UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 4, 1986
12:30 - 2:45
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

12:30 1. Reports:
   a. Finance Committee, Professor Shively
   b. Student SCC, Mr. St. Laurent
   c. SCC/FCC, Professor Berscheid
   d. Other.

12:45 2. External Governance Review: Suggestions for the External Reviewers' Schedule.

1:00 3. Implementation Committee on Undergraduate Education. Guest: Dr. John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

1:30 4. University Bookstores POlicies. Guest: James Duffy, Bookstores Director.

DISCUSSION/ACTION

5. Minutes of November 20 (attached).

6. Steering the resolution on CIA recruitment (discussion materials attached).

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 4, 1986
12:40-2:55
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (chair), Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Patrick Durbin, Brenda Ellingboe, Richard Goldstein, Ron Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Roy St. Laurent, Andy Seitel, W. Phillips Shively.

Guests: James Duffy, Director, University Bookstores (Twin Cities); Mike Peltier, Minnesota Daily ; Mary Jane Plunkett, adviser, Student Organization Development Center; Maureen Smith, editor, University Relations; John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; Marty Roth, Chair, University Bookstores Committee.

1. Reports.

A. Senate Finance Committee chair. Professor Shively announced the agenda items for SFC's meeting today with Vice Presidents Benjamin and Kegler: current outlook for the University's biennial request, the sabbatical support proposals, and academic planning.

B. Student SCC chair. Mr. St. Laurent announced that Jill Gaudette has been chosen to replace Patrick Durbin on SCC at the end of Fall Quarter, when he graduates. His replacement on the Finance Committee is still needed. Mr. Durbin will continue to work with Professor Murphy on the University Grievance Procedures through Winter Quarter.

C. Consultative Committee chair. Professor Berscheid announced new Twin Cities Campus steering business for the January 15 SCC meeting: class time and credit hours. Professor Goldstein summarized the case he had submitted in a recent letter to Professor Berscheid:

At the time the West Bank Campus opened, passing time on the Minneapolis Campus was extended from 10 to 15 minutes. Since no other changes were made, the 50-minute class hour was reduced to, and has remained, a 45-minute class hour. In addition, shortly after that change, an argument prevailed for students to have fewer courses per quarter and study each in greater depth, and the standard 3-credit module was converted to a 4-credit module. However, many departments changed neither the number of class meeting times nor the amount of work expected of students. The result, he said, is that class time per credit at this university is probably less than at any other university in the country.

Professor Shively added that student-teacher contact time in Summer Session is approximately 30% less than during the academic year.

An outline of Professor Goldstein's argument will be sent to SCC members together with the other materials for the January 15 meeting.

2. Governance: The external reviewers' schedule.

FCC's and SCC's chairs and vice chairs will meet in January to consider the reviewers' schedule for their February 9-10 visit. Both FCC and SSCC want to meet with them. Mr. St. Laurent hoped there would be a way to give the visitors a perspective on the five-campus aspect of the University by bringing in guests from the coordinate campuses; Mr. Kubik suggested those might be the representative from each campus who served last year on the Special Committee on Governance.

Professor Campbell recommended SCC also solicit the interest of the reviewers in what interviews they think would help them. (The chair will alert them now by letter that the committee will make that inquiry in January.)

Professor Murphy recommended including in interviews people who have been active at critical times. Professor Berscheid and Mr. St. Laurent recommended including past SCC/FCC and SSCC chairs. A tentative schedule should be ready by late January.

3. The minutes of the November 20 meeting were approved. Members have until Monday, December 8 to telephone corrections to the secretary.

4. Implementation Committee on Undergraduate Education. (Twin Cities Campus business.) Guest: Dr. John Wallace, Assistanta Vice President for Academic Affairs, and chair of the committee.

Dr. Wallace told SCC the committee would have a report by the time of the January Regents meeting. He anticipates the committee will make some substantial recommendations for real change. The pace of their work has picked up markedly from the slow process of reviewing the existing task force reports. Each of the five working teams will bring its recommendations back to the full committee on December 8 and 15, and more December meetings will be added if necessary to finish committee work. Dr. Wallace did not want to conjecture on what the recommendations might be, but predicted one would concern the faculty reward structure, along the following lines:

Student evaluation of teaching. Current policy requires each professor to have at least one course per year evaluated by students. The Implementation Committee favors moving to a central policy where every course is evaluated by students on a standard form, with the evaluation being administered by someone other than the teacher. There should probably be some quantification. Each department should be required to have a policy on how it will use the evaluations.

Professor Campbell saw the implication that the results of evaluation would be available to someone in the department other than the instructor, for example, for use in faculty salary decisions. Dr. Wallace said the committee is aware that different departments have different practices and they are not inclined to favor standarizing practices, but rather

publicizing what the various departments do.

Professor Goldstein stated his great concern about making too heavy use of student evaluations, and he recalled there had been extensive discussion of the Senate policy when it was proposed. The evaluations are primarily to help instructors help themselves. We should want to know who the best instructors are so we can reward them, and who the poorest are so we can help them. But he did not think scores were advisable. The open-ended questions have the most value, and certainly so to the instructor. People should read these comments and not a numerical conclusion.

Mr. St. Laurent thought using a standard format need not imply scoring. He regards it as important we make clear that good teaching is important and should be valued. Those making promotion and tenure and salary adjustment decisions, as well as the instructor, should know evaluation results.

There appeared to be considerable SCC support for a policy that every course be evaluated. Professor Shively supported this. His is a department in which every course is evaluated and the results are available to the whole department for use in promotion and tenure and salary decisions. He also favors requiring every department to have a public policy on how it uses the evaluations. However, he opposes a standard form.

Professor Brenner spoke in favor of evaluation for every course. He asked that the two purposes of evaluations be kept clearly separate; evaluations to help the instructor can be different from evaluations for promotion and tenure and salary decisions.

Mr. Kubik favors evaluating every course and believes a standard format would help students to write their evaluations well.

Professor Murphy also favors having every course evaluated. He reminds his students of their consumer role and lets them know what they write will be taken seriously by the department.

Professor Campbell noted that an evaluation is of the course as well as of the instructor. He commended Mechanical Engineering on the usefulness of its survey of alumni.

Professor Latterell said he believed evaluation should be broadened to include also advising, and departments should be asked how they are evaluating each. Professor Brenner remarked that some departments survey graduating seniors via mail, a good point at which to ask also about advising.

Ms. Ellingboe commented that last year's CLA committee on the Morse-Amoco teaching awards rated less highly nominations that had no student evaluations attached. Professor Shively took strong exception to that choice since teaching evaluation is a matter for departmental decision and not really under a faculty member's control.

Professor Berscheid explained that there are objective criteria which affect the validity of evaluations (such as whether a course is required or elected, and the time of day it is given). No one, she said, should be allowed to use the evaluations who is not familiar with relevant literature and who does not know how to interpret the results.

Reviewing the report of the Implementation Committee. Professor Berscheid asked what kind of internal response the committee would solicit before taking its report to the Regents. Dr. Wallace thought that because the Regents' January docket is already very full, it might be good to postpone that reporting until February, and discuss the recommendations with the Assembly Steering Committee in January. Professor Berscheid commented that the Campus Assembly resolution had envisioned more interaction than there has been between the Implementation Committee and both the Steering Committee and SCEP.

In response to a question, Dr. Wallace confirmed that there would be some recommendation from his committee to move in the direction of a core curriculum.

(Note: Copies of the Implementation Committee's report should be sent to Steering Committee members in advance of the January 15 meeting.)

4. University Bookstores Policies. Guests: James Duffy, Director, University Bookstores (Twin Cities Campus), Marty Roth, Chair, University Bookstores Comm.

Mr. Duffy distributed copies of two tables, "Comparison of the Ten Largest College Bookstore Operations" and "Comparison of Big Ten College Bookstore Operations" showing book sales, gross margin, and direct personnel costs in relation to total sales (excluding personal computer sales).

Professor Berscheid welcomed Mr. Duffy and remarked on the bookstores' reputation for being well-run. Mr. Duffy began to answer each of the questions the SCC had submitted to him in advance, and although discussion and related questions disordered that structure, he did respond to every question.

What is the mission of the University bookstores? Mr. Duffy read the bookstores' longstanding mission statement.

What is the bookstores' pricing policy? In brief, it is to price at reasonable figures to provide the customer with the best quality merchandise. The University of Minnesota (75.3%) and Wisconsin (73.8%) have the greatest percentage of total sales (excluding PC's) from book sales. On all non-book merchandise, the mark-up is 40%. On textbooks, both new and used, it is 20%. Publishers provide trade books at list minus 33%. The bookstores try to encourage trade book purchases and offer a 10% discount in certain categories. Generally they sell at the publisher's list price.

The bookstores pay students 60% of the cover price as a way to help books cost the student less. Only a few other schools pay 60%; 50% is the standard. However, the bookstores pay 50% for used books from wholesalers but sell them at the same price as those bought back from students, so gain a higher margin.

