

Senate Committee On Educational Policy  
Minutes  
February 14, 1986

Members Present: Andrew Collins, Gretchen Kreuter (ex officio), Susan Collison, Marvin Mattson, Ian Maitland, Patricia Thomas (staff), Brenda Ellingboe, Thomas Daniels, William Hanson (chair), David Lutz.

Members Excused: Mary Young, Sheila Corcoran, Van Gooch

Minutes: The minutes were approved as circulated.

Senate Library Committee

Bill Hanson reported that the Library Committee was concerned about a proposed \$126,000 cut in the Twin Cities campus libraries' acquisition budget and the libraries' ability to keep up with inflation. A resolution concerning this issue was sent to the Senate Consultative Committee, SCEP, and Vice President Murthy. The issue was discussed at the February 5 Finance Committee meeting, and the Library Committee subsequently withdrew the resolutions on assurance from Dr. Murthy that money would be provided.

Senate Research Committee

Bill Hanson said that Paul Gassman was unable to attend today's meeting, but he will be here on March 7 to discuss classified research and REI. The Research Committee has reaffirmed the existing policy which states no classified research can be done at REI.

Indirect Cost Recovery

Bill Hanson stated that the Senate Research Committee passed a resolution pertaining to the University's method of distributing research monies received from government contracts and private grants. An earlier Senate resolution mandated that one-half of the grant money be distributed to central administration, one-sixth to the college, one-sixth to the department, and one-sixth to the principal investigators. The Research committee is withdrawing this resolution and substituting the following grant distribution: one-half to central administration and one-half to the college which would then decide the amount to be given to the department and principal investigator.

Paul Gassman, chair of the Senate Research Committee, will come to the March 7 SCEP meeting to speak in opposition to the resolution. David Hamilton, a Research Committee member who supports the proposed resolution, will also attend the March 7 meeting. Bill Hanson will send copies of the original resolution to SCEP members prior to the meeting.

Advising Awards

Susan Stonefield will present the advising awards information at the February 28 meeting.

Retrenchment Plan 1986

Ian Maitland, sitting in for Finance Committee member, Bill Hanson, reported that Richard Heydinger substituted for President Keller, who was out of town. The administration is proposing a \$17.6 million

retrenchment plan which includes taking \$5 million up front and financing the balance. The principal and interest, to be paid back over a five-year period, would come from an increase in tuition and decreases in faculty and staff raises and department budgets. SCEP suggested that, if the retrenchment should be less than \$17.6 million, the department budgets be restored more quickly than raises or tuition decreases because it is more crucial in retaining and recruiting quality faculty.

#### Lower Division Task Force

Because William Hanson is chair of the Special Committee on Coordinated Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities campus, Andrew Collins served as chair during the following discussion.

William Hanson explained that the undergraduate center would have a director and several representatives who would report to the vice president of academic affairs. The center would have four main activities:

1. Be a source of information for new and transferring students and for those dislocated students within the University.
2. Be an advising and referral service for undergraduate education.
3. Coordinate activities of units of the several colleges within the university system with those of the office of student affairs.
4. Be responsible for some activities of the lower division, i.e., monitoring the effectiveness of large classes, providing means for implementing proposals, or seeing that CLE requirements are being met.

It was suggested that SCEP should play an active role in forming a policy concerning CLE requirements. Andrew Collins asked what major alternatives there were to the undergraduate center. Professor Hanson explained that in looking at ways of coordinating the lower division on this campus, two other models were considered. The first is the unified college model where all entering students, except General College students, would be admitted to a lower division college. After completing their freshman and sophomore requirements, the students would then transfer into one of the existing colleges. The second model is the overlay model. The lower division college would not admit students but would be an additional administrative structure, like the Graduate School, and have more clout than the undergraduate center of the report. Both of these models were rejected in favor of the center because the committee worried about preserving autonomy of the existing college structures if the unified college model were used and the increased administrative costs if the overlay model were used.

Lawrence Goodman expressed concern with the tenure code and the recommendations from the committee on the Quality of Teaching. William

Hanson said the committee did not cover this as it is handled by the tenure code.

Andrew Collins asked if the functions of the undergraduate center and the various colleges would not create duplication and added confusion for students. Professor Hanson said that the committee was thinking more boldly about transferring some activities to the center from the colleges and administration. He asked for specific suggestions, and Patricia Thomas suggested consolidating the program options of nontraditional students into a clearinghouse managed by the undergraduate center.

Andrew Collins asked from where would the money for the center come. Bill Hanson said three kinds of proposals were being considered:

1. Money saved by implementing other Commitment to Focus proposals could be used.
2. Existing staff in the office of Academic Affairs could be utilized.
3. The center could be staffed by people who would be transferred in from existing colleges.

The center would have to be carefully managed and the staff carefully trained.

At the February 28 meeting, the rest of the recommendations would be discussed and questions concerning financial aid counseling and student affairs functions would be discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia Thomas  
Administrative Fellow