission; the professional education programs; the faculty, resources, and programs that make it a prestigious research institution; and the structure and programs that support the University's graduate education mission.

The three areas in this section that receive special emphasis are the sections on planning, faculty research, and graduate education. The discussion of planning includes a summary of the major planning activities of the past decade and a discussion of current planning issues.

beginning to reshape the institution. Changes in the University's governance and personnel policies, such as the new Senate constitution in 1982 and a new tenure code in 1985, have been widely debated and subsequently endorsed. The University's planning process and other forces of change have affected faculty research and graduate, undergraduate and professional education.

In the area of planning, significant accomplishments include: the linking of budgeting and planning that began in 1979; initiating an early retirement program for faculty to reduce the number of tenured faculty, and the closing of units (e.g., the Library School) based on programmatic plans. Planning has had a significant impact on the University during the last decade.

The past decade includes numerous University initiatives to remove barriers to faculty research and to develop new programs to facilitate faculty research efforts. Among the accomplishments during the past decade are the following: the initiation of the Bush Sabbatical Program in 1981 to fund faculty sabbatical projects that list faculty research with undergraduate education; the use of special retention funds, beginning in 1983, to prevent the loss of the University's best research faculty; the initiatives taken to increase all faculty salaries to compensate for inflation losses; the actions taken in 1984 to enable the University to use the permanent endowment fund, together with funds from the Capital Campaign, to increase the number of endowed chairs; the increased use of indirect cost-recovery funds from sponsored research to facilitate faculty research (e.g., more funds to help with equipment needs); an improved patent office, now part of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer; several new research institutes and centers (e.g., Institute for Human Genetics, Supercomputer Institute, Center for Advanced Feminist Studies; a \$7.5 million grant from IBM, called Project Woksape to expand the use of microcomputer work stations; and improvements in services that support faculty research, including University Libraries (e.g., increased allocations for book purchases, the beginning of automation, and the

clearly articulated institutional goals and in developing strategies for achieving those goals. The success of that effort relies on University leadership that presents a vision for the University, such as that outlined in A Commitment to Focus, a vision that is shared widely among faculty on campus. That vision must be translated, however, by departmental units into the pursuit of excellence in each of their disciplines. The Advisory Committee's analysis of high quality University departments, not just excellent in research productivity but excellent in undergraduate and graduate instruction as well, underscores the key importance of departmental administrators in helping to create an environment in which excellence is expected and reinforced. Related planning concerns centered on the time required for overall institutional planning and the current absence of central administrators devoted solely to planning, the possible need for a planning advisory group, the role of the Management Committee (consisting of the University President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Finance and Operations) in planning and budgeting, and the absence of sufficient interface between program reviews and central planning and budgeting.

A second concern is the University's tendency to be less diverse in its student and faculty populations than other large research universities. This particular concern was noted in the two previous North Central Reviews: the 1966 Review Team stated that students would benefit from association with more high-quality outsiders. However, in spite of attempts by the University to recruit students from outside the State, currently 88 percent of the undergraduates and 50 percent of graduate students are from the State of Minnesota. A similar tendency is evidenced in statistics on institutions from which faculty received their doctorates: 29 percent of the PhD holders on the Twin Cities campus received their doctorates from the University of Minnesota.

the Student Experience, are needed to link faculty research with undergraduate education.

Another issue relates to the various personnel and human resource issues that affect faculty quality, productivity and morale. A comprehensive system involves four processes: hiring promising faculty or those with proven track records; retaining the best faculty; providing resources and opportunities to keep faculty current, and developing procedures and options for counseling unproductive faculty. The University has made progress in its hiring practices and has initiated new steps to keep faculty. Members of the Advisory Committee expressed concerns about the perceived high percentages of probationary faculty who receive tenure at the University compared to percentages at institutions we aspire to be like. The University also has several programs available to keep faculty current, although some of these options (e.g., sabbaticals) are underused. The University's sabbatical and single quarter leave programs provide development opportunities that are not always provided elsewhere. There have been few attempts, however, to develop programs for retraining or stimulating faculty who have become less productive. In regard to this last issue, no systems are available, for example, to identify faculty who should no longer have graduate faculty status. Another issue that concerns graduate faculty is a system of dual certification that requires faculty to apply for graduate status.

Employment related concerns for undergraduate and graduate students is also an issue, the nature of which differs for the two groups. For undergraduate students, the primary concern is the high percentage of undergraduates who work, out of necessity, a significant number of hours in jobs that have no educational value. For some students, work comes first and school comes second; for some students high pay rates for campus jobs are an incentive for them to attend the University. The concern for graduate students involves the low level of financial support for graduate students which forces many to seek non-University employment that is detrimental to their graduate study.

**MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ACCREDITATION REVIEW**

Professor Irwin Rubenstein, Department of Genetics and Cell Biology,
College of Biological Sciences, Chair

Professor Mark Brenner, Department of Horticultural Sciences and
Landscape Architecture, College of Agriculture

Professor Patricia Broen, Department of Communication Disorders,
College of Liberal Arts

Professor Gary Gray, Department of Chemistry, Institute of Technology

Mr. Tony Hill, Undergraduate Student

Professor Warren Ibele, Department of Mechanical Engineering,
Institute of Technology

Professor Frank Irving, Department of Forest Resources, College of Forestry

Ms. Ruth MacDonald, Department of Food Science and Nutrition, Graduate Student

Professor Shirley Moore, Institute of Child Development, College of Education

Mr. Keith Morton, Department of American Studies, Graduate Student

Professor Betty Wallace Robinett, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs,
Central Administration Coordinator

Professor John Sullivan, Department of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts

Dr. Darwin Hendel, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Staff