The bookstores' gross margin (total difference between what they buy for and what they sell at) is 23.2%. Mr. Duffy explained that he had eliminated computer sales from the analysis because the bookstores' gross margin on them is 4%; including that would skew all the other figures.

Overhead. The bookstores pay for utilities and a "use of facilities" figure, just as if they were a private bookseller occupant. The user charge is $160,895 per year and is based on the construction cost of the buildings.

Professor Berscheid asked why the bookstores give the customer a much better deal on a PC than on a book. Mr. Duffy explained that the University administration negotiated with manufacaturers regarding PC discounts before the bookstores acquired them for sale. The volume has been so high that the PC's have nevertheless generated a lot of the total profit. With gross sales of about $22 million a year, personal computers in 1984-85 accounted for $9,400,000 of those sales. Mr. Duffy mentioned that the Illinois legislature has prohibited University of Illinois bookstores from selling computers and an array of other merchandise, because of complaints from other area merchants.

Mr. St. Laurent asked if all the largest bookstores and other Big Ten bookstores operate basically on a non-profit basis. Mr. Duffy said not all do. Co-ops, for example, rebate money to their members at year's end. The non-profit bookstores aim for profits in the 7% to 9% range, he said.

Professor Shively asked whether, if the bookstores are not trying to make a profit, any savings could be passed on to the customers and whether there was any way to charge less than the list price on books. Mr. Duffy said it might be possible to take one percent off the list price, but added that record-keeping would be hard. If, as Professor Shively suggested, there were a larger mark-up on non-book items, book prices for students could be reduced about two percent.

Discussion then progressed, and returned again and again, to the idea of instituting a co-op design whereby excess profits would at the end of the year be returned to the student and faculty members who have bought books. Mr. Duffy called that a fair way to operate. He pointed out that a co-operative corporation has to have the capital to buy the initial inventory. Students would need to pay perhaps $25 to join, which would be returnable at graduation. The corporation would be subject to the state tax on inventory, which the University's non-profit bookstore is not. The annual return for members might be five to eight percent.

Professor Campbell asked what goes into determining how the bookstores select non-textbook scholarly books. Mr. Duffy replied that the bookstores personnel have tried to get faculty advice and that they welcome more of it. They also rely on publishers' representatives and other sources. They are continuously looking for more guidance. Each of the bookstores has a different buyer for the tradebooks, and each reflects to some extent the different nature of the customer groups in the four stores. He agreed with Professor Campbell's view that encouraging book purchasing among students should be part of the bookstores' mission.

To Professor Goldstein's question, he replied that no university's bookstores give faculty or students a discount on textbooks.

Professor Shively asked whether some price shifts could be made which might have better results for students: for example, giving a five

percent discount on textbooks, paying 50% instead of 60% for used books (to encourage students to hold onto their books), and making up the rest of the necessary two percent margin by a higher mark-up on the non-book merchandise. Mr. Duffy thought that could be done but that a rebate system would be preferable. One problem would be that increasing the profit margin on other merchandise would make the bookstores less competitive witih off-campus merchandisers.

Professor Brenner saw our objective as to make the purchase of textbooks and reference books as attractive as possible to students and faculty. Mr. Duffy told SCC that without a rebate system there will always be some excess profit at year's end.

Ms. Ellingboe asked the size of the advertising budget. Mr. Duffy replied that it is $42,000 and is used in the Daily, athletic programs, other organs with a student audience, and a gift catalog.

How is the bookstores' budget drawn up? Mr. Duffy said first bookstore staff write the budget; then C. Luverne Carlson (Assistant Vice President for Support Services and Operations) and then members of Vice President Lilly's office review it. The Bookstores Advisory Committee doe not get into any budgeting details.

Professor Shively suggested that because the bookstores build in their own operating costs they have no incentive for efficiency. Renovation of the bookstores looks conspicuously better than for the rest of the University. Mr. Duffy told SCC that they have held down full-time personnel and made more part-time student jobs; their personnel costs (11.8%) show a "pretty lean" operation.

How much was spent on the West Bank Bookstore remodelling? How are decisions to remodel made? Mr. Duffy listed four steps: (1) The University Bookstores Committee comes up with a general proposal; (2) the proposal goes to the Physical Plant Department; (3) its proposal proceeds in turn to the Management Committee; (4) the Management Committee's recommendation goes to the Board of Regents.

The just-remodeled West Bank Bookstore was built in 1968, he said, had had no work since then, had asbestos ceiling insulation and pipe covering (no longer allowed), wiring which was no longer up to code, and no sprinkler system. As a positive side effect to the remodeling the bursar's office had to be moved and is now for the first time handicapped-accessible. We accomplished more than cosmetic ends, he concluded. Costs were $497,700 and came from the accumulated reserve. The year-end balances go into the reserve.

Professor Campbell questioned the propriety of the bookstores being able to make their own remodeling decisions when all academic units must compete for funds from a very small pot. The University's money should all be the University's money, he argued. Mr. Duffy replied that clearly the Universitey as a whole should have a reserve fund. He asked how one could operate and make repairs without that.

Professor Berscheid asked how and when, besides for Project Woksape, the margins are spent. Mr. Duffy said the Bookstores Committee solicits

suggestions and requests; the committee's recommendations are forwarded to central administration, which may or may not agree with them.

Mr. St. Laurent commented that while students have the perception the bookstores make profits at the students' disadvantage, we have seen today that that is not strictly the case. However, he said, paying 60% instead of 50% constitutes something of a counter-academic incentive.

How were profits used before the large-scale sale of computers? Mr. Duffy said some went to student scholarships, to the Graduate School's visiting professor program, to the libraries and, on at least one occasion, for uniforms for the marching band.

How did the bookstores reduce profits from the 4-6% range to the current 2% range, and how has the pricing policy changed? Mr. Duffy said they have reduced their profits on a number of non-textbook items.

Have pro fits actually been in the 2% margin? Mr. Duffy reported the following profit figures:

Recent 4-6% target years:

1980-81	6%
1981-82	6.1%
1982-83	5.5%

2% target years:

1983-84	1.8%
1984-85	3.7% (first year PC's were sold)
1985-86	2.6%.

In response to Professor Goldstein's question of whether the bookstores pay support for the Microcomputer Center, where people go for advice on, for instance, which computer to buy, Mr. Duffy said the bookstores pay the center for a consulting service. Professor Berscheid asked whether the bookstores had been entirely self-supporting in the training program for the use of PC's and central administration had not provided the start-up costs. Mr. Duffy said that was right. (Note: SCC needs some clarification or further information here since central administrators have told SCC that there was a substantial central investment to set up workshops on the use of personal computers.)

What is the functional relationship between the bookstores director and the Assembly Committee on University Bookstores? Mr. Duffy said the committee has always had an advisory role. In recent years it has advised particularly on the distribution of the above-margin profits. SCC members noted that the first element of the Bookstores Committee's chargs is to recommend policies concerning the operation of the University bookstores. Mr. Duffy told SCC that the committee has been involved in policy change questions such as changing profit margins.

Professor Berscheid remarked that the Bookstores Committee would be the place where any move to change to a co-op/rebate system would have to begin and that the Assembly Steering Committee could ask that body to explore it.

Bookstore hours. Attention turned to Professor Michael Hancher's letter requesting that the bookstores, if at all possible, maintain a later closing time on more than one night a week. Mr. Duffy said the bookstores have been attentive to this question for years. They have worked closely with Continuing Education and Extension and they have experimented with keeping the stores open for various extra hours. They have concluded that keeping the store open late during the first week of classes, and thereafter one night per week, meets the need. They found that beyond that, people stopped in for nothing more than to buy snacks. With regard to Professor Hancher's observation of the "general tendency for campus life to dry up at 4:38," he commented that just keeping the bookstores open will not keep people on campus. Additional attractive events will be needed.

SCC members expressed their appreciation to Mr. Duffy for bringing them welcome information and candor.

Mr. Duffy left the meeting, and the SCC very briefly discussed how to initiate an exploration of the co-op idea. Mr. Seitel and Professors Brenner and Shively volunteered to draft a request to the University Bookstores Committee.

Closing comments came from Professor Brenner, who said that both offering rebates and fostering a more positive book image were desirable, and from Professor Goldstein who remarked that a valuable bookstore service is to make new books available quickly (especially since the libraries do not have new books available for about a year after publication.)

5. Steering the resolution regarding CIA recruiting on campus.

Professor Berscheid thanked Ms. Ellingboe for her extensive efforts in compiling the packet of background materials for SCC members.

Mr. St. Laurent observed that the materials display two issues: (1) there seems to be no policy governing employment recruitment on campus; and (2) the resolution itself, as Ms. Ellingboe introduced it to the Senate on November 6:

> "That the Senate Committee on Social Concerns be urged to investigate University recruitment policies and to discuss the intent of the CIA's presence in a University setting; and... that it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the University of Minnesota campuses."

Ms. Ellingboe recommended that, in addition to Social Concerns' attending to the resolution, the Assembly Placement Committee be asked to develop a campus policy on recruiting. The CLA Career Development Office, she suggested, could be part of writing a recruitment policy. The Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs should advise as well.

Following Professor Berscheid's summing up of the indicated inclination of the Committee, Mr. St. Laurent moved SCC approval of that position:

> (1) That the Senate Committee on Social Concerns be asked to consider Ms. Ellingboe's resolution on CIA recruitment; and (2) that the Assembly Placement Committee be asked to spearhead an attempt to devise a campus recruiting policy. The Steering Committee will suggest to Placement that they may want input from CLA's Career Development Office and the Offices of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

The motion was carried without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Mechanical Engineering
125 Mechanical Engineering
111 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 625-7366

1 December 1986

Professor Ellen Berscheid
Chairperson
Senate Consultative Committee
Department of Psychology
N309 Elliott Hall

Dear Ellen:

At the time the University was considering a change from quarters to semesters, I wrote to Dr. Robinett expressing my concern regarding the class contact time that students at the University of Minnesota would have with the proposed semester. Although the semester schedule is apparently a dead issue, the question of student class time is still something that should be considered within our structure of faculty governance.

There are two specific items which I believe should be considered--the forty-five minute class hour and the number of class hours per credit hour. Both of these underwent changes in the last fifteen years. Upon extending the Minneapolis Campus across the river to the West Bank, the passing time for students to go from classes on one side of the river to classes on the other side could no longer be easily accommodated in ten minutes. Rather than shift the schedule so that the classes would start at different times on the two banks, the passing time was increased from ten minutes to fifteen minutes. I do not recall whether this was considered to be a temporary change or not. In any event, this loss of 10% of the class time has never been made up. It has a very definite effect on the amount of material that can be covered in a course.

The change from 50 to 45 minutes per class room hour was due to a change in the physical layout of the University. The second change was related to a change in educational philosophy. This concerns the notion, which I believe is basically correct, that students should take a smaller number of courses in a given term, yet treat them in greater depth. Therefore, at least for undergraduates, we reduced drastically the fraction of courses that were given for three credits or less and for some time have had a standard module, for most classes, of four credits.

In my naive way - at that time I served as chairman of the IT Curriculum Committee - I assumed that there would be a concurrent increase in class meetings and that a four credit course would meet four hours a week. Although this is the case for some departments,

a casual review of the class schedule indicates that for many departments four credit courses meet three hours per week. Although in the past some argued that the decrease in class time per credit hour would be compensated with additional work given to students, it is not clear that this has been or really could be the case. In fact, as indicated in the minutes of the committee that was planning a potential change in calendar, it is apparently well accepted that for many departments, four credit courses would consist of three, forty-five minute "hours" per week.

Discussions with colleagues at other universities indicate no schools where the standard classroom hour is forty-five minutes and none where four credit classes, be they semester or quarter, meet less than four (fifty minute) hours per week, or their equivalent. We have, at Minnesota, a class contact time at least 10% less than the standard throughout American Universities, and in many departments 32 1/2% less than the norm.

I am troubled by three things. First, we have less time to get across material which is a definite loss to the potential knowledge base of our students. Second, there is a question as to whether we are overcharging in tuition payments. Thirdly, do we report the correct number of student credit hours to state bodies that worry about student credit hours?

As I mentioned, these points were brought up with the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs at the time of the examination of the calendar. Because no action was taken in terms of a change in calendar, the matter was not pursued. I would suggest that we have this as a topic of discussion for FCC or SCC. If not, could we consider asking the Senate Committee on Educational Policy or perhaps the Calendar Committee to consider the importance of these points?

Sincerely yours,

R.J. Goldstein
Professor and Head

RJG/cjs

cc: R. Benjamin
K. Keller
B. Robinett

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

December 30, 1986

Professor Marty Roth
Chair, University Bookstores Committee
Department of English
210H Lind Hall

Dear Professor Roth:

As you may recall, on October 23 President Keller prompted the Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee to review the profit structure of the University Bookstores. Following up on this, on December 4 we had a most informative discussion with Director James Duffy about the operations of the bookstores.

As an outcome of these meetings, we wish to propose that in your capacity as an advisory committee to the director of the University Bookstores, you consider recommending the following to Mr. Duffy:

The price and profit structure of the bookstores should be based on a clear, general philosophy which informs more specific decisions. A philosophy which seems to us most appropriate for a university is one that encourages students and staff to develop personal libraries. To this end you might consider the following ideas:

1) increase the number of serious trade books carried in stock;

2) offer rebates or reductions on the price of books for students, faculty and staff (a variety of mechanisms could accomplish this, one of which is reorganizing as a cooperative).

The above might be financed by:

3) reducing the price offered for used books from 60% of list to 50%, which would also encourage students to retain their books;

4) allowing non-book items' mark-up to rise to a competitive level, if these have been reduced in order to reach the proper level of profit; and

5) instead of accumulating excess reserves which then must be disbursed as grants, developing a system to return excess profits to your book customers.

Mr. Duffy agreed with us that any changes in the organization and mode of operation of the bookstores should begin with your committee. Since the question of the disbursement of the bookstores' "profits" has been controversial for some time, we hope you will consider some of the alternatives we suggest--as well as any others that may occur to you--and report back to us by April 2 the outcome of your deliberations and any actions you wish the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and the administration to take.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee

EB:mp

c: Shirley Clark
Associate Chair, Steering Committee
Roy St. Laurent
Chair, Student Steering Committee
Andy Seitel
Vice Chair, Student Steering Committee

bc: Rick Heydinger

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612)626-1850

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

November 21, 1986

Mr. James Duffy
Director, Minnesota Book Center
290 Williamson Hall

Dear Mr. Duffy:

The Senate Consultative Committee, and most specifically its Twin Cities Campus component, the Assembly Steering Committee, look forward to discussing bookstore policies and operations with you on December 4. By copy of this letter we are also inviting Professor Marty Roth, chair of the University Bookstores Committee of the Campus Assembly, to join us. In our committee's October 23 discussion, members framed a number of questions they would like you to address. You have, I believe, seen these in our minutes from that meeting, but I repeat them here:

- What is the mission of the University bookstores?

- What is the bookstores' pricing policy?

- How were profits dealt with before the large-scale use of computers?

- How did the bookstores reduce profits from the 4-6% range to the current 2% target? How has the pricing policy changed since the order to reduce profits?

- Have profits actually been in the 2% margin?

- How do our University bookstores compare with other Big Ten bookstores in areas such as pricing and personnel?

- What is the functional relationship between the Bookstores director and the Assembly Committee on University Bookstores?

- How much was spent on the West Bank Bookstore remodelling? How are decisions to remodel made?

When Brief reported that the Steering Committee would continue this discussion of the bookstores at a later meeting, Professor Michael Hancher sent me a copy of his letter to Professor Roth asking that the Bookstores Committee, if the cost is not prohibitive, encourage a later closing

hour for the bookstores several nights a week. With the writer's permission, a copy of that letter is attached, and we should like your comments on the suggestion.

We thank you for your attention to these matters and look forward to meeting you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee

c: SCC
Professor Marty Roth

Attachment: Hancher 10/31 letter to Roth

EB:mp

P.S. We have reserved time from 1:30 to 2:00 for this discussion.

COMPARISONS OF THE TEN LARGEST

COLLEGE BOOKSTORE OPERATIONS

(Related to Total Sales) *

SCHOOL	BOOK SALES	GROSS MARGIN	DIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS
1) Harvard University	26.6%	36.5%	13.7%
2) UCLA	45.1	31.7	17.4
3) University of Washington	58.5	33.4	13.2
4) University of Minnesota	75.3	23.2	11.8
5) Brigham Young University	49.6	30.8	12.4
6) Pennsylvania State University	63.9	29.1	10.4
7) University of Southern California	48.9	31.6	12.8
8) Stanford	57.0	32.2	12.5
9) Boston University	55.6	25.8	18.0
10) University of Wisconsin	73.8	32.4	12.6

*Excluding personal Computer sales

COMPARISON OF BIG TEN

COLLEGE BOOKSTORE OPERATIONS

(RELATED TO TOTAL SALES)

SCHOOL	BOOK SALES	GROSS MARGIN	DIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS
University of Minnesota	75.3%	23.2%	11.8%
University of Wisconsin	73.8	32.4	12.6
Michigan State University	60.3	24.9	14.9
University of Michigan	58.2	28.5	14.7
Indiana University	57.5	27.6	14.8
University of Illinois	85.2	21.8	8.1
University of Iowa	65.5	25.5	9.1

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of English
Lind Hall
207 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2595

New telephone: 612/625-3882

31 October 1986

Professor Marty Roth
Chair, University Bookstores Committee
Twin Cities Campus Assembly
207 LindH

Dear Marty,

A few years ago I suggested to then Vice-President Nils Hasselmo that intellectual life on campus would be enhanced if the bookstores were to stay open for business later on weekdays. In particular I thought that the bookstores should extend their opening hours until the beginning of Extension classes (6:20 p.m.) more than one night a week--both as a reasonable service to Extension students, and also as a way of counteracting the general tendency for campus life to dry up at 4:38. If I remember right Williamson Hall did extend its hours a bit for a while; but now they are back on the old schedule.

I know that the University annually faces the problem of how to allocate fairly excess profits made by the bookstore. It seems to me that one proper use of such profits would be to improve bookstore services late in the afternoon.

Does the bookstore have any information on how expensive it would be to do that? If the cost is not prohibitive, I hope that your committee will encourage the kind of change that I suggest.

Yours truly,

Michael Hancher
Director of Graduate Studies

MH/hs

cc: John Wallace

* Copy for Dec. 9 SCC meeting

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of English
Lind Hall
207 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2595

New telephone: 612/625-3882

10 November 1986

Professor Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
N309 Elt H

Dear Professor Berscheid:

I see in the 29 October 1986 issue of Brief that the Senate Consultative Committee will continue its recent discussion of the allocation of bookstore profits. Therefore I enclose a copy of a letter that I sent on 31 October 1986 to Professor Marty Roth, Chair of the University Bookstores Committee, suggesting what I think would be one appropriate use of those profits.

Yours truly,

Michael Hancher

Michael Hancher
Director of Graduate Studies

MH/hs

enclosure

c: Professor Marty Roth

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

November 3, 1986

To: Marty Roth
Chair, University Bookstores Committee

From: Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee, and
Roy St. Laurent
Chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee

Here are a few thoughts in response to your October 24 memorandum. First, I don't suppose an Assembly or Senate committee ever has power to spend any of the University's money except from the Senate's own budget. Nearly all Senate and Assembly committee decisions are necessarily advisory. One of the responsibilities of the Bookstores Committee, as stated in the Assembly Rules, is "to make recommendations for the disbursement of surplus funds, if any..." A useful clarification would be specification of to whom the recommendations are made. The reason for the Committee's existence is presumably to bring the judgment of users, that is, students and faculty, to bear on decisions about the use of surpluses.

The Bookstores Committee is also charged with establishing guidelines for the disbursement of any surpluses, and the Steering Committee would be very much interested in knowing that your committee has in fact set guidelines, and what those guidelines are.

We have minutes in our files from last year's Bookstores Committee meetings; they indicate the Committee has worked conscientiously in arriving at its recommendations. At the same time, central administration is challenging the premise which justifies that part of your committee's assignment. Clearly, within this academic year, these conflicting views have to be reconciled.

Mr. James Duffy will join the Assembly Steering Committee on December 4 (in a sub-part of the Senate Consultative Committee meeting). We will take up with him the host of questions set out in the October 23 meeting. Please join us for that meeting if your schedule permits it. The time of the Bookstores item within our 12:15 to 3:00 meeting is yet to be determined. By copy of this memo and of our upcoming letter to Mr. Duffy which will contain our questions, we will inform Linda Ellinger, chair of the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs, of the meeting and will invite her to come as well.

If the Bookstores Committee will meet in the meantime, perhaps they would like to consider how effective they are able to be on the first two of their duties and responsibilities--serving as an advisory committee to the Bookstores director, and recommending policies concerning the Bookstores' operation.

:mp c: Linda Ellinger, Shirley Clark

OCT 2 7 1986

university of minnesota memo

Date October 24, 1986

To Ellen Berscheid

From Marty Roth

Subject Bookstores Advisory Committee

I don't know what the chain of command is here, but I wanted to let you know that last year's committee did address itself to student interests, not by recommending that money be ploughed back into bookstore operations, but by recommending a $300,000 endowment for the Presidential Outstanding Minority Scholarship Fund. I have already sent a letter to the deans soliciting proposals for the next installment, which is $400,000. I would like to have student proposals. Perhaps the students on your committee would like to make one?

What I would like are copies of the minutes of meetings that pertain to the bookstore so that I can share them with my Committee.

Most importantly, can you tell me who has the power to spend this money? The experience of last year and today's Daily suggests that it's the administration. If so, why is the Committee working up recommendations and reporting them to the Student Affairs Committee. I would really appreciate it of you or someone could tell me what the structure is.

Bus Adm Form 536A-Rev 2/84
S92049 (P-855B)

ANNUAL REPORT 1985-86
BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Bookstore Advisory Committee held three meetings in the 1985-86 year. The most important item for consideration was the large excess in the Bookstore Reserve Fund. After review of several projects presented by administration, the committee recommended that the following allotments be made from the fund.

1. $300,000 to create an endowment in support of the Presidential Outstanding Minority Scholarship Fund.

2. $400,000 in support of Project Woksape to improve computer operations used for education within the University.

3. $500,000 to be held in reserve for support of further projects.

At its last meeting the committee recommended that each University dean be asked to recommend potential uses of the reserve fund in order to support University programs.

BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MAY 29, 1986

A brief meeting was called to order with the report on operations from Jim Duffy. Two aspects were emphasized. First, the Bookstore on the West Bank will be going through remodeling. Although the remodeling started slightly behind schedule, Mr. Duffy hopes that the completion date will be before the fall quarter begins. Secondly, Mr. Duffy believed there was approximately $400,000 remaining in the Bookstore Reserve Fund.

We also discussed the committee's role in recommending allocation of funds from the Bookstore Reserve Fund. It was decided that a letter would be written to each of the deans requesting suggestions for projects on which these funds might be spent. The committee also asked that a letter be written to Vice President Murthy emphasizing the committee's concern regarding not being notified of the administrative decision after our original recommendation for deposition of the excess reserve fund was made.

Respectfully submitted,

I. Dodd Wilson, M.D.
Chairman, Bookstore Advisory Committee

BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1986

Members Present

Dodd Wilson
Mary Nelson
Marty Roth
Louise Straus
Ann Loper
James Duffy

Guests

Barbara Pillinger (Merit Scholarship Program)
Judy Kirk (Minnesota Foundation)
Donald Riley (Project Woksape)
Kevin Smith (Minnesota Daily)

Members Absent

Shannon Beaudin
Daniel Luchsinger
Robert Morris
Bruce Vandal

The meeting was called to order and the minutes of the November 19, 1985 meeting were approved. The Bookstore reserve fund surplus was discussed briefly by Mr. Duffy. The excess is close to $1,200,000. Don Riley presented the needs of Project Woksape. He stated that this project is supported by a $7,500,000 gift in the form of a three year grant, renewable each year, for computer hardware and some software. There are no University funds committed to support this project. Most of the project money will go to the Institute of Technology although in the near future this will become a University-wide program. Funds will be spent primarily for teaching-related research and development. There are some projects that will have a primary investigative component. Mr. Riley felt that the project will need between $685,000 and $1,000,000 for the remainder of this academic year. Other possible sources include $100-200,000 from indirect cost recovery.

Barbara Pillinger described the merit-based scholarships at the University. Her role is that of Director of the Academic Honors Program. She coordinates the Elmer L. Anderson National Merit Scholarship, the Presidential Scholarships and the Morton S. Katz and President's Outstanding Minority Scholarships. Her request was for an endowment for high ability minority students. They would like to be able to fund a student for each of his/her four years in college. The scholarship is $1,000.00 and is identical to the Morton S. Katz scholarship which is already funded for a small number of students. The goal of the University is to have twenty of these scholarships awarded each year.

The committee heard brief presentations from Mary Nelson regarding the need for more accessible audio-visual equipment and from Louise Straus regarding need based scholarships in the University. Because administration had not requested this, the committee did not consider these requests further. The committee will ask the administration for a discussion of needs regarding the re-entry or non-traditional student in the area of merit-based or needs-based scholarships.

A motion to fund the Presidential Outstanding Minority Scholarship at the level of $500,000 for endowment was defeated 3 to 2. The final motion recommending that an endowment be created for the support of the Presidential Outstanding Minority Scholarship Fund at the level of $300,000 from the Bookstore excess reserve fund was passed unanimously. Next a motion was made by Ann Loper and seconded by Mary Nelson to provide initial support to the Project Woksape at the level of $400,000. This was also unanimously approved by the committee. The committee also recommended that the remaining $500,000 not be spent but that further requests be brought to the committee by the administration in order to develop recommendations for the best use of these funds.

Respectfully submitted,

I. Dodd Wilson, M.D.
Chairman, Bookstore Advisory Committee

BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 19, 1985

Members Present

Dodd Wilson
Mary Nelson
Marty Roth
Louise Straus
Ann Loper
Daniel Luchsinger
Robert Morris
Bruce Vandal

Members Absent

James Duffy
Shannon Beaudin

Guests

Vice President David Lilly
Vice President Rama Murthy
Robert Stans

The committee meeting began with a brief review of the bookstore reserves and surplus funds. Vice President Lilly made a presentation asking that the committee support those priorities set by central administration for use of the excess in the reserve fund which totals close to one million dollars.
Vice President Murthy then presented priorities, the first of which was support of project WOKSAPE. This project represents a three year 7.5 million dollar grant from IBM to the University for 450 work stations plus an IBM 4381 main frame computer. The grant is designed to support innovative instructional research and also the development of computer based delivery of instruction. Other institutions that have been recipients of these grants have between 50 cents and $2.00 for every dollar of grant support in order to develop the project successfully. A budget was presented for the 1985-86 year which would include $685,000 for technical support and training, hardware support and maintenance on IBM hardware and software, programming and program management and instructional design. Other items mentioned by Vice President Murthy were support of the library automation project, partial or total support of a graduate school chair and use of the money to support the Presidential Scholarship Fund. Members of the committee raised the possibility that part of the funds might be used to support audio-visual needs at the University and to defray costs of books for students or to support scholarships other than those within the Presidential Fund. We agreed to obtain as much information as possible regarding alternatives and to discuss the project further at the next Bookstore Committee meeting.

Bob Stans gave a general brief overview of the operations of the bookstore to the committee. Professor Roth asked that an item on our future agenda be a discussion of the responsiveness of the bookstores to all groups of students, with special emphasis on non-traditional students who are likely to use the University primarily in the evening.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Project Woksape
139 Shepherd Laboratories
100 Union Street, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 376-2390

November 15, 1985

TO: C. Luverne Carlson, Asst. Vice President
Support Services and Operations

FROM: Donald R. Riley, Project Director

As we had discussed over the telephone, there is a real need for support of Project Woksape, the three-year $7.5 million IBM grant to the University. The grant was only for IBM hardware and software: approximately 450 workstations (PC/XT/AT), plus and IBM 4381 mainframe computer. The purpose of the grant is to support innovative instructional research and development of computer-based delivery of instruction (CBI). The projects to be supported are to be small pilot projects in nature; in some cases this involves establishment of small clusters of workstations to support pilot class use of developed software.

In the first phase of the project, there are 41 projects and 71 principal investigators in four colleges: Ag, CLA, Ed, and I.T. Over 130 workstations have already been delivered. Over the three years of the grant, I expect all of the colleges on the Twin Cities campus to participate in the project through the submission of proposals for development.

To date, there has been no substantial commitment of University funds to support the software development projects proposed in the grant. There are many needs associated with such development: non-IBM hardware and software, maintenance, programming support, programming management, instructional design, etc. Some funds have been made available to support two additional positions in the Microcomputer Services Group to provide additional technical support and training courses. However, the funds needed for supporting the principal investigators in pursuing their projects are enormous.

At this point in time, it is difficult to accurately estimate the required funds, although I am trying to generate such a budget document for submission to Central Administration. I have asked the colleges involved to help me develop such an estimate, but it is not ready yet. However, since we are the 19th school to be brought into this program by IBM, I have been trying to benefit from the experiences of the other schools, some of which have been in this program for over a year. Based on their experience, as well as other published data, the estimated additional funds

required to support such a significant activity vary from $.50 to $2.00 for every dollar of donated hardware and software. From talking with various of the schools, it appears that the schools who gave me the lower amount are also those who are struggling the most to make any real progress. From discussions with the four colleges, my best estimate is that it will cost us from $1.00 to $2.00 per dollar of grant if we are to be successful.

For Project Woksape, this would mean that additional funding of from $7.5 to $15.0 million would be required to make us successful. Obviously, this is a very high figure -- one with which it is not easy to deal with. I don't believe that anyone was really aware of the magnitude of the related costs at the time the grant was accepted by the University. There has never been a comparable grant or activity at the University before. Nevertheless, I do believe it is a tremendous opportunity for the University, if we are able to muster the necessary resources to insure the success of the projects. This project has the potential to significantly impact the overall instructional environment at the University, by helping make it possible to introduce computer technology into the classroom in new, innovative ways that truly enhance the educational experience.

I am aware that Support Services has generated a significant surplus this year. In particular, I am aware that the Book Center computer sales have generated a significant profit this year. I am writing to request that you and your committee consider dedicating some of those funds to support of Project Woksape. Since the software developed under this grant will directly benefit students in the classroom, it would seem to be a very fitting use of the profits from the Book Center computer sales. I would also offer my support for indirect support of the project through additional resources being dedicated to the Book Center computer sales and the Microcomputer Services group.

I have tried to estimate some of the major Project needs for support. Please feel free to ask me for more information or for clarification. The items listed below do not represent the total project needs, rather some of the additional support needs which the colleges/departments are not able to provide at this time

Project Woksape Support Needs 1985-86

Technical support, training -- Micro group	$ 60,000
Hardware support, maintenance -- UCC Field Engineering	75,000
Non-IBM hardware/software	150,000
Programming and programming management	300,000
Instructional design, evaluation/assessment support	100,000
Total	$685,000

cc: D. Lilly, J. Wallace, R. Heydinger, V. Rama Murthy
Woksape Advisory Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MORTON S. KATZ AND PRESIDENT'S OUTSTANDING MINORITY SCHOLARSHIP
1986-87

Application Information and Guidelines

This $1000 award will be renewed annually for a maximum of four years for those students making satisfactory degree progress. The scholarship is transferable to other University of Minnesota campuses. For recipients attending Crookston and Waseca, the award will be for two years and may be continued for an additional two if the student transfers to a four-year campus of the University of Minnesota to complete a baccalaureate degree.

The University will consider candidates who meet the following eligibility requirements:

1. High school senior.
2. Member of a racial or ethnic minority.
3. Excellent high school academic performance with grade average of 3.25-3.5 or higher in academic subjects and an overall high school class percentile rank of 85% or above.
4. Strong performance on the National Merit/PSAT examination or comparable academic assessment instrument (SAT and/or ACT).
5. Evidence of outstanding leadership in school or community.
6. Applicant to the University of Minnesota at the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, Twin Cities, or Waseca campus.

The University Katz and President's Scholarship Committee will make the final selection of Katz and President's Scholars. All candidates will be notified of the outcome of the selection process by ~~February~~ April 15, 1986.

Please submit all of the following application materials and documents to the Office of Academic Honors Programs by ~~November 20, 1985~~ Feb. 1, 1986. All materials must be submitted at the time of application.

- Katz Scholarship Application Form
- An essay (250-500 words) on a subject of the candidate's choice, written and submitted by the candidate. The essay will be evaluated on content, originality, and skill in communication.
- List of activities submitted by the student showing the candidate's leadership and participation in high school and community life and any honors received. The suggested format would include leadership positions, years of participation, and outcomes.
- Two letters of recommendation from teachers (one may be from a school counselor) describing the candidate's academic performance and leadership ability and accomplishments.
- High school transcript, including high school rank, (submitted by the high school).
- Test scores (PSAT, SAT, and/or ACT) (submitted by the high school).

SUBMIT APPLICATION AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS TO: Office of Academic Honors Programs, University of Minnesota, 260 Williamson Hall, 231 Pillsbury Drive S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 (612) 373-2147.

University of Minnesota
MORTON S. KATZ AND PRESIDENT'S OUTSTANDING MINORITY SCHOLARS
Application form 1986-87

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Student Candidate Name _____

Address _____
(Street)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

Telephone (_____) _____

High School _____

Campus Selected (Please circle)

Crookston Duluth Morris Twin Cities Waseca

Intended Major _____

Career Goal _____

Predominant Ethnic Background (Please circle)

American Indian Asian/Pacific Black Chicano/Latino

APPLICATION COMPONENTS

- Essay (Attach 250-500 word self-essay)
- High School and Community Leadership Activities (Attach list)
- Two Letters of Recommendation (Names of teachers and/or counselor who will be submitting letters of reference on candidate's behalf)

  1. _____

  2. _____
- Test Scores, Class Rank, and Transcript (see other side)

Signature _____ Date _____

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION: Postmark no later than ~~November 29, 1985.~~
Feb. 1, 1986

TEST SCORES AND HIGH SCHOOL RANK FORM

TO BE COMPLETED BY HIGH SCHOOL OFFICIAL

(All items must be completed.)

Student Candidate Name _____

High School _____

School Address _____
(Street)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

Student ranks _____ in a class of _____.

Standard Test Scores:

PSAT - Verbal _____ SAT - Verbal _____

PSAT - Math _____ Or SAT - Math _____

ACT - Eng _____

Math _____

Soc. S _____

Nat. S _____

Comp _____

High School Official Completing This Form _____

Position _____ Telephone (___) _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Please mail application, the student's transcript, and supporting materials to:

Dr. Barbara B. Pillinger
Director, Academic Honors Programs
260 Williamson Hall
231 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2147

Academic Merit Scholarship Programs
University of Minnesota

1986-1987

The University of Minnesota is pleased to announce the following Academic Merit-Based Scholarships available to high school seniors planning to enroll as freshmen at the University of Minnesota. These scholarships may be used at any campus of the University of Minnesota and are transferable between campuses. Recipients not only receive a financial award; they are eligible to participate in a special four-year program of academic and cultural enrichment that includes retreats, breakfast seminars, and other honors activities.

Applicants who are eligible for more than one award will receive the higher of the awards. All recipients will receive a total financial aid package that meets 100 percent of their demonstrated need as calculated by the University's Office of Student Financial Aid. At least one-half of this total will be in the form of scholarships and grants.

Applicants for the Presidential and Minority Scholarships must submit personal essays and teacher recommendations in support of their applications. Demonstrated leadership qualities are important criteria in the selection process for these awards.

Elmer L. Andersen National Merit Scholarships ($750-2,000)

National Merit Scholarships award $750-2,000 per year for up to four years, depending upon documented financial need and continued satisfactory progress toward a degree. Eligibility requirements include:

- Semi-finalist in the National Merit Scholarship competition;
- Selection of one of the University of Minnesota campuses as **first choice of college** on the National Merit Scholarship Application form.

Presidential Scholars ($1,000)

These awards of $1,000 each are offered for the freshman year only and are not renewable. Eligibility requirements include:

- Minnesota resident
- High school rank in the top five percent;
- Demonstrated exceptional school or community leadership.

Morton S. Katz and President's Outstanding Minority Scholarships ($1,000)

These awards of $1,000 each are renewable for up to four years. Eligibility requirements include:

- Member of a racial or ethnic minority;
- Superior high school academic record;
- Strong performance on the National Merit/PSAT examination or comparable academic assessment instrument (SAT or ACT);
- Leadership qualities and potential.

Application Deadline: February 1, 1986

For application information, please contact your guidance counselor, principal, or:

Dr. Barbara B. Pillinger
Director, Academic Honors Programs
260 Williamson Hall
University of Minnesota
231 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 373-2147.

University of Minnesota

XXI. NEW BUSINESS

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (CIA) ON CAMPUS

RESOLUTION:

This resolution is to be introduced November 6, 1986, at the fall quarter 1986 University Senate meeting, for consideration by the Committee of Social Concerns and SCC during fall and winter quarters.

WHEREAS the CIA has violated international law and has committed acts of violence against people and property in many nations;

WHEREAS the University policy concerning recruitment needs to be studied at a Senate committee level;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate Committee of Social Concerns be urged to investigate University recruitment policies and to discuss the intent of the CIA's presence in a University setting;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the University of Minnesota campuses.

BRENDA ELLINGBOE
CLA Senator

As an item of new business the resolution was referred to the Senate Consultative Committee for consideration at a future meeting of the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

March 9, 1987

Professor Timothy Knopp
Chair, Senate Committee on Social Concerns
Forest Resources
101c Green Hall
St. Paul Campus

Re: Senate resolution on CIA recruiting on campus

Dear Professor Knopp:

When the Senate Consultative Committee asked your committee to consider the resolution that was introduced at the November Senate meeting, it also requested you to make a progress report to the Senate on May 14 (whether or not you were at the point of having a motion to present for action). Since that time, you have been asked by others to hasten your deliberations.

This letter is simply to tell you that the SCC is concerned that you have enough time to reflect on this matter and to coordinate your activities, as we requested, with the Placement Services Committee. If your two committees find yourselves in accord and ready to submit a motion to the Senate for the April 16 meeting (docket deadline, April 2), please do so. We urge you, however, to take the time you need to prepare your proposal. The SCC, as the steering committee of the Senate, proposed that the involved committees have at least four months to complete their work because the project is an important one, requires coordination among two governance committees and CLA's Career Development Office, and should produce a result with which the University will be satisfied to live for years.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

EB:mp

c: Shirley Clark
SCC Asociate Chair
Roy St. Laurent
Student SCC Chair

Andy Seitel
Student SCC Vice Chair

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

January 9, 1987

Professor Timothy Knopp
Chair, Senate Committee on Social Concerns
Forest Resources
101c Green Hall
St. Paul Campus

Re: Resolution on CIA recruiting

Dear Professor Knopp:

As you know, at the November 6 University Senate meeting, Brenda Ellingboe introduced a resolution concerning University policy on recruitment and the availability of University offices for CIA interviews of students. A copy of the resolution is attached. As Senate bylaws stipulate, that item of new business, because it had not yet had committee attention, was referred to the Senate Consultative Committee.

At its December meeting, the Consultative Committee voted to ask the Senate Committee on Social Concerns to consider that resolution. With this letter I officially transmit that request to you for your committee's attention. Ms. Ellingboe has, I believe, already provided you with a copy of the packet of materials she compiled which relate to her resolution. Her memorandum listing her suggestions for committee activity is also attached.

We are at the same time asking the Assembly Committee on Placement Services, chaired by Lee Stauffer, to spearhead an attempt to devise a campus recruiting policy. We expect that your two committees will want to coordinate your deliberations and activities.

At the February 19 Senate and Assembly meetings, SCC and its component Assembly Steering Committee will report the ways in which we have steered Ms. Ellingboe's resolution. It is our hope that Social Concerns will make a progress report to the Senate at the May 14 meeting, whether or not it wants to introduce a motion at that point.

Please keep us informed of the progress of your deliberations, perhaps through a copy of your meeting minutes. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

bc: Shirley Clark
Roy St. Laurent
Andy Seitel

EB:mp

Attachments (2)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

March 9, 1987

Professor Lee D. Stauffer
Chair, Assembly Committee on Placement Services
Health Service Administration
Box 187 Mayo

Re: Senate Resolution on CIA
Recruiting on Campus

Dear Professor Stauffer:

On January 7 I wrote to you on behalf of the Assembly Steering Committee and asked the Placement Services Committee to take the lead in formulating a campus recruitment policy. The request was, as you know, prompted by the resolution that was introduced to the Senate on November 6 and that was concerned with CIA recruitment on campus.

In my letter I asked the Placement Services Committee to report to the Assembly on either April 16 or May 14 its progress toward creating a campus recruiting policy. The Steering Committee believed that your committee would require several months to complete its work, particularly since we asked you to coordinate your deliberations with the activities of the Senate Committee on Social Concerns and the CLA Career Development Office.

We are aware that others have since asked your committee to speed up its deliberations and that, as a consequence, both you and the Social Concerns Committee are attempting to have a motion ready for presentation to the Assembly and Senate on April 16. (The deadline for docket material for that meeting is April 2, by the way.) The point of this letter is simply that the Assembly Steering Committee wishes to reaffirm that it is important that any document we bring to the Assembly reflect careful thought and serve the University well in the years to come. Thus we would welcome an early completion of your work only if you are fully satisfied with the result that you can achieve within the next few weeks.

We believe that your committee and the other bodies involved should take whatever time you feel necessary to arrive at a considered recommendation.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee

EB:mp

c: Shirley Clark,
Associate Chair, ASC
Roy St. Laurent,
Chair, Student Steering Committee
Andy Seitel,
Vice Chair, Student Steering Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

January 7, 1987

Professor Lee D. Stauffer
Chair, Assembly Committee on Placement Services
Health Services Administration
Box 197 Mayo

Dear Professor Stauffer:

At its December meeting, the Assembly Steering Committee/Senate Consultative Committee considered how best to steer the attached resolution concerning CIA recruiting on campus which was introduced to the University Senate on November 6. The Committee was struck by the fact that there seems to be no policy governing employment recruitment on the Twin Cities Campus.

The ASC/SCC voted to ask the Assembly Committee on Placement Services to spearhead an attempt to devise a campus recruiting policy. The Steering Committee wishes to suggest that in this effort your committee might want to seek input from CLA's Career Development Office and coordination with at least two central administrative offices which will have an interest: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

The Consultative/Steering Committee will report back to the Senate at its February 19 meeting on where it has steered Ms. Ellingboe's resolution on CIA recruiting. Would you please plan to report to the Assembly at one of the two scheduled Spring Quarter meetings, April 16 or May 14, on the progress the Placement Services Committee is making toward establishing a campus recruiting policy? By copy of this letter we will alert Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to the assignment we are asking you to undertake.

The Consultative Committee is steering the resolution itself to the Senate Committee on Social Concerns and you will want to coordinate your activities with their deliberations also. Under separate cover we are sending to you, as to Social Concerns, a packet of reading materials compiled by Ms. Ellingboe, together with a copy of her December 30 memorandum to SCC's staff assistant. The memorandum includes a list of her personal wishes for the way Placement Services, Social Concerns, and also the CLA Career Advisory Committee, will proceed this winter.

If you have any questions about our request of you, please feel free to telephone me. The Steering Committee appreciates your serious consideration of its request.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee
and Senate Consultative Committee

EB:mp

c: Vice President Frank Wilderson
Vice President Roger Benjamin

Attachment: resolution and memorandum

bc: Shirley Clark
Roy St. Laurent
Andy Seitel

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 4, 1986
12:30 - 2:45
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

12:30 1. Reports:
   a. Finance Committee, Professor Shively
   b. Student SCC, Mr. St. Laurent
   c. SCC/FCC, Professor Berscheid
   d. Other.

12:45 2. External Governance Review: Suggestions for the External Reviewers' Schedule.

1:00 3. Implementation Committee on Undergraduate Education. Guest: Dr. John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

1:30 4. University Bookstores POlicies. Guest: James Duffy, Bookstores Director.

DISCUSSION/ACTION

5. Minutes of November 20 (attached).

6. Steering the resolution on CIA recruitment (discussion materials attached).

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 4, 1986
12:40-2:55
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (chair), Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Patrick Durbin, Brenda Ellingboe, Richard Goldstein, Ron Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Roy St. Laurent, Andy Seitel, W. Phillips Shively.

Guests: James Duffy, Director, University Bookstores (Twin Cities); Mike Peltier, Minnesota Daily ; Mary Jane Plunkett, adviser, Student Organization Development Center; Maureen Smith, editor, University Relations; John Wallace, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

1. Reports.

A. Senate Finance Committee chair. Professor Shively announced the agenda items for SFC's meeting today with Vice Presidents Benjamin and Kegler: current outlook for the University's biennial request, the sabbatical support proposals, and academic planning.

B. Student SCC chair. Mr. St. Laurent announced that Jill Gaudette has been chosen to replace Patrick Durbin on SCC at the end of Fall Quarter, when he graduates. His replacement on the Finance Committee is still needed. Mr. Durbin will continue to work with Professor Murphy on the University Grievance Procedures through Winter Quarter.

C. Consultative Committee chair. Professor Berscheid announced new Twin Cities Campus steering business for the January 15 SCC meeting: class time and credit hours. Professor Goldstein summarized the case he had submitted in a recent letter to Professor Berscheid:

At the time the West Bank Campus opened, passing time on the Minneapolis Campus was extended from 10 to 15 minutes. Since no other changes were made, the 50-minute class hour was reduced to, and has remained, a 45-minute class hour. In addition, shortly after that change, an argument prevailed for students to have fewer courses per quarter and study each in greater depth, and the standard 3-credit module was converted to a 4-credit module. However, many departments changed neither the number of class meeting times nor the amount of work expected of students. The result, he said, is that class time per credit at this university is probably less than at any other university in the country.

Professor Shively added that student-teacher contact time in Summer Session is approximately 30% less than during the academic year.

An outline of Professor Goldstein's argument will be sent to SCC members together with the other materials for the January 15 meeting.

2. Governance: The external reviewers' schedule.

FCC's and SCC's chairs and vice chairs will meet in January to consider the reviewers' schedule for their February 9-10 visit. Both FCC and SSCC want to meet with them. Mr. St. Laurent hoped there would be a way to give the visitors a perspective on the five-campus aspect of the University by bringing in guests from the coordinate campuses; Mr. Kubik suggested those might be the representative from each campus who served last year on the Special Committee on Governance.

Professor Campbell recommended SCC also solicit the interest of the reviewers in what interviews they think would help them. (The chair will alert them now by letter that the committee will make that inquiry in January.)

Professor Murphy recommended including in interviews people who have been active at critical times. Professor Berscheid and Mr. St. Laurent recommended including past SCC/FCC and SSCC chairs. A tentative schedule should be ready by late January.

3. The minutes of the November 20 meeting were approved. Members have until Monday, December 8 to telephone corrections to the secretary.

4. Implementation Committee on Undergraduate Education. (Twin Cities Campus business.) Guest: Dr. John Wallace, Assistanta Vice President for Academic Affairs, and chair of the committee.

Dr. Wallace told SCC the committee would have a report by the time of the January Regents meeting. He anticipates the committee will make some substantial recommendations for real change. The pace of their work has picked up markedly from the slow process of reviewing the existing task force reports. Each of the five working teams will bring its recommendations back to the full committee on December 8 and 15, and more December meetings will be added if necessary to finish committee work. Dr. Wallace did not want to conjecture on what the recommendations might be, but predicted one would concern the faculty reward structure, along the following lines:

Student evaluation of teaching. Current policy requires each professor to have at least one course per year evaluated by students. The Implementation Committee favors moving to a central policy where every course is evaluated by students on a standard form, with the evaluation being administered by someone other than the teacher. There should probably be some quantification. Each department should be required to have a policy on how it will use the evaluations.

Professor Campbell saw the implication that the results of evaluation would be available to someone in the department other than the instructor, for example, for use in faculty salary decisions. Dr. Wallace said the committee is aware that different departments have different practices and they are not inclined to favor standarizing practices, but rather

publicizing what the various departments do.

Professor Goldstein stated his great concern about making too heavy use of student evaluations, and he recalled there had been extensive discussion of the Senate policy when it was proposed. The evaluations are primarily to help instructors help themselves. We should want to know who the best instructors are so we can reward them, and who the poorest are so we can help them. But he did not think scores were advisable. The open-ended questions have the most value, and certainly so to the instructor. People should read these comments and not a numerical conclusion.

Mr. St. Laurent thought using a standard format need not imply scoring. He regards it as important we make clear that good teaching is important and should be valued. Those making promotion and tenure and salary adjustment decisions, as well as the instructor, should know evaluation results.

There appeared to be considerable SCC support for a policy that every course be evaluated. Professor Shively supported this. His is a department in which every course is evaluated and the results are available to the whole department for use in promotion and tenure and salary decisions. He also favors requiring every department to have a public policy on how it uses the evaluations. However, he opposes a standard form.

Professor Brenner spoke in favor of evaluation for every course. He asked that the two purposes of evaluations be kept clearly separate; evaluations to help the instructor can be different from evaluations for promotion and tenure and salary decisions.

Mr. Kubik favors evaluating every course and believes a standard format would help students to write their evaluations well.

Professor Murphy also favors having every course evaluated. He reminds his students of their consumer role and lets them know what they write will be taken seriously by the department.

Professor Campbell noted that an evaluation is of the course as well as of the instructor. He commended Mechanical Engineering on the usefulness of its survey of alumni.

Professor Latterell said he believed evaluation should be broadened to include also advising, and departments should be asked how they are evaluating each. Professor Brenner remarked that some departments survey graduating seniors via mail, a good point at which to ask also about advising.

Ms. Ellingboe commented that last year's CLA committee on the Morse-Amoco teaching awards rated less highly nominations that had no student evaluations attached. Professor Shively took strong exception to that choice since teaching evaluation is a matter for departmental decision and not really under a faculty member's control.

Professor Berscheid explained that there are objective criteria which affect the validity of evaluations (such as whether a course is required or elected, and the time of day it is given). No one, she said, should be allowed to use the evaluations who is not familiar with relevant literature and who does not know how to interpret the results.

Reviewing the report of the Implementation Committee. Professor Berscheid asked what kind of internal response the committee would solicit before taking its report to the Regents. Dr. Wallace thought that because the Regents' January docket is already very full, it might be good to postpone that reporting until February, and discuss the recommendations with the Assembly Steering Committee in January. Professor Berscheid commented that the Campus Assembly resolution had envisioned more interaction than there has been between the Implementation Committee and both the Steering Committee and SCEP.

In response to a question, Dr. Wallace confirmed that there would be some recommendation from his committee to move in the direction of a core curriculum.

(Note: Copies of the Implementation Committee's report should be sent to Steering Committee members in advance of the January 15 meeting.)

4. University Bookstores Policies. Guest: James Duffy, Director, University Bookstores (Twin Cities Campus).

Mr. Duffy distributed copies of two tables, "Comparison of the Ten Largest College Bookstore Operations" and "Comparison of Big Ten College Bookstore Operations" showing book sales, gross margin, and direct personnel costs in relation to total sales (excluding personal computer sales).

Professor Berscheid welcomed Mr. Duffy and remarked on the bookstores' reputation for being well-run. Mr. Duffy began to answer each of the questions the SCC had submitted to him in advance, and although discussion and related questions disordered that structure, he did respond to every question.

What is the mission of the University bookstores? Mr. Duffy read the bookstores' longstanding mission statement.

What is the bookstores' pricing policy? In brief, it is to price at reasonable figures to provide the customer with the best quality merchandise. The University of Minnesota (75.3%) and Wisconsin (73.8%) have the greatest percentage of total sales (excluding PC's) from book sales. On all non-book merchandise, the mark-up is 40%. On textbooks, both new and used, it is 20%. Publishers provide trade books at list minus 33%. The bookstores try to encourage trade book purchases and offer a 10% discount in certain categories. Generally they sell at the publisher's list price.

The bookstores pay students 60% of the cover price as a way to help books cost the student less. Only a few other schools pay 60%; 50% is the standard. However, the bookstores pay 50% for used books from wholesalers but sell them at the same price as those bought back from students, so gain a higher margin.

The bookstores' gross margin (total difference between what they buy for and what they sell at) is 23.2%. Mr. Duffy explained that he had eliminated computer sales from the analysis because the bookstores' gross margin on them is 4%; including that would skew all the other figures.

Overhead. The bookstores pay for utilities and a "use of facilities" figure, just as if they were a private bookseller occupant. The user charge is $160,895 per year and is based on the construction cost of the buildings.

Professor Berscheid asked why the bookstores give the customer a much better deal on a PC than on a book. Mr. Duffy explained that the University administration negotiated with manufacaturers regarding PC discounts before the bookstores acquired them for sale. The volume has been so high that the PC's have nevertheless generated a lot of the total profit. With gross sales of about $22 million a year, personal computers in 1984-85 accounted for $9,400,000 of those sales. Mr. Duffy mentioned that the Illinois legislature has prohibited University of Illinois bookstores from selling computers and an array of other merchandise, because of complaints from other area merchants.

Mr. St. Laurent asked if all the largest bookstores and other Big Ten bookstores operate basically on a non-profit basis. Mr. Duffy said not all do. Co-ops, for example, rebate money to their members at year's end. The non-profit bookstores aim for profits in the 7% to 9% range, he said.

Professor Shively asked whether, if the bookstores are not trying to make a profit, any savings could be passed on to the customers and whether there was any way to charge less than the list price on books. Mr. Duffy said it might be possible to take one percent off the list price, but added that record-keeping would be hard. If, as Professor Shively suggested, there were a larger mark-up on non-book items, book prices for students could be reduced about two percent.

Discussion then progressed, and returned again and again, to the idea of instituting a co-op design whereby excess profits would at the end of the year be returned to the student and faculty members who have bought books. Mr. Duffy called that a fair way to operate. He pointed out that a co-operative corporation has to have the capital to buy the initial inventory. Students would need to pay perhaps $25 to join, which would be returnable at graduation. The corporation would be subject to the state tax on inventory, which the University's non-profit bookstore is not. The annual return for members might be five to eight percent.

Professor Campbell asked what goes into determining how the bookstores select non-textbook scholarly books. Mr. Duffy replied that the bookstores personnel have tried to get faculty advice and that they welcome more of it. They also rely on publishers' representatives and other sources. They are continuously looking for more guidance. Each of the bookstores has a different buyer for the tradebooks, and each reflects to some extent the different nature of the customer groups in the four stores. He agreed with Professor Campbell's view that encouraging book purchasing among students should be part of the bookstores' mission.

To Professor Goldstein's question, he replied that no university's bookstores give faculty or students a discount on textbooks.

Professor Shively asked whether some price shifts could be made which might have better results for students: for example, giving a five

percent discount on textbooks, paying 50% instead of 60% for used books (to encourage students to hold onto their books), and making up the rest of the necessary two percent margin by a higher mark-up on the non-book merchandise. Mr. Duffy thought that could be done but that a rebate system would be preferable. One problem would be that increasing the profit margin on other merchandise would make the bookstores less competitive witih off-campus merchandisers.

Professor Brenner saw our objective as to make the purchase of textbooks and reference books as attractive as possible to students and faculty. Mr. Duffy told SCC that without a rebate system there will always be some excess profit at year's end.

Ms. Ellingboe asked the size of the advertising budget. Mr. Duffy replied that it is $42,000 and is used in the Daily, athletic programs, other organs with a student audience, and a gift catalog.

How is the bookstores' budget drawn up? Mr. Duffy said first bookstore staff write the budget; then C. Luverne Carlson (Assistant Vice President for Support Services and Operations) and then members of Vice President Lilly's office review it. The Bookstores Advisory Committee doe not get into any budgeting details.

Professor Shively suggested that because the bookstores build in their own operating costs they have no incentive for efficiency. Renovation of the bookstores looks conspicuously better than for the rest of the University. Mr. Duffy told SCC that they have held down full-time personnel and made more part-time student jobs; their personnel costs (11.8%) show a "pretty lean" operation.

How much was spent on the West Bank Bookstore remodelling? How are decisions to remodel made? Mr. Duffy listed four steps: (1) The University Bookstores Committee comes up with a general proposal; (2) the proposal goes to the Physical Plant Department; (3) its proposal proceeds in turn to the Management Committee; (4) the Management Committee's recommendation goes to the Board of Regents.

The just-remodeled West Bank Bookstore was built in 1968, he said, had had no work since then, had asbestos ceiling insulation and pipe covering (no longer allowed), wiring which was no longer up to code, and no sprinkler system. As a positive side effect to the remodeling the bursar's office had to be moved and is now for the first time handicapped-accessible. We accomplished more than cosmetic ends, he concluded. Costs were $497,700 and came from the accumulated reserve. The year-end balances go into the reserve.

Professor Campbell questioned the propriety of the bookstores being able to make their own remodeling decisions when all academic units must compete for funds from a very small pot. The University's money should all be the University's money, he argued. Mr. Duffy replied that clearly the Universitey as a whole should have a reserve fund. He asked how one could operate and make repairs without that.

Professor Berscheid asked how and when, besides for Project Woksape, the margins are spent. Mr. Duffy said the Bookstores Committee solicits

suggestions and requests; the committee's recommendations are forwarded to central administration, which may or may not agree with them.

Mr. St. Laurent commented that while students have the perception the bookstores make profits at the students' disadvantage, we have seen today that that is not strictly the case. However, he said, paying 60% instead of 50% constitutes something of a counter-academic incentive.

How were profits used before the large-scale sale of computers? Mr. Duffy said some went to student scholarships, to the Graduate School's visiting professor program, to the libraries and, on at least one occasion, for uniforms for the marching band.

How did the bookstores reduce profits from the 4-6% range to the current 2% range, and how has the pricing policy changed? Mr. Duffy said they have reduced their profits on a number of non-textbook items.

Have propfits actually been in the 2% margin? Mr. Duffy reported the following profit figures:

Recent 4-6% target years:

1980-81	6%
1981-82	6.1%
1982-83	5.5%

2% target years:

1983-84	1.8%	
1984-85	3.7%	(first year PC's were sold)
1985-86	2.6%.	

In response to Professor Goldstein's question of whether the bookstores pay support for the Microcomputer Center, where people go for advice on, for instance, which computer to buy, Mr. Duffy said the bookstores pay the center for a consulting service. Professor Berscheid asked whether the bookstores had been entirely self-supporting in the training program for the use of PC's and central administration had not provided the start-up costs. Mr. Duffy said that was right. (Note: SCC needs some clarification or further information here since central administrators have told SCC that there was a substantial central investment to set up workshops on the use of personal computers.)

What is the functional relationship between the bookstores director and the Assembly Committee on University Bookstores? Mr. Duffy said the committee has always had an advisory role. In recent years it has advised particularly on the distribution of the above-margin profits. SCC members noted that the first element of the Bookstores Committee's chargs is to recommend policies concerning the operation of the University bookstores. Mr. Duffy told SCC that the committee has been involved in policy change questions such as changing profit margins.

Professor Berscheid remarked that the Bookstores Committee would be the place where any move to change to a co-op/rebate system would have to begin and that the Assembly Steering Committee could ask that body to explore it.

Bookstore hours. Attention turned to Professor Michael Hancher's letter requesting that the bookstores, if at all possible, maintain a later closing time on more than one night a week. Mr. Duffy said the bookstores have been attentive to this question for years. They have worked closely with Continuing Education and Extension and they have experimented with keeping the stores open for various extra hours. They have concluded that keeping the store open late during the first week of classes, and thereafter one night per week, meets the need. They found that beyond that, people stopped in for nothing more than to buy snacks. With regard to Professor Hancher's observation of the "general tendency for campus life to dry up at 4:38," he commented that just keeping the bookstores open will not keep people on campus. Additional attractive events will be needed.

SCC members expressed their appreciation to Mr. Duffy for bringing them welcome information and candor.

Mr. Duffy left the meeting, and the SCC very briefly discussed how to initiate an exploration of the co-op idea. Mr. Seitel and Professors Brenner and Shively volunteered to draft a request to the University Bookstores Committee.

Closing comments came from Professor Brenner, who said that both offering rebates and fostering a more positive book image were desirable, and from Professor Goldstein who remarked that a valuable bookstore service is to make new books available quickly (especially since the libraries do not have new books available for about a year after publication.)

5. Steering the resolution regarding CIA recruiting on campus.

Professor Berscheid thanked Ms. Ellingboe for her extensive efforts in compiling the packet of background materials for SCC members.

Mr. St. Laurent observed that the materials display two issues: (1) there seems to be no policy governing employment recruitment on campus; and (2) the resolution itself, as Ms. Ellingboe introduced it to the Senate on November 6:

> "That the Senate Committee on Social Concerns be urged to investigate University recruitment policies and to discuss the intent of the CIA's presence in a University setting; and... that it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the University of Minnesota campuses."

Ms. Ellingboe recommended that, in addition to Social Concerns' attending to the resolution, the Assembly Placement Committee be asked to develop a campus policy on recruiting. The CLA Career Development Office, she suggested, could be part of writing a recruitment policy. The Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs should advise as well.

Following Professor Berscheid's summing up of the indicated inclination of the Committee, Mr. St. Laurent moved SCC approval of that position:

(1) That the Senate Committee on Social Concerns be asked to consider Ms. Ellingboe's resolution on CIA recruitment; and (2) that the Assembly Placement Committee be asked to spearhead an attempt to devise a campus recruiting policy. The Steering Committee will suggest to Placement that they may want input from CLA's Career Development Office and the Offices of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

The motion was carried without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant