



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall (c/o Agronomy)
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)625-7719

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
May 1, 1986
608 Campus Club
1:00 - 2:00

AGENDA

Approx. time

- 1:00 1. Minutes of April 17. (To be sent later)
2. Recommendations from the C_tF Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus (Assembly Steering Committee business).
(NOTE: Final report expected for distribution at the meeting.)
- 1:35 3. Ratification of nominations to Senate and Assembly committees and other boards.
- 1:40 4. Civil Service representation: approval of motions for the Senate and Assembly dockets.
(NOTE: Docket wording will be sent later.)
- 1:50 5. Child Care Committee report: Approval of a motion to the Assembly.
(NOTE: Docket wording will be sent later.)
6. Governance Committee: preliminary report.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall (c/o Agronomy)
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)625-7719

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 1, 1986
608 Coffman Memorial Union
1:05 - 1:55 p.m.

Members present: Ellen Berscheid, Patrick Durbin, Patricia Gearrick, Richard Goldstein, David Hamilton, Linda Hanson, Ronald Kubik, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin, Paul Murphy, Timothy Pratt, Wanda Reinke, Irwin Rubenstein, Roy St. Laurent, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman (Chair).

Guests: Members- elect Charles Campbell and W. Phillips Shively.

1. Minutes of April 17. No corrections were received.

2. Report of the Chair.

A. Change in agenda. The report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education is not ready yet, so discussion of the recommendations will be postponed to the next SCC meeting.

B. Members were reminded of the luncheon meeting with Congressman Martin Sabo on May 2.

C. Members were reminded that SCC and the Finance Committee would meet jointly on May 7 with President Keller and Vice President Murthy. One agenda item has been added--the criteria for academic unit retrenchment due to unallotment.

D. Search for Academic Vice President and Provost is proceeding according to schedule. The search committee will submit its short list to President Keller about May 15; it is anticipated that the FCC and SSSC interviews will take place during the last week in May and first week in June.

E. Some action on the Child Care Report is planned for the June 5 Assembly meeting rather than for May 15 as earlier considered.

F. Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly agenda for May 15. Copies of the agenda were distributed together with copies of the grading policy motion.

G. Revised University Grievance Procedures. Copies of the most up-to-date revision were distributed to the members. SSSC and FCC this spring

will separately discuss the sections relevant to their respective constituencies. The chair voiced his hope for Senate action next fall.

H. The nominating subcommittees of SSSC and FCC will meet jointly to discuss recommendations for chairs for those committees SCC appoints or nominates.

3. Child Care Report and Recommendations.

Copies were distributed of President Keller's letter to Professor Margery Durham raising questions and seeking clarifications based on the report of her committee. Professor Stuthman reported that Professor Durham had prepared a response to each question except that on what to retrench to fund child care. Professor Stuthman reported that he had suggested to the president that it would be helpful if people familiar with the budget could designate potential budgets to be touched, following which certain committees could suggest choices from among these. The SCC supported this suggestion.

Professor Sorauf voiced his concern that an important issue such as child care might get sidetracked because the basis for estimating need is vulnerable. Since the special committee's estimates were based on waiting lists it is easy for critics to charge that the figures are inflated. Professor Stuthman recommended that rather than rely on any certain number, SCC agree that the need is greater than the supply.

Professor Sorauf cautioned the committee to keep in mind that demand will vary in part according to the amount of service offered and the price charged. Professor Stuthman noted that the special committee had at least in part addressed this question since the coordinator is to deal with outside suppliers as well as inside.

Professor Stuthman remarked that if child care is subsidized for employees, it becomes part of their fringe benefits; users would probably have to trade this benefit off against something else they currently receive. Professor Sorauf noted that having two disparate sets of users, employees and students, complicates the rationale and the economic arrangements for child care provision.

4. Special Committee on Governance.

Ms. Hanson told SCC that the special committee had reversed itself on the question of an open forum on May 15, having concluded that the Senate would probably not discuss the report substantively. The Governance Committee might prefer to submit an informational report for the June 5 Senate docket and allow time within the meeting for questions and answers.

5. Open agenda time.

A. Physical plant maintenance and the appearance of the campus. Professor Stuthman confirmed that the issue is on the agenda for May 15 during the SCC's time with President Keller. SCC is making invitations to Vice President David Lilly, Mr. Tony Aydinap (Director of Physical Plant

SCC
5/1/86
page 3

Operations), and Professor Harry Hogenkamp (Chair of the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation) to join that discussion.

B. In response to Mr. St. Laurent's inquiry, Professor Stuthman said the special extended SCEP subcommittee on computers and other information systems would be discussed with members of that group on June 5. The present group is serving in an interim capacity as advisory to Assistant Vice President Barbara Wolfe; as soon as appropriate a standing committee of the Senate should be created.

The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Philosophy
355 Ford Hall
224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
April 30, 1986

The Educational Policy Committee, in support of a recommendation made by the Student Academic Support Services Committee (SASS), recommends that the Twin Cities Assembly adopt the following motion:

That the grade of "F", fail, be used in an A-F grading system for the Twin Cities Campus replacing the "N" in the current A-N system as soon as practical. The "F" represents performance that fails to meet basic course requirements and is unworthy of credit. The "F" would be included in calculating grade point averages as zero (0) grade points in the current four point system.

Comment:

In its discussion of this issue the Educational Policy Committee considered a number of arguments both for and against the proposed change. In support of retaining the present grading system it was argued that a transcript should stress a student's achievement and that grading policies, so far as possible, should encourage students to broaden their selection of courses and worry less about failure. It was also argued that the University has already changed its grading policies too often and that each change introduces a measure of administrative cost and community-wide confusion that often offsets any advantages that the change may bring.

In favor of the proposed change it was argued that the N is ambiguous, since it may represent either academic failure or noncompletion of a course. Although it was recognized that the F may also be somewhat ambiguous, since it too can be assigned in either of these cases, it was argued that the clear connotation of academic failure associated with the F provides students with a strong incentive to avoid it or to seek having it changed to a more appropriate symbol (e.g., W) in those cases when it might represent mere noncompletion. Along these same lines, it was argued that under the present system the GPA is misleading. Some institutions and agencies recompute GPAs, counting Ns as 0, much to the surprise and dismay of students. It was also argued that the present system invites grade manipulation. Students who are willing and financially able to sacrifice credits can avoid the risk of an unacceptable grade and the damage it would do to their GPA by not taking the final examination or completing the course. This discriminates against students with limited financial resources.

After considering all these arguments and noting the force of those on each side, the Educational Policy Committee voted seven to three to endorse the change described in the motion stated above.

William H. Hanson
Chair, Educational Policy
Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

College of Liberal Arts
215 Johnston Hall
101 Pleasant Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
April 17, 1986

Professor Wendell De Boer
Chair, Student Academic Support Services Committee
Office of the Associate Dean
College of Veterinary Medicine
460 Veterinary Teaching Hospitals

Dear Wendell:

On March 13 I wrote to the eight collegiate units which, in replying to the Student Academic Support Services Committee survey sent out during the winter, either favored S/N over S/U as a grading option, or were uncertain. To date I have received five replies. Of the four written replies, copies of which I attach, three units now favor the S/U grading option (Dentistry, Pharmacy, and University College), while Nursing states a reasoned preference for continuing with S/N. Phone calls to the other units have not brought any additional responses, except from the Graduate School, which, like Nursing, continues to favor the S/N.

Adding this new information to your February 26 report of the Student Academic Support Services Committee survey results, I find there are now ten units now on record as favoring the change from S/N to S/U: Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, Education, Institute of Technology, College of Liberal Arts, Home Economics, Continuing Education, Dentistry, University College, and Forestry. On the other side, Nursing and the Graduate School have reaffirmed their support for the S/N, and three other units are still on record (from the survey) as favoring the S/N, Agriculture, General College, and School of Management. But since General College has its own grading system, and will not be affected if the Twin Cities Assembly takes action on this question, I would read the score, in terms of unit votes, as ten to four in favor of changing the S/N to a S/U grading option.

To recapitulate some of the previous discussion, one of the main reasons for restoring the F, and dropping the N, is that "N" in the meaning we have given it is fundamentally ambiguous: it can mean that a student did no work, or did work that was not worth a "D." My view is that if we are to discontinue the principal use of this ambiguous grading symbol, we should also discontinue its secondary use, that is, by changing the present S/N grading option to S/U.

In light of the fact that three additional units now endorse the S/U, may I ask if your Committee would be willing to add to its motion for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly (as indicated in your March 18 letter to Deon Stuthman) a paragraph changing S/N to S/U? The added paragraph might read as follows, based on wording adopted last spring by the CLA Assembly:

That a grade base of S/U (replacing the present S/N), meaning "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" performance, shall be offered as an option to the grade base ABCDF. Neither the symbol S nor the symbol U shall be figured in to the student's Grade Point Average.

Thank you for your attention, and for the patient good work you and your Committee have done on this whole issue.

Sincerely Yours,


James D. Tracy
Chair, Council for Curriculum,
Instruction and Advising

JDT:mjl

cc: Deon Stuthman ✓
William Hanson
Eleanor J. Sullivan
Kenneth Zimmerman

Enclosure



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

School of Dentistry
Malcolm Moos Health Sciences Tower
515 Delaware Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 25, 1986

TO: James Tracy
Chair, Council for Curriculum

FROM: James R. Jensen *JRJ*

RE: S/N or S/U

I see no reason if the F grade is reinstated that we should not use S/U instead of S/N. I personally have never been in favor of the N grade.

JRJ:als



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

College of Pharmacy
Health Sciences Unit F
308 Harvard Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 18, 1986

TO: James Tracy, Chair
Council for Curriculum
College of Liberal Arts

FROM: Mahmoud M. Abdel-Monem
Associate Dean

SUBJECT: S/N or S/U

Members of the faculty of the College of Pharmacy were equally divided on the issue of S/N versus S/U. I suspect that the inclusion of the statement "and including the grade of "0" ... etc." may have caused some confusion. I personally support the change of the S/N to S/U. A grade of U would clearly indicate that the student's performance was unsatisfactory.

MMAM

MAR 18 1986

Office of the Dean



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

School of Dentistry
Malcolm Moos Health Sciences Tower
515 Delaware Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 25, 1986

TO: James Tracy
Chair, Council for Curriculum

FROM: James R. Jensen *JR*

RE: S/N or S/U

I see no reason if the F grade is reinstated that we should not use S/U instead of S/N. I personally have never been in favor of the N grade.

Office of the Dean



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

College of Pharmacy
Health Sciences Unit F
308 Harvard Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 18, 1986

TO: James Tracy, Chair
Council for Curriculum
College of Liberal Arts

FROM: Mahmoud M. Abdel-Monem *MMAM*
Associate Dean

SUBJECT: S/N or S/U

Members of the faculty of the College of Pharmacy were equally divided on the issue of S/N versus S/U. I suspect that the inclusion of the statement "and including the grade of "0" ... etc." may have caused some confusion. I personally support the change of the S/N to S/U. A grade of U would clearly indicate that the student's performance was unsatisfactory.

MMAM



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

School of Nursing
6-101 Unit F
308 Harvard Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-3462

DATE: March 31, 1986
TO: James Tracy, Chair, Council for Curriculum, College of
Liberal Arts
FROM: Eleanor J. Sullivan, Associate Dean, School of Nursing
RE: S/N or S/U

*Eleanor
Sullivan*

This memo is in response to your request for the School of Nursing's position on use of S/N or S/U options. Faculty in the School of Nursing voted to retain the current system with "N" meaning "no credit" rather than "non-satisfactory". The difference between "no credit" and "unsatisfactory" is simply that no credit means that the student has simply not earned the credit for whatever reason and "unsatisfactory" means that the student has attempted to earn the credit and has not done the work in a satisfactory fashion. So, in contrast to your suggestion that "N" means non-satisfactory, the "no credit" definition of "N" more clearly distinguishes between absence of performance and poor performance. It is upon this definition that the School of Nursing faculty made their decision.

I hope this will clarify our vote.

EJS/cm

Dean Fahy



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

College of Liberal Arts
215 Johnston Hall
101 Pleasant Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 13, 1986

TO: Wesley K. Wharton, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture
James Jensen, Associate Dean, College of Dentistry
Kenneth Zimmerman, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Evelyn Hansen, Associate Dean, General College
Frederick Beier, Associate Dean, School of Management
Eleanor Sullivan, Associate Dean, School of Nursing
Mahmoud Abdel-Monem, Associate Dean, School of Pharmacy
Donald Ross, Director, University College ✓

FROM: James Tracy, Chair, Council for Curriculum
College of Liberal Arts

RE: S/N or S/U

According to the recent report by the Twin Cities Assembly Student Support Services Committee (extra copy of summary sheet attached), your unit favors retaining an S/N grading option, rather than an S/U option, if and when the Twin Cities Campus reinstates the grade of F.

If "N" under the new system would mean "Non-Satisfactory," it would take a mind more subtle than mine to discern the difference between "Non-Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" (U), especially since neither the N nor the U would be figured in for the student's GPA. But, presuming we do reinstate the F, students might be inclined to assume that "N" means the same thing it does now, that is, "no credit." In other words, the "N" in the current A/N system may appropriately be given when the student has never attended class, nor done any work.

My question is, since continued use of the symbol "N" would entail at least a slight confusion, are there any reasons that (presuming reinstatement of the F) we should not use S/U instead?

Thank you for your attention.

JT:mjl

Enclosure

cc: Wendell DeBoer, Deon Stuthman, William Hanson

*None that I
can understand
Donald Ross
3/18/86*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

College of Veterinary Medicine
Academic Affairs and Research
460 Veterinary Teaching Hospitals
1365 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
(612) 376-3886

February 26, 1986

TO: Student Academic Support Services Committee Members

FROM: Wendell DeBoer, Chair

SUMMARY OF TWIN CITY CAMPUS GRADING POLICY SURVEY

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Favor Reinstating Grade of "F"</u>	<u>Favor Retention of a pass-no credit alt. system</u>	<u>Retain Current S/N Option</u>	<u>Change to an S-U Option</u>
Agriculture	X	X	X	
Pharmacy	X	X	X ← → X	
Medical School	No change per Dr. McCollister			
Veterinary Medicine	X	X		X
Nursing	X	X	X	
Education	X	X		X
Graduate School	X	X	X	
I.T.	X	X		X
Public Health	No change per phone call			
C.L.A.	X	X		X
General College	X	X	X	
Home Economics	X	X		X
Continuing Education	X Admin.*	X		X
Dentistry	X	X	X	
Biological Sciences	X	X	Not considered	
University College	X	X	X	
Forestry	X	X		X
Law	Maintains separate grading system			
School of Management	X	X	X	

* Student Board in Cont. Ed. votes no.

WJD:sk



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

May 1, 1986

TO: Kenneth H. Keller

FROM: Margery S. Durham, Chair
Child Care Committee *MSD*

SUBJECT: Your comments and questions on the Committee Report

Late yesterday I received your April 24 memo, describing your reaction to our report. At this date it seems unlikely that further committee meetings will be useful, though I will hold them if either you or the committee members, to whom I have forwarded copies of both your memo and this reply, request that I do so. Right now I can answer most of your questions and can make suggestions concerning the others.

The estimate of 1,200 child care openings needed on or close to campus, as well as the 4,500 over-all estimate, comes from the CURA report, "Child Care at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities: A Preliminary Needs Assessment (Jan., 1986). Sources for the figures were: current waiting lists at the three existing campus child care centers; requests for applications at these centers; and requests by University students, faculty and staff at the two main Twin Cities referral agencies. Attached are some relevant pages (pp. 4-6, 12) from the CURA report.

The issue of separate funding for space, maintenance and utilities for various student activities was on the agenda for the Regents' meeting for January 9-10, 1986, as stated in our report, Item F, page 7. Enclosed is a copy of the notice that I received, as well as a page of the November 7, 1985 report of the Office of Student Affairs to the Board of Regents' Staff and Student Affairs Committee. I do not know how this item was disposed of, but have recently discussed our support of this idea with Don Zander in the Office of Student Affairs.

Concerning legislation: Appendix E describes the Dependent Care Assistance Plan, passed in 1981, pertaining

President Keller
May 1, 1986
Page Two

to employee benefits. Organizations subject to taxation actually make money on this arrangement; tax-free institutions can save their employees tax money with an optional, before-taxes deduction from employee salaries. This would cost the University nothing but some book-keeping, and would have the effect of reducing over-all expenses for the employees who chose to take advantage of such a plan.

This could be part of a larger cafeteria benefits plan, described in the enclosed article from the Chronicle of Higher Education (Vol. 32, No. 2, March 12, 1986), "Colleges Permitting Employees to Tailor Fringe Benefits to Their Own Needs." Legal and procedural details are given fully in Appendix D. Under this arrangement no new money would be committed by the University, but employees wanting child care would forego other optional benefits.

Appendix E also points out that federal legislation has passed the House. HR 3700, passed in December, 1985, includes "Special Child Care Services for Disadvantaged College Students" and a "Child Care Personnel Work-Experience Program." This is the House version of the Kennedy bill, S 809. I have no way of knowing whether the Kennedy bill will pass or what the House will do with the building rehabilitation money that Kennedy includes and the House does not. I will forward copies of these bills to you if you want them.

I think that I can get some information about state money not being made use of by the University at present. These funds are available only to students in vocational training, however, and for this reason have never been used by the University.

The funding referred to on page 8 under V concerns primarily start-up money from the Capital Campaign, mainly for the acquisition and rehabilitation of space. Space is needed in order to: 1) facilitate research. Observation space, separate from the play areas, is unavailable at the present centers; 2) start

President Keller
May 1, 1986
Page Three

new child care centers on campus, relocate the existing cooperative centers should their rent become an impossible burden, and provide new, expanded quarters for the West Bank Center. The committee had in mind the McKnight contribution, which seems suited to a University-wide concern such as child care.

The University is eligible, I believe, for the new Emma B. Howe Memorial Foundation grants, whose announcement I have attached, and grants are an alternative source of at least initial funding. We list the development of grant proposals as one of the responsibilities of the Child Care Coordinator, whose duties are described in Appendix A of the committee report.

Some recurrent expenses, however, will have to be initiated by the University, in the hope of getting future legislative appropriations. Child care is becoming a concern in the State Legislature, as is shown by the Spear-Clark bill described in Appendix E. Although that particular bill might not greatly benefit the University, it is an example of the growing interest in child care that was also visible (or audible) in the local precinct caucuses this past winter. Relying partly, then, on growing legislative concern, the recurring item to which we give first priority is the salary of the Coordinator, largely because it has to do with generating more funds.

Lacking full knowledge of the University structure and the University budget, I believe the committee would find it impossible to make responsible recommendations for retrenchment to cover child care costs. We might be willing to rank a list of, say, 15 activities in order of priority, if we receive such a set of proposals from you, but even that seems beyond the scope of our authority. Probably the best we could offer would be a plan for voluntary self-taxation by individual units within the University. I dislike that course of action because, first, the decisions would often be made by those who least need the service, and second, considerable education would be needed before enough units come to see that their investment will reward them with lower employee absenteeism and with either larger student enrollment or

President Keller
May 1, 1986
Page Four

a larger pool of applications from which to select the best students. Our report makes these points; I can see that you understand them; but getting them generally accepted so as to elicit widespread self-taxation would take longer than I believe you want to wait -- certainly longer than we do.

Our committee has found ways -- through DCAP and other employee benefits plans, through grant money, through slight changes in the criteria for student financial aid, and through the acquisition and allocation of space -- by which the University can provide more child care largely through the non-controversial use of its present resources. This seems like an efficient way of both fulfilling the University's intellectual and social responsibilities, and putting the University in a good position to compete for high quality students, faculty, and staff.

We appreciate having the opportunity to report more fully to you, and hope that the information provided here will prove helpful. Of course we will be glad to answer any further questions.

/cb

Enclosures - CURA Needs Assessment, pp. 4-6, 12
Regents' Agenda, January 9-10, 1986, 1 page
OSA Report to Regents, November 7, 1985, p. 5
Chronicle, Mar. 12, 1986, pp. 1, 31
Emma B. Howe Memorial Foundation Grants Announcement,
pp. 1-3

cc: Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
Professor Jack Merwin, Chair, Senate Finance Committee
Child Care Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 24, 1986

TO: Margery Durham, Chair, Child Care Committee
FROM: Kenneth H. Keller 
SUBJECT: Comments on Child Care Report

Thank you for your memorandum of April 14, 1986, forwarding to me the latest version of the report of the Child Care Committee. I am not quite certain whether this represents the final version of the report, but, on the assumption that you might be making further changes and have further committee meetings, I thought it might be useful for me to share some comments and questions with you.

- On page four, you estimate that there is a need for approximately 4500 additional child care slots by current members of the University community, of which 1200 are needed at or close to the campus. I would appreciate a clearer statement of how these estimates were obtained and any information you may have to support their validity. Since the provision of that many slots would give us a program more than seven times larger than that of any other public university contacted in the CURA survey, it seems to me important that we address the question of numbers with more than casual attention.
- On page seven, item II-F speaks to the issue of funding space, maintenance and utilities for various student activities in a separate budget item on the legislative request. I am not aware of any such proposal and would appreciate clarification of the meaning of that statement.
- On page five, the suggestion is made that "... the University should provide funding by taking advantage of federal, state and county subsidies ..." On page six, item II-E, further reference is made to pending federal legislation and Appendix E lists some pending legislation at the state and federal level. To my knowledge, no funding for new titles or expanded funding for existing titles within the Higher Education Act is currently considered at all probable. Does the committee have any information of which I am not aware that money has been or will shortly be allocated for these purposes? Are there currently existing programs of which the University is not presently taking advantage?

Professor Margery Durham
April 24, 1986
Page Two

- On page eight, under V, the committee suggests "... the assignment of as yet undesignated, discretionary funds directly by the University President ... " to these purposes. Were there particular funds that the committee had in mind? The President has no undesignated, recurring funds except for those that are obtained through new appropriations by the Legislature or retrenchment of existing unit appropriations. Does the committee consider all (or some) of the funding needs it reports to be of sufficiently high priority to warrant retrenchment? I realize that the committee cannot be totally familiar with the University's budget, but it would be useful to have an assessment of where it judges the priority for these child care needs to be relative to faculty salaries, graduate student support, academic unit instructional funding, departmental supplies and equipment funding, or other general categories.

Let me be clear that I agree with the committee on the need for child care. However, a lack of specificity on issues of this sort seriously compromises the value of the report in helping us to gauge these needs in comparison to all others. If we are to act quickly, judgments related to the above issues will have to be made and the committee's willingness to share responsibility for those judgments in an explicit way would increase the impact and credibility of its report. Indeed, even its suggestions of areas which should not be retrenched in order to provide funding for these purposes would help us to gauge the relative priority it attaches to these needs.

KHK:kb

c: Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
Professor Jack Merwin, Chair, Senate Finance Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 23, 1986

TO: President Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President V. Rama Murthy

FROM: Phyllis Freier and Carol Pazandak
Senate Consultative Committee Subcommittee
on University Grievance Procedures

RE: Proposed University Grievance Procedures - Revision

The attached Proposed University Grievance Procedures were originally submitted to the Senate Consultative Committee and subsequently distributed to committees within the University. This revision of the proposal reflects suggestions made by the University Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee and the Senate Judicial Committee. The revision also takes account of recent developments within the University, including adoption of the new Tenure Code and the recent decision to appoint an Academic Staff Assistance Officer.

Review by others, including the deans and central administration needed now. The intention of the Senate Consultative Committee is to bring a final proposal to the Senate in the fall, and in preparation for that to distribute a revised proposal to the Senate members at the start of the Fall Quarter.

Please note that these University Grievance Procedures do not address all complaints from all constituents within the University, but are limited to the constituencies and the issues which are defined in the document. They will be incorporated into the University Grievance Procedures Guidebook replacing the sections that address academic freedom and responsibility matters. The changes to the extant 1974 Senate document on Academic Freedom and Responsibility grievance procedures are summarized in the attachment to the proposed procedures which are included here.

cc: Senate Consultative Committee
✓ Deon Stuthman, Chair

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Proposed Procedures	i
University Grievance Procedures Introduction	1
Grievance Support Structures	6
Definitions	16
Section A. Academic and Responsibility Issues	20
Section B. Salary Complaints.	32
Section C. Administrative Actions	37
Exhibit A. Senate Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (1974, 1977, 1978).	A
Exhibit B. Linck Memorandum, November 18, 1974 -- Faculty Employee Grievance Procedures.	B

Drafted by

Professor Phyllis Freier, Senate Consultative Committee
Professor Carol Pazandak, University Grievance Officer

for the Senate Consultative Committee

May 16, 1985
Revised draft April 22, 1986

SUMMARY OF NEW GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

for information only

These grievance procedures have three components. One provides for academic freedom and responsibility complaints, updating the existing University Senate legislation and adding a section dealing with research fraud. This first section applies to all members of the academic community, faculty, academic and professional staff, students, and civil service staff. A second section defines a mechanism for addressing faculty salary complaints. The third section outlines suggested procedures for handling complaints about administrative actions of department heads, directors, and deans, and applies to faculty members.

The procedures all emphasize the importance of informal discussion as a first step as well as early efforts to resolve problems. Major responsibility for resolving complaints is lodged with the collegiate units and with the dean.

Appeals beyond collegiate level are regularly provided for academic freedom and responsibility issues, and in specified cases the all-University Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility acts as the original hearing body. For salary complaints, the expectation is that a college committee will address the matter, and that only in instances when the dean does not follow committee recommendations will there be any review by Central Administrative officers. For complaints about administrative actions, the dean has final responsibility and authority.

Collegiate units determine their own specific grievance procedures within general guidelines of process and time schedule. Admonition is given that failure to file complaints in timely fashion may be cause for refusing to address them and failure to respond within time limits may be cause for moving the grievance to the next step of the process or, in some instances, of automatically finding for the plaintiff.

These procedures do not address all complaints within the University. Other processes are established to resolve complaints that fall outside of the scope of these by nature of the complaint or of the complainant. (See Exhibit C.) These procedures will be incorporated into a revised edition of the University manual, Guide to Grievance Procedures, which outlines all grievance procedures within the University, and includes a chart showing which avenues of redress apply to what kinds of problems.

Draft - May 15, 1985

Revised - April 22, 1986

UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

These University Grievance Procedures are the primary mechanism for addressing a broad range of faculty, academic staff, civil service staff, and student complaints about other University staff members or administrative actions. In conjunction with other existing grievance processes, they are intended to afford members of the University community ready access to the means for resolving complaints in a simple, timely, and fair manner. The first section, Section A. Academic Freedom and Responsibility Issues, is a reaffirmation, with modification, of the existing 1974 University Senate statement and grievance procedures relating to academic freedom and responsibility. The second section, Section B. Salary Complaint Procedures, is a procedure for handling faculty salary grievances. The third section, Section C. Administrative Actions, is a suggested procedure for dealing with complaints by faculty about actions or decisions of department heads, directors, or deans.

Section A. provides all members of the University community: students, faculty, academic and civil service staff, with the mechanism to resolve grievances related to academic freedom and responsibility, fraudulent behavior, including research fraud, and other grievances for which no appropriate hearing body is available.

Section B. Salary Complaints and Section C. Administrative Actions, apply only to faculty. Other University employees are provided separate, though similar, procedures. Faculty who are members of bargaining units also have alternative procedures.

General principles underlying these procedures are that informal mediation efforts precede formal hearings and that resolution is sought in the setting in which the complaint arises and among the parties involved. A genuine, good-faith effort must be made in a timely and unbiased manner to resolve the complaint within the unit before the matter may be brought to a formal hearing process. Further, the complaint must involve an action or situation that clearly and detrimentally affects the ability of the University member to function as a scholar or that threatens the integrity of the University community. A grievance committee may decline to hear a complaint that in its view is frivolous or not substantial enough to warrant a formal hearing process.

Full and fair formal hearings are held by a committee or selected panel thereof that includes representation from the University groups of which the parties to the complaint are members. Hearings are normally held at a level beyond or above that giving rise to the grievance in order to assure that an unbiased and impartial review occurs. Appeals, when warranted, are provided at a next higher level and are based on the record of the formal hearing. The complaint may not be expanded or altered at point of appeal. A new full hearing is not provided, although the appeals review may include testimony from both parties as well as a report from the hearing panel.

For complaints lodged by faculty and staff, only informal discussion should occur at the departmental level, and formal hearings should not be held until a formal grievance is filed with the college grievance committee, or comparable committee on coordinate campuses, and in non-collegiate units.

There is no proscription against departmental grievance committees; in fact, in addressing student complaints they may well be the most appropriate mechanism. However, the following cautions that apply to faculty are also concerns for students. If complaints by students about instructors are heard at the departmental level, care should be taken that students are not discouraged from seeing a hearing because of fear of reprisal from instructors. Possibilities of partiality and personal involvement in complaints between faculty or staff are risks in departmental level hearings. Those units that wish to use departmental grievance committees for formal hearings must be duly cautious to assure fairness. In any event, no complaint involving the head of the department should be heard by the departmental committee, but rather it should be referred to the college grievance committee.

Informal efforts to resolve complaints are generally personal and private in nature. Formal grievance hearings are generally open, with provision made for closing panel hearings when requested by both parties to the complaint or the chair of the hearing panel. In instances when hearings are closed, the findings and recommendations of the hearing will be considered public.

Time limits that are specified in these grievance procedures are calendar days. In all cases, the time intended is the regular academic year. The summer period will not count in the total time allowed. If all parties agree, a grievance hearing may be completed over the summer, but committees should be judicious in initiating hearing procedures unless they can be completed before an extended break in the process.

Time limits are set for initiating complaints and for responding. Failure by the complainant to follow these time limits may be sufficient reason for refusing to address the complaint. Failure by the respondent, gives the grievant the right to move to the formal grievance process and may be justification for the hearing committee to find for the plaintiff.

The grievance procedures presented here do not override the jurisdiction of the Senate Judicial Committee established under the Tenure Code, which addresses grievances related to appointment or non-reappointment, promotion, tenure, unrequested leave of absence and dismissal for cause, and which reserves the right to review, on final appeal, other faculty claims that fall under the tenure regulations.

Other grievance procedures exist to address the complaints of University members, and these grievance procedures complement or complete them, and are not intended to be in conflict. Some overlap may exist, but normally there is one most appropriate mechanism for each individual and each complaint. When jurisdiction is in doubt because of the complex nature of the complaint, the following order of priority shall prevail in determining the original hearing body: 1) sexual harassment, 2) judicial committee matters, 3)

academic freedom and responsibility issues, 4) salary complaints. When questions arise, the college grievance officers or the University grievance monitor should be consulted. If the jurisdictional question concerns the Judicial Committee and the University Grievance Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, the chairs of those committees will normally determine which should accept jurisdiction based upon the issues in the case. In the event of jurisdictional dispute, the University grievance monitor will make the final determination. No single grievance will be addressed in more than one forum at a time and only one process may be followed to its final conclusion within the University. Once a committee accepts jurisdiction for a grievance hearing, only the processes provided by that hearing procedure, including appeals, will be followed.

Note that the tenure code provides for faculty right of appeal from other grievance body decisions if the claim is that a faculty member's "rights or status under these (Tenure) regulations have been adversely affected without his or her consent." (Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure: Sec. 15.1 July 1, 1985). If such review is granted, it will be an appeal on the record.

Other University-level grievance procedures include Civil Service grievance procedures, Academic Staff grievance procedures, the Campus Committee on Student Behavior and President's Student Behavior Review Panel, Bargaining Unit Employees procedures, and the Sexual Harassment Policies and Procedures.

GRIEVANCE SUPPORT STRUCTURES

1. College Grievance Committee

Each college or equivalent unit of the University must have an elected grievance committee, chosen according to procedures developed by the unit, and providing for peer representation on hearing panels. This body shall be a standing committee including, wherever possible, representation from faculty, academic staff, student, and civil service members, each selected by their respective constituent groups. Heads of administrative units shall be ineligible for membership.

Committee members who are involved in a grievance must disqualify themselves, and a process for replacing them, on a temporary basis, provided in the college procedures. Panels should include peer representation and may include only members drawn from the same constituent group(s) as the parties to the complaint.

The committee chairperson, who shall be empowered to receive statements of grievances, shall be selected from committee membership as provided in the college grievance procedures.

This committee will address grievances under grievance procedures, Section A. Academic Freedom and Responsibility Issues. The faculty component of this grievance committee will participate in hearing grievances filed under Section B. Salary Complaints, according to the procedures defined in that section.

2. College or Unit grievance procedures

Every college or equivalent administrative unit must have, and departments may have, formal grievance procedures. These procedures must reflect the principles of fairness, simplicity and accessibility, insuring that:

1. The right to due process of complainants and respondents is guaranteed, including the right to present information, to bring witnesses, to have the support of an advisor selected by the party to the complaint, to hear and refute the presentation of the contending party.
2. The grievance committee includes peer representation with membership reflecting the composition of the unit it serves.
3. Grievances are dealt with as expeditiously as possible, but in any event in accordance with the time guidelines specified in the grievance procedures for resolving complaints concerning academic freedom and responsibility issues, salary complaints, and administrative actions.
4. The grievance committee is given adequate clerical support. The University grievance monitor is responsible for reviewing and approving college grievance procedures to assure that they are in compliance with Senate policy.

Copies of college and unit procedures are to be filed with the University grievance monitor.

3. College Grievance Officers

There shall be a grievance officer of each college, institute, or campus to provide assistance for complainants in resolving complaints informally and

in gaining access to formal grievance procedures. The grievance officer is selected by the head of the unit or by other procedures which the unit has determined. These officers shall file annual written reports concerning the nature of the grievances they have handled together with their dispositions with the University grievance monitor at the end of each academic year.

The College grievance officer shall not be a member of any grievance committee and, with the exception of the officers of the Graduate School, Continuing Education and Extension and other units that are primarily administrative, shall not hold positions that are administrative. The principal responsibility of the officer shall be to monitor all grievance procedures within the jurisdiction of the unit to insure that the rights of complainant and respondent are respected.

In order to advise complainants effectively, college grievance officers are responsible for being informed about all University-level grievance procedures and campus referral services. Faculty and academic and professional staff may be assisted by the Academic Staff Assistance Officer. Students may also be referred to the Student Ombudsman and Advocate Services. When the issue is sexual harassment, referral should be made to the Sexual Harassment Entry Level Office.

The grievance officer serves as a neutral ombudsperson; an adviser, mediator, source of information, and monitor, but not partisan advocate. Any unit grievance officer may request transfer a grievance proceeding from the jurisdiction of an academic unit to that of the next higher unit, if in his or her discretion it is necessary to achieve a fair and impartial

disposition. The higher level hearing body will determine whether it will accept jurisdiction. In disputed cases the University grievance monitor will make the final determination.

In the event that the grievance officer in any of his or her capacities in the academic community is involved in a grievance, the University grievance officer shall act in his or her place.

4. University Grievance Monitor

The President shall appoint a University grievance monitor charged with seeing that grievance procedures are provided within colleges, according to Senate policy. The monitor shall provide information and assistance to unit grievance officers or grievance committees about available grievance processes and assist them in referral of grievances to appropriate bodies. All complaints by faculty members asserting that their rights under the Tenure Code have been violated, shall be referred to the Judicial Committee which shall determine whether the issue is within its jurisdiction. In cases of jurisdictional dispute, when the Chairs of the grievance bodies cannot agree on jurisdiction, the monitor shall determine the hearing body.

The University grievance officer assists in handling appeals from college grievance committees to the University appeals bodies.

The University Grievance Monitor shall prepare a document outlining all University grievance procedures for distribution to those charged with responsibilities related to grievance processes, and accessible to all interested University members. The Monitor is responsible for seeing that

the University community is made aware of grievance procedures and for providing informational meetings for College grievance officers and grievance committee chairpersons. The Monitor shall maintain a record of college and unit grievance procedures and a current roster of college grievance committees and grievance officers.

5. Academic Staff Assistance Officer

The Academic Staff Assistance Officer (Officer) shall provide information and assistance to all academic employees regarding internal University grievance procedures (whether or not arising out of a Rajendar claim) with the understanding that this includes assistance with both discovery and assessing the merits of the grievance. Beyond that, the Officer shall help the academic employee in securing either mediation or a faculty advocate to advise her/him through the grievance process. The Officer shall also recruit and train volunteer faculty advisers to represent parties in the discovery process, during mediation and at hearings.

The Academic Staff Assistance Officer is selected by a committee comprised of two members chosen by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and one member chosen by the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and subject to the approval of the Academic Vice President. (This is a new position, appointed for 18 months beginning in mid-1986. Continuation of the position beyond the initial appointment will be determined by the University. For the selection of the first Officer, the petitioners under the Consent Decree shall also approve the selection.

The Officer reports to and works under the direction of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. (Settlement Agreement and General Release - University Attorney's Office - March 27, 1986)

6. University Grievance Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

This committee functions as an appeals body from actions based on the decisions of an inferior grievance committee, and in special cases as the original hearing body. Experience has shown that most complaints are resolved within the college and that the University committee is infrequently called upon to review or to hear grievances. It is, nevertheless, important to have an appeals process in order to address those exceptional cases. The level of demand and the nature of the work involved argue for a committee comprised of members knowledgeable and experienced in handling complaints. The recommendations for selecting members for this committee reflect concern for these issues.

6a. Composition and constitution of the University Grievance Committee.

The membership of the committee shall be composed of six members of the faculty, four students, two civil service staff members, and one member of the academic staff. Faculty and student members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees, with approval of the University Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the president on recommendation of the Civil Service committee, and the academic staff member shall be appointed by the president on recommendation of the Academic Staff advisory committee. Consideration shall be given to appointing persons who have served as chairs or members of college grievance committees or as college grievance officers.

Composition of the University grievance committee may be changed over time to reflect the composition of the University community served by these procedures. Such changes will be based on recommendation of the Committee to the University Senate Committee on Committees.

This University grievance committee shall be an Operations committee of the University Senate.

6b. Purview of Committee

1) The committee review appeals beyond the collegiate or campus level on issues of academic freedom and responsibility according to the criteria provided in these procedures. The Committee will determine for itself the review to be granted, based on the record from the original hearing. The Committee may decline to consider an appeal if, in its

view, the matter is outside its jurisdiction, or the issues raised in the appeal are beyond those considered in the original hearing.

2) The Committee will serve as the original hearing body in certain academic freedom and responsibility cases in which an impartial hearing cannot be provided at college or unit level, or in cases involving faculty and staff from more than one college. There can be no further appeal within the University grievance structure from a decision of the Committee, except in the case of a faculty member who claims that the decision violates his or her rights under the Tenure Code, and who may therefore appeal to the Judicial Committee.

3) Student complaints will not be heard originally by this committee, but rather will be addressed within the college or unit in which the alleged infraction occurred.

6c. The Committee as an Appeals Body

1) The University grievance committee shall develop its own rules of procedure, subject to review by the University Senate. Following the adoption of these University grievance procedures by the Senate, the Committee shall prepare or review rules of procedure and submit them to the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee for Senate approval. The rules may be amended at any time by the Committee. In any particular case the parties may consent to any variance from the rules with the approval of the panel hearing the case. The Committee shall make its procedures known to appellants and other parties to the appeal at the point when the appeal is received.

2) The hearing panel appointed should, if possible, include peer(s) from groups of which the parties to the grievance are members. Committee procedures must include a provision for temporarily adding a member to serve on a hearing panel, if needed, to accommodate this requirement. A hearing panel will include a minimum of three members.

6d. Scope of Review on Appeal

1) When the committee reviews a grievance hearing from a lower body, it will not grant a hearing de novo, nor rehear evidence, nor will it decide the merits of the case. Rather, it will address the adequacy of the procedures followed and whether the Appellant received a fair due process hearing.

2) The committee may affirm the original disposition of the case, remand the case for further proceedings, or it may reverse or modify the disposition if the substantial rights of the appellant have been prejudiced because the disposition was:

- . made without a reasonable basis in the record taken as a whole;
- . made upon procedures that denied a party's right to a fair hearing, or
- . was in excess of the authority of those making the disposition appealed from.

6e. The Committee as an Original Hearing Body

1) In certain cases, when in the view of the college grievance officer or the University grievance monitor, a fair hearing cannot be provided at college level, the Committee may function as an original hearing body in cases involving academic freedom and responsibility issues.

2) The committee will develop appropriate rules to conduct such hearings. The rules of procedure will be submitted to the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee for Senate approval.

3) In these cases in which the committee serves as original hearing body, no appeal mechanism is provided.

5f. The committee may amend its rules with concurrence of the University Senate. In any particular case, the parties may consent to variance from these rules with the approval of the panel hearing the case.

7. Directory of grievance procedures

In order to provide complainants with adequate information and assistance, the University must publish and disseminate a description of all University grievance mechanisms, of which these University grievance procedures are a part. The University grievance monitor will be responsible for preparing and distributing this publication.

8. Repeal of Contradictory Policies

These procedures supersede the Senate actions on academic freedom and responsibility of December 17, 1970, and of April 18, 1974, and amended March 3, 1977, and March 2, 1978, and any other earlier contradictory policies or administrative directives, specifically including the Faculty Employment Grievance procedures memorandum of A.J. Linck, November 18, 1974.

9. Review and Report to the Senate

A record of the number and kinds of complaints brought to and heard by collegiate and University grievance committees under the provisions of these procedures shall be kept by these committees and reported annually to the University grievance monitor. An ad hoc committee, appointed by the Senate Consultative Committee, shall review the record at the end of five years from date of implementation of these procedures and report to the Senate. The University grievance monitor will be responsible for assisting in preparation of this report. The purposes of the review are to determine the effectiveness and need for modification of these procedures, to ascertain the nature of the complaints addressed, to decide whether grievable matters should be more fully defined or delimited, and to make appropriate recommendations for change.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions used in these procedures are outlined in this section.

Complainant

The party or parties (students, professional/academic staff, civil service staff members and faculty) alleging a violation of academic freedom or charging the respondent with failure to meet academic responsibility.

Disposition

The outcome of any proceeding, formal or informal, including the report made by the Grievance Committee at the ends of formal grievance proceedings. Such report shall include members present, summary of discussion, the committee's decision as to whether the grievance is valid, the reasons for the decision, and recommendations to the appropriate administrator on the actions to be taken. The outcome existing after all appeals are exhausted, or after both parties forgo further appeals, is the final disposition.

Record

The file of all documents and evidence resulting from a particular grievance. For college level hearings, this record shall be maintained in a central college file. Records for University level Grievance Committee hearings shall be kept in a central University file. Records shall be maintained for a period of five years, or longer if University or civil litigation related to the grievance is still unresolved.

Grievance

A formal allegation that there has been a violation of an individual's rights, legal, constitutional, or defined by University policy or rules. These rights must be related to the person's standing as a member of the University community in order for the University grievance mechanisms to be applicable. Members of the University community are those holding

appointments as University staff members, students and scholars with formal University affiliation.

Members of the University community may file grievances based on their perceptions that their rights have been violated. Conversely, the University or its members may file a complaint about an individual for perceived failure to abide by policies, behavior codes, and conditions of employment.

Faculty Member

Included in this class are those holding appointments numbered 9401 through 9410 as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, regents' professor, research associate, and research fellow.

Note that faculty who belong to recognized bargaining units have alternative mechanisms for addressing complaints against administrative actions or salary decisions, as outlined in the contract agreements.

Academic Professional Staff Member

Academic Professor staff members include those with appointments numbered 9701-9799. These are such academic specialists as librarian, psychologist, continuing education specialist, attorney, curator. Individuals in most but not all of these categories may hold continuous appointments in their positions. Some Agricultural Extension staff, those with titles of educator or fellow are also included in this group.

Civil Service Staff Member

Any person holding a civil service appointment with the University at the time of the alleged infraction.

Academic Administrators and Administrative Staff Members

Members of this personnel group include all holding administrative assignments such as dean, director, vice president, president, assistant and associate deans and vice presidents, and assistant and associate to the above posts. These and other similar positions do not carry continuous appointments, and individuals serve at the pleasure of the employer. This group also includes some Agricultural Extension posts, as director, leader, or head.

Student

A person who is or was formally registered in the University at the time of the alleged infraction or who has been admitted and is in the process of registering. Informal course auditors may not file complaints about the course.

Student Academic Employees and Fellows in Professional Training Programs

These are academic classifications (appointments numbered 9511 through 9563) and are primarily graduate assistantships or related appointments.

SECTION A: ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY ISSUES
INVOLVING FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS

RATIONALE

Academic freedom is fundamental to the life of the mind. If a University is to fulfill its missions of intellectual inquiry and advancement of knowledge its members must be guaranteed an environment that supports freedom of inquiry. By the same token, these missions can thrive only when the members of the University community meet and uphold the highest standards of academic responsibility and honesty. The University of Minnesota has long been acutely sensitive to the preeminence of academic freedom in the pursuit of knowledge. The University Board of Regents recognized this fundamental importance of academic freed in a resolution of January 28, 1938, in which it reaffirmed commitment to the principles of academic freedom and responsibility which are corollary to "the advancement of learning and the search for truth."¹ In 1963² and again in 1971,³ Regents of the University expanded upon this resolution, coupling academic freedom and academic responsibility and extending the scope of the resolution to the "entire learning community."

A further clarification of the University as a learning community was added in the University Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of April 18, 1974. "The civil service employee in service to and support of scholarly activities"⁴ was specifically included among those having "responsibility for the maintenance of academic freedom." There is now need to include specifically the academic professional and administrative staff members who share equally in the responsibility to protect academic freedom and to uphold academic responsibility. The faculty, the professional

academic staff, and the civil service staff members, must maintain high ethical and professional standards. Intellectual honesty and integrity in teaching, in professional activities, and in conducting and reporting research must be upheld throughout the University. By the same token the student body must maintain standards conducive to a climate fostering academic pursuits.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY COMPLAINTS

1. What are academic freedom and responsibility issues?

Without intending to develop a compendium of examples or a dictionary of grievable issues, it is worth defining more fully what is meant here by academic freedom and by academic responsibility and what is not included in that definition.

Academic freedom speaks to the intellectual freedom of the University member to teach, pursue research, and to present results of scholarly inquiry in his or her disciplinary areas of expertise without sanctions, fear of reprisal, or interference by others within or outside of the University.

Academic responsibility requires of the faculty or staff member the honest fulfillment of obligations for teaching and scholarship both in terms of the quality of effort and the manner in which the commitments are met. In scholarly work, academic responsibility mandates integrity in reporting and acknowledgement of the contributions of others.

Academic freedom also ensures that the personal beliefs, values, or politics that an individual espouses will not be used as a basis for excluding any individual from the academic community or as a basis for diminishing the rights of any member of the academic community. Academic responsibility requires that instructors or other members of the academic community not abuse their power to persuade or promulgate personal views, unrelated to course or academic objectives. Academic responsibility also requires that members of the academic community uphold and abide by University policies and standards related to equal opportunity and sexual harassment.

2. What are not considered academic freedom and responsibility matters?

Two classes of complaints can be identified that are not addressed by the Committee. On the one hand, there are matters that have serious implications or consequences for the individual as a member of the University community and that are addressed under other grievance channels, for example, salary complaints, issues that concern promotions and tenure, sexual harassment, and discrimination based on race, religion, age, or handicap.

Secondly there are complaints not grave enough to constitute a violation of academic freedom, but that are a source of annoyance and distress. Such issues may result from administrative decisions, for example, course teaching responsibilities, allocation of office space, permission for leave, or they may arise from personal disagreements among colleagues.

It is the responsibility of the unit head and finally of the dean to address such complaints and to seek appropriate resolution. Clearly

or when notification should have been given, stating the grounds upon which the appeal is based. (See Introduction, 6d.)

Upon receiving the notice of appeal, the chair of the Committee shall notify each party to the case and the University grievance officer of the appeal. Upon request by the chair of the committee, the University grievance officer shall assist in obtaining, for the use of the parties and the committees, the record of the hearing held at the lower level.

If the University grievance committee decides that the grounds for appeal are sufficient for review, it shall review the record of the hearing following its own rules of procedure as developed within the general guidelines for appeals outlined in the Introduction.

The University committee should complete its review within 45 days and send its findings to the appropriate vice president who will be responsible for implementation if accepted and explanation of reasons if rejected.

Research Fraud

In cases of alleged research fraud, the grievance procedure requires an additional step between Step 1, informal discussion at the departmental level, and Step 2, formal grievance. If Step 1 does not resolve the matter, then any party to the case (the person reporting the alleged fraud, the potential defendant, or the department chair) may refer it to the dean's office for a preliminary investigation, to determine whether a formal charge of fraud should be brought to the college grievance committee. The dean will appoint an ad hoc "fact finding committee" of peers, which will gather

information in order to determine whether further action is required. If the facts clearly warrant no further action, the matter is dropped. If the facts warrant further inquiry, then the matter will go to the college grievance committee as in all other cases of academic freedom and responsibility, as just described. The committee may bring in outside experts, including the ad hoc committee that conducted the preliminary investigation, as it deems necessary for a full understanding of the alleged fraud. If there is no university complainant who believes that his or her rights have been abridged by the alleged fraud, then the Academic Vice President's office may act as a complainant on behalf of the entire University community. The University may initiate dismissal proceedings for cause against those found guilty of research fraud, when this is deemed to be in the best interests of the University.

Definition of Research Fraud

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR AD HOC "FACT FINDING" AND FOR GRIEVANCE COMMITTEES IN
CASES OF ALLEGED FRAUD

1. If the ad hoc committee determines there is probable cause for a full hearing by the grievance committee, then sponsoring agencies should be notified that there is an investigation underway.
2. During the course of the investigation, all individuals involved should be advised of the progress of the investigation and be afforded the opportunity to respond and provide additional information.
3. If the alleged fraud is substantiated, consideration should be given to the review of all research with which the individual is involved.
4. If the alleged fraud is substantiated, sponsoring agencies should be notified of the findings of the investigation and appropriate restitution should be negotiated.
5. If fraud is substantiated, all abstracts and papers based on the fraudulent research should be withdrawn and the editors of journals that have published abstracts or papers should be notified.
6. If the alleged fraud is not substantiated, formal efforts must be taken by the University to restore fully the reputation of the individual(s) accused. The University may take action against parties whose allegations were demonstrated to have been malicious or intentionally dishonest.
7. All appropriate action must be taken to protect and encourage those people who have honestly brought forward allegations of fraud, in order to foster an environment that encourages honest, open research and discourages all elements of academic fraud and dishonesty.

N.B. Portions of these guidelines were taken from the list suggested by the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges in "The Maintenance of High Ethical Standards in the Conduct of Research," June 24, 1982.

FOOTNOTES

¹Academic Freedom Resolution, Board of Regents, University of Minnesota,
January 28, 1938

²Freedom and the University, Statement, Board of Regents, University of
Minnesota, December 14, 1963

³Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Statement, Board of Regents, University
of Minnesota, January 8, 1971

⁴University Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility,
April 18, 1974

SECTION B. SALARY COMPLAINTS

RATIONALE

Salary issues are a concern to almost everyone in the University community. It is difficult, if not impossible, to compensate each faculty member in a manner commensurate with contributions to the University. Realizing that this ideal situation does not exist, the University needs a systematic method to lodge complaints for faculty members who believe that their salary has been unfairly determined. The amount of salary paid to a faculty member, at least in the nonunionized parts of the University, is an individual contract between that faculty member and the Board of Regents; the amount of salary is not guaranteed by tenure codes or statements on academic freedom. However, as in any organization, a prevailing distrust of procedures or disgruntlement with salary determinations is undesirable.

This salary grievance procedure requires an examination of whether salary determinations have been based on appropriate criteria. There may be instances when salaries have been unfairly determined, and there may also be misunderstandings that have arisen because salary determinations have not been explained to the faculty. However, there are realistic constraints which must inform the review process: the salary pot is finite, and more than half of the people will be below the median. Complaints must be non-trivial involving either significant amounts of money or failure to comply with University-mandated directives.

The procedure outlined is based on two premises; the faculty member has a right to know on what grounds the salary assignment is made, and the department head or body making the salary decision has an obligation to use a common set of standards and criteria in all departmental salary decisions.

The procedure is a three-step process, with provision for appeal only under limited conditions. The emphasis is on informal resolution with any necessary formal hearing within the faculty member's college. Time limits have been specified to expedite resolution of complaints. The formal hearing process initiated by Step 3 is envisioned as requiring no more than 90 days. (See Table B.)

PROCESS

Step 1: Informal discussion at departmental level

A faculty member who wishes to question a salary decision should talk first with the department head. The college grievance officer, or a faculty adviser of the faculty member's choosing, may be brought in to help in discussions with the department chair. The department chair will not convene a committee, but will review the bases for the salary decision with the faculty member. The department chair has an obligation to respond within 15 days. If the salary is assigned directly by the dean, then go immediately to Step 2.

Step 2: Informal discussion at college level

If satisfactory resolution is not achieved at Step 1, the faculty member should complain within 15 days to the dean. The dean or designee will review the complaint with the faculty member and the department head, and will,

after studying the matter, arrive at an independent determination. The dean should respond to the faculty member within 15 days.

Step 3: Formal hearing by college salary advisory committee

If the dean cannot resolve the complaint to the satisfaction of the faculty member, the faculty member may within 30 days request by letter to the dean that the complaint be referred to the college salary advisory committee.

The salary advisory committee of a college shall be a standing committee of five or more members, three or more faculty members from the elected college grievance committee designated by that committee and two others appointed by the dean who need not be members of the college grievance committee. The latter two members may hold administrative assignments in the college, other than in the dean's office. Staff support for this committee will be provided by the college.

The salary advisory committee shall write out its own rules of procedure which must require a written statement from the complainant stating the rationale for the complaint. It may refuse to hear trivial complaints. If the committee accepts the complaint, it requests a written statement from the department chair or others who assigned the salary, documenting the procedure followed and the reasons for the salary determination. The basic elements of due process must be followed in the hearing process. The committee should keep a written record and a taped recording of any oral testimonies. Both parties should be present if oral arguments are presented to the panel.

The complainant and the dean are obliged to share relevant and necessary information requested by the panel. The salary advisory committee will be given college salary data so that it can make informed decisions.

When a faculty member requests a hearing by the salary advisory committee, a panel of three members will be constituted promptly in the following manner. From the committee of five, the dean and the complainant will each strike a name with the dean striking first. The remaining members will conduct the hearing. The panel will review available data and make a recommendation to the dean about what adjustment, if any, shall be made. The dean will be expected to follow the panel's recommendation. Only if the dean regards the level of adjustment as financially unacceptable may the dean modify the recommendation of the panel. In case of modification, the dean must explain to the panel and the complainant what will be done and the reasons for the action.

If the dean modifies the recommendation, and the complainant is dissatisfied, then the complainant may appeal in writing to the appropriate vice president. The vice president will review the matter and related data, and will uphold or modify the decision of the dean. Any adjustment the vice president makes must be in favor of the faculty member and within the recommendation of the salary panel.

SECTION C. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

RATIONALE

Administrators charged with responsibility for directing a unit, deans, directors and department heads, are required to make many decisions as well as to implement many University and collegiate policies and procedures. Not all administrative actions will be popular; some may be perceived as unfair. Faculty members who believe that they have been unfairly and adversely affected by an administrative action of their unit heads, must be accorded an opportunity to seek redress of their complaints. While this process must be hospitable to the faculty complainant, it must also, at the same time, recognize the responsibility and authority of the administrators.

The dean of a college or school, (or the director of a comparable major unit) has the final authority and accountability for administrative decisions for his or her unit. Complaints about administrative actions should be addressed promptly in a manner determined by the dean. The following three step process serves as a model. Regardless of the process adopted, faculty members should be informed about how to address such complaints.

PROCESS

Step 1: Informal discussion at initiating level.

The faculty member who disputes a decision made by the department head should meet with the department head to discuss the complaint and to seek resolution. The department head has an obligation to cooperate with the faculty member in efforts to resolve the complaint, for example meeting in timely fashion and providing necessary background information. Similarly,

the faculty member must make complaints within a reasonable time period, normally within 30 days of the disputed action. The faculty member may call on the unit's grievance officer or a faculty adviser for advice and assistance.

Step 2: Informal discussion at college level

If reasonable efforts to resolve the problem at departmental level fail, then the faculty member or the department chair brings the matter to the dean. The dean will review the matter and make an independent judgment based on available facts. In the review the dean will meet with the faculty member and with the department head and may call for whatever additional information is needed. The dean should inform the faculty member and the department head of his decision in writing as quickly as possible, but within 30 days of meeting with them.

Step 3: Referral for resolution

Either as part of Step 2 or following it, in the event that such discussion does not satisfactorily resolve the problem, the dean may call on others to assist. If a college committee exists that normally hears such complaints, the dean may call upon that body. Alternatively, the dean may appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the complaint and to advise on resolution. Another alternative for the dean is to name an arbitrator from the University community, but not necessarily from within the college, to collect information and to adjudicate the matter, recommending a course of action to the dean. The dean may also consult with Academic Affairs or with the vice president to whom he or she reports concerning precedents for similar situations, but the final decision resides with the dean.

In the event that the dean does not refer the matter to a committee or arbitrator, the faculty member must still be accorded fundamental fairness. This includes the right to be aware of the contents of all documents bearing on the decision, to hear opposing statements, to present evidence on one's own behalf, and to be represented by an adviser of the faculty member's choice. When a committee or an outside arbitrator acts, a report should be submitted to the dean in writing, summarizing the evidence and the reasons for the recommendations. A copy of the report should be sent to the faculty member.

If the faculty member deems the administrative action to be so serious as to violate academic freedom and responsibility, he or she may request that the college grievance committee hear the grievance. The decision to accept the grievance rests with the committee. Appeals from the college grievance Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility issues go to the University grievance committee.

administrative matters are within the purview of the dean. The collegiate grievance officer may be of assistance in resolving these complaints informally. (See Section C for suggested procedures for resolving administrative matters.)

Sometimes it is difficult to differentiate between Academic Freedom and Responsibility issues and administratively engendered or private disagreements. When there is reasonable doubt, the complainant may enter Step 2. of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility grievance procedures. That committee will then determine whether to accept the complaint.

3. Complaints concerning grades

Grade complaints must be resolved within the unit according to departmental and collegiate procedures. No appeal to the University Grievance Committee is provided. Grade complaints will not be addressed by this procedure except in specific cases where the charge is failure of academic responsibility or prejudicial behavior.

PROCESS

The complaints addressed by these procedures are normally to be resolved within the collegiate units, except in instances where two or more units are involved. In the exceptional cases, the jurisdiction goes directly to the University Grievance Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

This procedure includes effort at informal resolution, a formal hearing at the college level and, if required, an appeal on the record to the University grievance committee. (See Table A.)

Step 1: Informal discussion at department level

The complainant should discuss the problems with the person with whom he or she is in disagreement. If this discussion does not resolve the problem, then the complaint should be taken directly to the department head. Complaints must be brought within 90 days of the alleged infraction or of awareness of the alleged infraction. The department head has 30 days to attempt informal resolution, through whatever means the department has established. At any point in this process the complainant may seek assistance from the college grievance officer.

Step 2: Formal grievance

If satisfactory resolution is not achieved within 30 days of the initial complaint to the department chair, the complainant may request a hearing by the college grievance committee. This request must be in writing, must specify the remedy requested, and must identify the right that has been abridged or the alleged infraction. The complaint is filed with the chair of the college grievance committee within 15 days of failure to achieve informal resolution, i.e., within 45 days of referral to the department head.

On the basis of the written complaint, the committee may determine that no legitimate grievance is involved or that the matter is within the jurisdiction of another grievance procedure. If the complaint is not deemed to be a grievance, the complainant will be so advised. If the complaint is

referred to another University grievance body, the grievance committee chair will transmit the grievance in writing to the more appropriate body, giving reasons for the referral. The college and University grievance officer may be called on for advice in making this referral.

If the complaint is accepted, the chair will within 15 days of accepting the complaints, constitute a panel of three members from the college grievance committee, with one member designated to serve as the chair of the panel. The panel selected should include a representative of the same class as the parties involved, faculty, staff, or student. The constitution of the college grievance committee and the selection of a panel will follow college procedures. The panel will conduct a hearing of the issues set forth in writing by the complainants and agreed upon in preliminary discussion. The committee will maintain a written and taped record of the proceedings. The records should be stored in a designated college file and retained for a period of five years or longer if necessary to assure that they will be available for any later appeal process, including related civil suits. Witnesses may be called. Unless the hearing is closed at the request of the parties to the complaint or the chair of the panel, the hearing will be open. Even though the hearing is closed, the findings will be made accessible at the conclusion of the hearing process. Both parties to the dispute may call on faculty or staff advocates to assist them in presenting their cases. While the participation of attorneys in grievance matters is not encouraged, such participation cannot be forbidden. If the claimant does not use an attorney, then, when the University is the respondent, it will not do so.

The panel will, after hearing the case, withdraw to executive session to conduct its deliberations and make its determinations. The report of the panel will be submitted promptly to the full grievance committee for its review and endorsement, prior to making a report to the dean. The committee should complete its work as promptly as possible, but should issue its findings and recommendations to the dean and the parties involved within 90 days of accepting the formal grievance. Recommendations for action by the dean should be pertinent to the complaint. No damages or other compensatory considerations unrelated to the complaint will be awarded.

The findings and recommendations of the grievance committee are advisory to the dean. If the dean accepts the findings and recommendations, then the dean is responsible for seeing that the recommendations are implemented. In the event that the dean rejects or modifies the findings and recommendations, then it is the responsibility of the dean to explain the grounds for this action to the grievance committee and to the parties involved, and to specify the alternative action proposed. The dean should respond in writing to the parties to the complaint and to the grievance committee notifying them of his or her action within 15 days of receiving the report.

Appeals Process

The decision of the college grievance committee is transmitted to the dean, who has 15 days to respond by accepting and implementing the recommendations or by rejecting and explaining the reasons for rejecting. At the end of that 15 day period, either party to the grievance may appeal the dean's action (or inaction). The appeal must be filed in writing with the chair of the University grievance committee within 15 days of notification of action taken



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
420 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)625-7719

MINUTES
JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
AND
THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
WITH
PRESIDENT KELLER AND ACTING VICE PRESIDENT MURTHY

May 7, 1986
1:05 - 4:20
The Regents Room

Finance Committee members present: Gerald Bauer, Charles Campbell, Linda Hanson (also SCC), Harry Hogenkamp, Gerald Klement, Ron Kubik (also SCC), Sally Jorgensen, Wendell Johnson, Jack Merwin, Chair (also SCC), and Patricia Swan (for W. Donald Spring).

Consultative Committee members present: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner (member-elect), Patrick Durbin, Richard Goldstein, David Hamilton, Cleon Melsa, Tim Pratt, Irwin Rubenstein, Roy St. Laurent, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Chair, W. Phillips Shively (member-elect).

Guests: President Kenneth Keller, Acting Vice President V. Rama Murthy, David Berg, James Borgestad, Sue Klemond, Marsha Riebe, Maureen Smith, Margery Durham.

1. Minutes of the April 3 Finance Committee meeting: no corrections were offered.
2. Rescheduling the June meeting. Because a Senate and Assembly meeting have now been scheduled for June 5, SFC's meeting will be re-set for later in the month.
3. Child Care.

Professor Merwin invited Professor Margery Durham, chair of the Special Committee on Child Care, to speak about that committee's report.

Professor Durham said the committee recommended making a start by hiring someone to coordinate all child care activity. Later in the meeting she raised the question of whether the position of someone currently working in the University's child care system could be upgraded to that of Coordinator. The plan, she said, would not add a great many new slots all at one time. She told the group that there are considerably smaller universities that provide on-campus care for much larger numbers of children.

Professor Sorauf inquired what portion of total costs user charges cover. Professor Durham said some users pay nearly \$100 per week on the sliding scale, while some pay far less; altogether, fees do not cover costs.

Mr. Bauer asked who the committee believed should have top priority in getting child care. Professor Durham said committee sentiment gave priority to low income students and employees. The coordinator, she said, in consultation of others, would have the assignment of prioritizing.

President Keller said he had read the report and prepared written comments to the Child Care Committee. He said that when he and the Consultative Committee had jointly appointed the special Child Care Committee (Autumn 1985) he felt that child care was important and was presently inadequate here. It is necessary to know how great the need is and how much the University should spend to help meet that need. He questioned the credibility of the report's needs estimate from CURA figures based on waiting lists and telephoned inquiries. He cautioned against moving into a big undertaking without knowing what private facilities exist. Financing questions include whether the University expects to be repaid through fees, whether child care would be an option in a cafeteria of benefits for faculty or other staff, whether the University would pay for child care for indigent students, and whether to any extent for students generally.

He told the meeting he was left with a series of questions as to the likely magnitude of a budget request and its priority relative to all the other major budget items. The plan needs to be rational within the context of the University's other needs. Putting more money into the existing structure so it can provide more care might be more cost-effective than alternatives. He noted his concern over renovation costs. He said we should address the question of whether the University should get started by doing some small things at once.

Professor Durham noted that her written reply to the President's inquiries suggested small ways to make a beginning such as, for example, enabling a Mills II-type deduction for faculty child care fees. It was noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee has been unenthusiastic at least in the recent past about "cafeteria-style benefits" options; and that the civil service staff would probably like the question of such an option for them to be investigated.

Professor Stuthman, noting that insurance costs are becoming a burden, asked whether there is any advantage in a child care center being insured through the University. President Keller remarked that the University's rates have risen so high that it has reduced its liability from \$40 million to \$10 million while undertaking to be self-insured. Some private providers, he added, volunteer to provide the University with needed spaces, for a fee.

Professor Hogenkamp inquired how the University's fees compare with those at private centers. President Keller said the University's are about 10% higher for employees paying at the top of the scale because of the University's higher adult-to-child ratio.

Professor Merwin asked how the Finance and Consultative Committees could help increased child care to proceed. President Keller recommended that they first encourage those changes that can be made without cost. Next they should consider the questions of renovating or adding space; the administration would need capital expense figures very soon to feed into the next legislative request. He said he was not asking the committees to come up with a plan, but for some guidance on the size of spending and the degree of space subsidy.

Professor Dunham said it has been the Child Care Committee's premise that any step which would make a start would be good. They left further action to those who know more about the University's budget.

Professor Hogenkamp inquired about the centers' present cost and subsidy. President Keller reported that student services fees contribute \$20,000 and central administration provides ^{approximately} a \$100,000 subsidy.

Mr. St. Laurent asked whether child care can legally be included as a criterion for financial aid. Professor Durham knew of no legislation on that.

Mr. Bauer asked whether the legislature would be likely to help fund a subsidy for child care. President Keller said the University must rank its requests and be prepared to answer the legislature as to which items are more important to us.

4. INDIRECT COST RECOVERY.

Copies were distributed of the motion agreed to by both the Educational Policy and Research Committees, as well as copies of an amendment proposed by the Consultative Committee. (Current Regents' policy provides for at least one-third of available ICR's to be distributed to the generating collegiate units.) Professor Stuthman described his amendment as attempting to define some middle position between Regents' policy and what the committees seek.

Dr. Murthy noted that requesting distribution of 50% of the ICR's had not even been a point of discussion in SCR and SCEP since the committees were in complete agreement on that point. He said that since the University is purchasing more and more expensive equipment, he would prefer retaining one-third as the minimum and giving out more whenever possible, as he has been doing.

President Keller reminded the meeting that the Regents make University policy and he asked rhetorically if the Senate can veto Regents' policy. He regards a 50% distribution from central administration as running counter to the principles of ICR. ICR is an issue on every campus: faculty want more money for their research, central administrations want to be able to support research, and legislatures do not want to pay the full cost of research. It is true that the faculty member is the instrument for grant money coming to the University; but the federal government is supposed to pay all the real cost of research on its grants and if what it pays exceeds the real cost, auditors will discover the discrepancy.

The investigator, he continued, has no innate right to the money back, but of course the administration wants to help the investigator do more and better research. These funds actually belong to the state, and it is up to the state to give up what fraction it is willing to. The funds are being returned to the state for having covered the indirect costs in the first place. The University has persuaded the legislature to help it do a better job by not taking full reimbursement.

The University has further persuaded the legislature to let it keep more of the ICR on the premise that the University would not request appropriations for major research equipment. Consequently, the University cannot now reverse itself and seek those equipment appropriations. The major equipment involved in set-ups is costly. This year, he said, there have been half a dozen in the \$100,000 to \$150,000 range. These needs are not captured by an arbitrary distribution formula, he insisted.

has
The administration agreed to disperse at least one-third. Recently \$2 million per year (which is more than one-third) has been distributed to the faculty. However, next year's situation may be tougher. The University has just suffered a base cut of \$4 million. Central administration has decided to use part of the ICR's for library acquisitions.

President Keller told the committees he believed there should be guidelines for distribution and that central administration should explain to the Finance Committee when it believes it is necessary to deviate from the guidelines.

Vice President Murthy reported that central administration has now for the first time separated the ICR money so one can see just how it is going to be used. He said he thought it would be appropriate for the Finance Committee to insist on an accounting each year as to how the ICR's have been used.

Professor Swan referred to the Finance Committee's charge and asked if ICRF stands apart from budgetary criteria generally. She asked if there is a set of criteria by which SFC can judge the budget.

Dr. Murthy said the same criteria used in the University's planning process were used in drafting the budget. The Budget Principles essentially constitute the criteria. Professor Swan pointed out that the Finance Committee needs to know what are the criteria so it can perform its responsibility of seeing if the budget is consistent with the criteria.

The group then discussed the consultative process. The Finance Committee has not been having the opportunity to discuss the budget principles or the budget plan before they go to the Regents. SFC needs to receive the necessary information promptly so it will have a basis for offering responsible advice to the administration.

ARRIVING AT A COMPROMISE POSITION REGARDING ICR's.

President Keller objected to a proposal for a Senate policy which would change Regents' policy and require the approval of a Senate committee to vary from that policy. That would require the Regents to forgo their own authority.

Further brief discussion resulted in an oral agreement among the committee members and the President and Acting Vice President that the motion to the Senate should be phrased as a recommendation to the Board of Regents, and that deviations from the guidelines should require consultation with the Finance Committee rather than the approval of the Finance Committee.

VOTE: GIVEN THESE MODIFICATIONS, THE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE EACH VOTED SEPARATELY, WITHOUT DISSSENT, TO TAKE THE MOTION TO THE SENATE.

(The motion, as modified, recommended that Regents' policy be changed to state that at least one-half of available ICR's would be distributed from central administration to the collegiate units generating them, and prescribed a formula for further distribution within the units which the units could elect to modify if they so chose.)

5. CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC UNITS' RETRENCHMENT RESULTING FROM UNALLOTMENT.

Handout: "Final Unallotment Plan." The document showed retrenchment for academic programs as \$808,910 per year for five years.

The Finance Committee expressed surprise at the size of some unit cuts. Professor Merwin reminded the group that the only information the Finance Committee had previously received had been an oral report in an earlier meeting that the maximum cut would be to CLA, and would be \$65,000.

(Twin Cities' academic unit cuts were to be as follows:

Education	\$150,000
CLA	100,000
CEE	50,000
Law	30,000
AFHE	35,410.)

The Finance Committee had thought it had understood the President to say at the March 6 meeting that the maximum cut to any academic unit would be about one-third of one percent. President Keller said what he had intended to tell SFC was that the average cut to academic units would be one-third of one percent. The \$809,000 cut is about one-third of one percent of the total academic budget. The College of Education has the largest proportional cut among academic units, about 1.5%.

Professor Stuthman suggested that to the greatest extent possible written information should be distributed to the appropriate consulting committees so as to reduce the risk of an error in committee records. Moreover, committee comprehension is better when an oral presentation follows distribution of documents. President Keller said he agreed with that as a general practice. In the case of unallotment and retrenchment, matters were in transition.

Professor Merwin inquired what determined which units would be protected from any retrenchment whatever. Vice President Murthy said that, as reported in the April 3 SFC minutes, units were not retrenched if they had been identified in Cycle II Planning as of high priority or if they had some deficit. In addition, he said, he approached more aggressively those units with a relatively better rank funding compared to peer institutions. The College of Education is better funded in the aggregate than is CLA; hence the larger percentage retrenchment in Education. He said he had reviewed each college's proposals as to how it would absorb a retrenchment.

Professor Berscheid asked if any unit is allowed to operate at a deficit. President Keller said only the School of Management has requested and been granted that permission. It is appropriate in that case because of commitments central administration has made but not yet kept to match funds SOM raised privately. He said there have been a small number of other instances where a unit has run a debt and central administration has worked out a short-term repayment plan. Central administration has not as a matter of course rewarded either poor management or "rich" management.

Professor Stuthman asked where the University would not cut if the total unallotment is reduced. President Keller said he thought the administration would welcome the committees' advice. He thought the understanding at present was that the dollars would be returned in approximate proportion to units' cuts.

Professor Sorauf suggested the Office of Student Affairs might well be able to absorb a cut larger than \$60,000 per year. President Keller replied that the cut to OSA is 0.6% of its base budget, more than many of the cuts.

Professor Johnson noted that the final Duluth Campus plan was very different from what had been reported earlier. Dr. Murthy explained that was because the legislature imposed a lid on the amount of cut that could be taken from state specials; without being able to draw down on one unspent special, UMD decided to take its cut over the five years.

Professor Sorauf said that while he understood the reasons for differentiation in assigning cuts, the symbolic aspect of managing retrenchment should not be ignored. The approach of sharing the burden is not being applied as regards the Twin Cities academic programs. President Keller responded that three Twin Cities units account for approximately 50% of the University's academic budget: CLA (\$30 million), IT (\$25 million) and Medicine (\$25 million). Professor Sorauf said he was not arguing for across-the-board or proportionate cutting, but for the desirability of widespread sharing of the cut.

Vice President Murthy told the group he took responsibility for the cut distribution. He reported that he had declined IT's offer of \$50,000 because he could not justify to the legislature taking away to cover the debt some extra funds the University had sought and gained from the legislature because IT is one of our highest priorities. He pointed out that the legislation regarding reducing budgets to meet this state revenue shortfall requires that the legislature approve the budget plans, including the University's.

Professor Campbell said he frankly thought the University's collegiality is threatened when IT is repeatedly seen as receiving special consideration. He said he supported a budget cut for IT in this instance. Professor Goldstein noted that two of the state specials being trimmed are in IT, but he added that he too believed that IT, as a part of the University, should contribute to the academic program cut.

President Keller said central administration has told the affected units that although the budgetary judgments have been made, there are flexible dollars available to help them out of difficulties. In fact, he said, next year every unit will receive more money this year: more salary dollars and in some cases new positions. He said there is no unit among those taking program retrenchment that does not have an exchange of funds within a year that exceeds these retrenchment figures. (Vice President Murthy noted that total post-budget adjustments are \$7 million to \$8 million per year.) The administration finds non-budgetary sources to meet particular needs such as TA's for CLA.

President Keller told the committees that it is very hard to make what is on paper reflect what really happens to a unit's budget in the course of a year. What is important, he said, is that we have kept those aggregate reductions to under \$1 million per year. In the aggregate, he said, this list conveys to him a symbol of selectivity. He raised the question of whether the committees wanted to change that for a symbol of the aggregate.

6. 1986-87 BUDGET PLAN AND BUDGET.

Hand-Out: "Proposed State Special Budgets for 1986-87" and "Proposed Operations and Maintenance Fund Budget Plan."

Professor Merwin noted that the budget and the budget plan were being discussed in the Senate Finance Committee for the first time.

President Keller said the budget plan is based on and expands upon the budget principles. The administration has incorporated into the budget all the items officers have talked with the Finance Committee about over the course of this year.

The budget will continue to be tight, he said, because lower enrollments in 1984-85 will result in a base reduction of about \$ 4 million and because fuel and utilities deficits will have to be covered. There is a serious question of how to balance the budget given these costs together with a 5% faculty salary increase and 3% civil service salary increase. It helps that the University did not incur a deficit, as had been expected, in its '85-'86 budget. But the budget allows us to do very little that is new.

A decision was made, he said, that the only way we could meet all of the goals was to draw upon the one part of the budget which is increasing: the Indirect Cost Recovery Fund (ICRF). Library acquisitions is one item that can legitimately be shifted from the basic O&M budget to ICRF. He invited questions about the budget plan.

Professor Swan inquired about the relationship of the budget plans to the University's programmatic plans. Looking at the 1986-87 budget in the context of Commitment to Focus, she said, there is recognition of priorities in some of the items but it is not as clear as it might be on some points, such as how the University is moving to reduce the ratio of undergraduate students to graduate students. President Keller responded that because we are in a retrenchment budget we couldn't do a lot of new things. He said what additions there are are consistent with Commitment to Focus.

Professor Stuthman inquired about the \$431,000 anticipated from making CEE rely increasingly on income. President Keller said he would still like to pursue moving CEE on budget; one requirement is to work out course credit equivalencies.

Professor Campbell inquired about the size of an SEE increase. President Keller said this budget, in contrast to previous annual budgets, does not distribute any SEE money across the board; the administration will instead apply those funds selectively. The appropriation for an SEE increase has been absorbed into one of the Resources. He said if the administration had budgeted the SEE increase across the board, it would have had to adjust items downward in the Resource Application list.

Vice President Murthy noted that every unit is being allowed to retain any 1985-86 budget funds still unspent at the end of the fiscal year.

Dr. Murthy also reported that the administration had pooled funds from other parts of the budget to bring the faculty salary pool to a 5% increase.

Advancing a year on the ICR budget. The officers reported that the University has shifted its ICR budget forward by a year. Professor Rubenstein asked if there is any risk in spending the ICR in the year it is received. The President said that except for loss of some temporary income, he thought not. If the University should overspend one year it would have to make up for that the next year.

Commitment to Focus. President Keller told the committees he thought

the budget plan moves the University toward C_tF, although not on every item. He said he felt worst about being unable to protect Instructional Computing. Professor Swan said if restoration is possible, it looked as though Instructional Computing might be a programmatically important item to restore. The President said he would approve of going that way; however, since it is not a retrenched item in the unallotment, doing so would mean a shift from other programs or other unallotment items to instructional computing and he would want the Finance Committee to advise on that. He recommended that the Finance Committee discuss reallocation since his discussions with SFC on retrenchments were necessitated by the state's unallocation without knowledge of what other budgetary retrenchments we were going to have.

7. STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIENNIAL REQUEST.

President Keller recommended a special meeting with the Finance Committee within approximately the next week. He said the administration would take the request to the Regents in July for their information; the Regents would act on it at their September meeting.

Professor Campbell said he was concerned that the committees representing the faculty have relatively little opportunity for input. President Keller said that what the administration has so far to draft the request are the lists of wishes from the units.

Professor Campbell noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee was quite eager to submit items for inclusion in the request and had been requesting this opportunity for input for a long time. President Keller said the administration would need the proposals from SCFA immediately.

Professor Swan asked whether there would be the opportunity to develop budgetary rationale and criteria. President Keller said there would be and that the Finance Committee should start on that soon.

Faculty Salaries. Professor Swan asked what would be requested from the state for faculty salaries and on what it would be based. President Keller said the request would be for 5.5% to stay 2% ahead of the improvement schedule. Professor Swan asked if the University was looking at comparisons with the rest of the Big Ten, and Mr. Berg said it was.

Professor Swan asked if committees were interested in building a bridge from the existing salary improvement plan to a successor plan. President Keller said it was unwise to introduce a new plan at this stage (the current plan is designed to run to FY 1992) but said rank funding adjustment is a good place to work on faculty salary improvement.

Professor Rubenstein commented that if we are to be in the top five public universities, our salaries have to be up there too. The President remarked that, however, you don't improve a poor faculty member just by paying that person more; hence you have to be selective in applying the increases. He said the state asks the University how it can demonstrate that just because it is funded at a certain level it is actually that good. We must be very careful about how we adjust a goal for faculty salaries which has been accepted, he repeated. The goal of rank funding adjustment has also been accepted at the legislature and the President believes that is the avenue the University should use at this time for further salary improvement.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Meredith Poppele, SCC Exec. Ass't.

AMENDMENT - Revised form

(INDIRECT COST RECOVERY FUND)

MOTION:

To amend the motion submitted by the Educational Policy Committee and the Research Committee by adding the following contextual wording before the first sentence:

"The University Senate recommends that the Board of Regents adopt the following policy regarding Indirect Cost Recovery Funds:"

and by inserting the following passage between the first and second sentences of the motion as submitted:

"Should budgetary circumstances warrant consideration of less than 50% distribution to the colleges, consultation with the Senate Finance Committee is required. In no case, however, will the distribution to the colleges be less than 1/3."

Jack C. Merwin, Chair,

Finance Committee

Deon D. Stuthman, Chair,

Consultative Committee

INDIRECT COST RECOVERY FUND DISTRIBUTION

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

(Action)

MOTION:

That Indirect Cost Recovery Funds retained by the University should be distributed as follows: 50% should be retained by central administration to support research activities, to be allocated by the graduate school and by central administration, and the remaining 50% should be distributed on a proportionate basis to the colleges that generated these funds. Colleges should then allocate their share of these funds as follows: 1/3 retained by the college for centralized allocation to support research activities, 1/3 allocated on a proportionate basis to the departments that generated the funds, and 1/3 to the faculty who generated the funds, unless the proportionate share amounts to less than \$100, in which case it should revert to the department. In colleges where the faculty so votes, however, the collegiate distribution may differ from that prescribed by this formula.

William H. Hanson, Chair,
Educational Policy Committee
Paul G. Gassman, Chair
Committee on Research

Considerable support exists among the faculty for the implementation of a more well-defined process for the distribution of those indirect cost recovery funds which exist. In permitting the University to retain a portion of the funds resulting from indirect cost, the legislature recognized the need for the use of these funds to support ongoing research and to stimulate new research. Those faculty who have been heavily involved in bringing these funds to the University see this as: (a) a method of helping Central Administration bear a portion of the cost necessary to convert the University of Minnesota into a research university of the first rank; (b) a method of helping support the financing of research at both the collegiate and departmental levels; and (c) a method of both supporting and encouraging those faculty who were responsible for bringing these funds to Minnesota.

Lengthy discussion, over a two-year period, resulted in a consensus that an equitable distribution would be: (a) no more than 50% to be retained by Central Administration; (b) of the remaining funds 33 1/3% should be distributed to each of the following: 1. the generating colleges, 2. the generating departments, and 3. the generating principal investigators (each in proportion to their contribution).

Paul G. Gassman
Chair, Senate Research Committee
April 30, 1986



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

*Copies distributed in advance
of May Mtg.*

April 8, 1986

TO: The Honorable Wendell R. Anderson
The Honorable Charles H. Casey
The Honorable Willis K. Drake
The Honorable Erwin L. Goldfine
The Honorable Wally Hilke
The Honorable David M. Lebedoff, Vice Chair
The Honorable Verne Long
The Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan, Chair
The Honorable Wenda W. Moore
The Honorable David K. Roe
The Honorable Stanley D. Sahlstrom
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

Forwarded with this letter is the proposed Budget Plan for fiscal year 1986-87. This plan focuses on the General Operations and Maintenance Fund which represents the major area of policy choice in our budgets. There are many fewer choices to be made in the State Specials although there will be some impact of the retrenchment imposed by the Legislature. The budget for the Specials will be presented at the April meeting. The rest of the University's comprehensive budget involves self-supporting operations such as hospitals, dormitories, food services and the like. It will be available for Regents' review and approval when the final budget is submitted in July.

The attached draft budget plan reviews the major constraints and policy choices that face us as we budget for 1986-87. We expect to present additional detail at the April meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:kb

Enclosure

c: University Vice Presidents
University Chancellors
Student Representatives to the Board of Regents
✓ Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee
Professor Jack Merwin, Chair, Senate Finance Committee

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET PLAN FOR 1986-87
A Proposal for Information and Discussion

Introduction and Overview

Although it represents only about 40 percent of the University of Minnesota's total operational expenditures, the Operations and Maintenance Fund is at the heart of the institution's educational mission and the physical and human resources that directly support that mission. Moreover, most of the policy choices in protecting and improving the University's missions find fiscal expression through the budgeting of the General Operations and Maintenance Fund.

The plan presented here is a fiscal reflection of goals and priorities originating in the University's planning process. It incorporates the Budget Principles and the budget constraints for 1986-87. We continue to believe that positive change requires continual review and redeployment of available resources and that this is particularly true when resources are very constrained, as is the case in 1986-87. To protect the progress we have made and continue to move toward our goals requires that the 1986-87 budget be highly selective in where increases are provided.

The comments that follow should be read in conjunction with the attached schedule.

The State Budget and the University Budget

As this is written, the amount by which the University's appropriation will be decreased in the current biennium continues to be uncertain. Throughout this budget plan we assume that number to be \$17,623,000. Should it ultimately prove to be more or less, it will be necessary to make further adjustments in the plan. We assume further that the ultimate resolution of the "unallotment" issue will permit use of the borrowing plan we have put forward in an effort to minimize disruption of program planning.

The Current Year Budgeted Deficit

Our 1985-86 budget contained an estimated deficit of \$2,633,020. Had our estimates been perfectly accurate, prudence would require that we budget for a compensating surplus in the 1986-87 budget. In fact, current revenue and expense estimates suggest that we will not have a deficit at year end. Thus, the 1986-87 budget need only be balanced; a surplus is not required.

Effect of Average Cost Funding

Because of enrollment declines in 1984-85, legislative funding for 1986-87 decreased by \$3,875,600. We have not proposed to translate that decrease into reductions in direct academic support, but to derive it, as far as possible, from tighter budgeting in other areas.

Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) Income

The Legislature has reduced the offset against our appropriation from ICR income from \$14 million in 1985-86 to \$8 million in 1986-87. Any funds we collect above that latter amount are available for discretionary use. Unfortunately, because of the drop in instructional funding and the fact that our fuel and utilities increases were not funded, the actual additional discretion provided by the ICR funds is considerably less than what it appears to be.

To make clear how these funds are being handled, we are proposing (with the concurrence of the Department of Finance) that the available ICR funds be budgeted separately rather than being commingled with O&M funds. That accounts for the separate column shown for indirect cost recoveries. The income represents the amount we expect to collect (over and above the \$8 million offset) in 1986-87 plus carry forward funds from 1985-86. Certain expenditure items that are properly charged to indirect cost recoveries are transferred from the O&M fund in order to relieve the pressure on that budget. The transferred items have been limited so that almost \$5 million will remain for central research support and for distribution to the colleges, departments, and investigators who originally generated the funds.

Faculty Pay Plan

Among our highest priorities is continued progress toward the restoration of faculty purchasing power. The proposed plan allocates 5 percent cash plus associated fringe benefits for this purpose. The 1985 Legislature appropriated about 5.6 percent for that purpose. This has been reduced by slightly less than .5 percent to help defray the borrowing program and by slightly over .1 percent to pay for mental health insurance coverage continued through the present year (no coverage beyond that included in insurance will be provided in 1986-87). We estimate that the 5 percent increase will keep us ahead of the Board's timetable in restoration of purchasing power.

Civil Service Pay Plan

The 1985 Legislature provided 4 percent for Civil Service increases in 1986-87. In the 1985-86 budget we deliberately provided raises beyond available funding, in effect borrowing from available

1986-87 funds to the extent of about .5 percent. Financing the borrowing program would have reduced available funds by another .5 percent and continuation of mental health insurance by .1 percent. Steep increases in fringe benefit costs further eroded the available funding by about .8 percent, leaving enough funds for a 2.1 percent cash increase. It is our judgment that we should provide a 3 percent cash increase to at least remain even with inflationary trends and so we have reallocated funds to augment the appropriation.

Graduate and Professional Tuition Relief

Beginning fall term, 1986, subject to Regents' approval, tuition benefits will be provided for all University employees who qualify. In particular, graduate assistants will receive relief in the amount of twice their percentage of appointment so that a 50 percent or more graduate assistant will, in effect, pay no tuition. In the light of these actions, we propose no increase in graduate student pay rates.

Supplies, Expense, and Equipment (SEE) Funds

No formula increase in SEE funding is proposed for 1986-87. This will create hardship situations but we have thought it preferable to preserve the ability to alter program directions while dealing with those hardships on a case-by-case basis. The proposed budget plan does preserve substantial central resources to deal with equipment needs although, as noted below, there are some cuts in this area as well.

Library Acquisitions

The proposed budget provides over \$532,000 of additional acquisitions money, sufficient to ensure that acquisitions bases throughout the system will have increased by at least 8.2 percent in each year of the biennium.

Other Programmatic Initiatives

- UMD Engineering Programs - \$594,000
- Presidential Scholarship Program - \$260,000
- Sabbatical Program - an additional \$200,000
to bring the annual budget to \$300,000
- Sexual Violence Program - \$70,000
- Move Music, Debate and Forensics programs into
instructional funding and off the Student
Service Fee - \$58,000

Plant Operations

The 1985 Legislature provided \$2 million in 1986-87 for operations of new buildings being opened. We are controlling costs to live within that appropriation. However, fuel, utility and solid and hazardous waste disposal costs present a problem. When the books are closed for 1985-86, we expect to be carrying about \$3.2 million in deficits on these accounts for which legislative funding has not been received. On the basis of present estimates, 1986-87 would produce approximately \$2.4 million of additional fuel, utility, and waste disposal account deficits. Talks continue at the state level about the inadequacy of the Average Cost Funding system in dealing with these relatively non-controllable costs; we continue to hope for legislative relief in this area. If, eventually, no such relief appears, substantial reallocation into plant operation accounts will be required. Meanwhile, our proposed policy is to use every reasonable cost-saving technique to reduce this budget demand, attempting to achieve a long-term balance without program disruption.

Reserves

We believe the tuition revenue shown in this plan to be based on a very conservative enrollment projection, a decline of 2.4 percent. Thus, we believe that it is safe to eliminate the \$1 million recurring reserve for enrollment shortfall that we have been carrying. We also propose to eliminate the \$400,000 reserve for administrative building expansion and several smaller reserves that appear unneeded currently. In this way \$1.621 million is released for specific budget funding. Although technically a budget retrenchment, the \$750,000 reduction in the Summer Session budget is also, in effect, a recurring reserve reduction since it is agreed that it represents an overstatement of true budget needs.

Other Budget Balancing Moves

- It is reluctantly proposed to reduce central budgets for equipment by slightly over \$1 million and the central instructional computing budget by about \$1.1 million. These funds were derived from part of the Rank Funding Adjustment appropriations of the 1985 Legislature. The equipment replacement base with which we entered the 1985 Legislature, \$2,450,000 annually, has been protected. If circumstances permit, these retrenched items will be a high priority for funding from non-recurring sources.

- Insurance cost increases in the amount of about \$835,000 have been deferred pending decisions about how to cope with the current crisis in insurance rates. If the decision is to continue these coverages, we will seek non-recurring funding and subsequent legislative relief.

• The schedule also shows the proposed unit retrenchments toward meeting the first year of debt service on the five-year borrowing plan.

Concluding Comments

While the possibilities of dramatic progress are limited in a budget plan with shrinking real resources and a fiscal climate that continues to be doubtful, the administration proposes through this budget plan to continue to force some progress toward achievement of the University's high priority objectives. Toward that end, the budget plan presented here takes some reasonable risks while forcing enough hard choices to ensure a prudent fiscal plan. It will preserve some degree of momentum while coping with the realities of the present revenue situation.

The administration believes the plan follows the Regents' budget principles, is closely related to existing planning, and is prudent and realistic.

KHK:kb
4-8-86

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Preliminary Operations and Maintenance Fund Budget Plan
for 1986-87
(\$ millions)

<u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>O and M Fund</u>	<u>Indirect Cost Recoveries</u>
Net Appropriation	\$288.058	\$
Tuition	108.773	
Preparatory Instruction	.194	
Temporary Investment Income	3.450	
Indirect Cost Recoveries	8.000	9.200
Other Income	1.652	
	<u>\$410.127</u>	<u>\$9.200</u>
 <u>RESOURCE APPLICATIONS</u>		
FY 1986 Base	\$411.883	
Less Nonrecurring Items	(19.068)	
FY 1986 Recurring Base	<u>\$392.815</u>	
Faculty Salary Plan at 5% Cash plus Fringe	11.098	
Civil Service Salary Plan at 3% Cash plus Fringe	4.719	
Library Acquisitions Increase at 8.2%	.532	
Operation Costs of New Space	2.000	
Graduate Student Fellowships	2.500	
UMD Engineering Programs	.594	
Health Science Scholarship and Fellowship Adjustment	.602	
Physical Plant Operations Cost Increases	1.019	
Presidential Scholarship Program	.260	
Sabbatical Program	.200	
Sexual Violence Program	.070	
Music, Debate, Forensics	.058	
Library Automation Debt Service		.325
Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program		.200
Support Program Increases	.011	
Reduction in Budgeted Reserves	(1.621)	
Reduce Margin in Summer Session Budgeting	(.750)	
Debt Service on Borrowing Plan (\$12.639, 7%, 5 years)	3.127	
Borrowing Plan Retrenchments (First of Five Years)	(.902)	
Reduce Budgeted Equipment Replacement	(1.042)	
Reduce Instructional Computing Budget	(1.134)	
Fund Patent Office From Patent Income	(.217)	
Move Research Supporting Costs to ICR Funding:		
Library Acquisitions (37%)	(2.100)	2.100
Solid and Hazardous Wastes Disposal	(.920)	.920
Radiation and Environmental Health	(.078)	.078
Technical Services Shops	(.141)	.141
Research Grant and Contingency Funds	(.394)	.394
High Tech Research Computing	(.305)	.305
	<u>\$410.001</u>	<u>\$4.463</u>
Balance Available	<u>\$.126</u>	
Balance for Central Research Support and Distribution to Colleges, Departments, Investigators		<u>\$4.737</u>

1
rec'd SFC/SCC 5/7/86

Final
Unallotment Plan

Total Unallotment

\$17,692,063

From State Specials

Hormel	\$ 400,000
County Papers	1,200,000
Agricultural Research	353,000
MRRRC	23,400
Geological Survey	23,400
Industrial Relations Education	12,000
NRRI	90,000
Special Hospitals, Service, Educational	221,000
Student Loans Matching	98,000

\$2,420,800

Other 1985-87 Upfront Reductions

President and Regents	\$ 30,000
V.P. - Finance and Operations	1,538,000
V.P. - Institutional Relations	36,000
V.P. - AFHE	20,000
V.P. - Legal	200,000
CEE	750,000
Health Sciences	656,032

3,230,032 5,650,832

Amount to be Borrowed

\$12,041,231

Debt Service on Above Amount at 7%, 5 yrs.

\$ 2,936,744

MPIS
4/30/86

Debt Service Plan

<u>Additional Tuition Charge (.75%)</u>	\$ 670,980
<u>Faculty Salary Reduction (.5%)</u>	946,919
<u>Civil Service Salary Reduction (.5%)</u>	<u>580,343</u>
	\$2,198,242

Program Retrenchment (5 years)

Legal Counsel	\$200,000	
Education	150,000	
CLA	100,000	
CEE	50,000	
Law	30,000	
V.P.Academic Affairs	20,000	
Student Affairs	60,000	
AFHE	35,410	
Crookston	13,000	
Waseca	11,000	
UMD-CLA	17,617	
UMD-SBE	9,668	
UMD-Education & Human Services Professions	13,671	
UMD-Science & Engineering	29,764	
UMD-Fine Arts	7,663	
UMD-Academic Administration	14,050	
UMD-Administration, Business, Student Life	11,083	
UMD-Physical Plant	28,917	
UMD-Chancellor	7,067	808,910
		<u>\$3,007,152</u>

MPIS
4/30/86

Rec'd SCC/SFC
5/17/86

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Proposed Operations and Maintenance Fund Budget Plan
for 1986-87
(\$ millions)

<u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>O and M Fund</u>	<u>Indirect Cost Recoveries</u>
Net Appropriation	\$288.058	\$
Tuition	108.773	
Preparatory Instruction	.194	
Temporary Investment Income	3.450	
Indirect Cost Recoveries	8.000	9.200
Other Income	1.652	
	<u>\$410.127</u>	<u>\$9.200</u>

RESOURCE APPLICATIONS

FY 1986 Base	\$411.883	
Less Nonrecurring Items	(19.068)	
FY 1986 Recurring Base	<u>\$392.815</u>	
Faculty Salary Plan at 5% Cash plus Fringe	10.964	
Civil Service Salary Plan at 3% Cash plus Fringe	4.919*	
Library Acquisitions Increase at 8.2%	.532	
Operation Costs of New Space	2.000	
Graduate Student Fellowships	2.500	
UMD Engineering Programs	.594	
Health Science Scholarship and Fellowship Adjustment	.602	
Physical Plant Operations Cost Increases	1.019	
Presidential Scholarship Program	.260	
Sabbatical Program	.200	
Sexual Violence Program	.070	
Music, Debate, Forensics	.058	
Library Automation Debt Service		.325
Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program		.200
Support Program Increases	.011	
Reduction in Budgeted Reserves	(1.406)	
Reduce Margin in Summer Session Budgeting	(.750)	
Debt Service on Borrowing Plan (\$12.041, 7%, 5 years)	2.937	
Borrowing Plan Retrenchments (First of Five Years)	(.809)	
Reduce Budgeted Equipment Replacement	(.886)	
Reduce Instructional Computing Budget	(1.134)	
CEE Increased Reliance on Income	(.431)	
Move Research Supporting Costs to ICR Funding:		
Library Acquisitions (37%)	(2.100)	2.100
Solid and Hazardous Wastes Disposal	(.920)	.920
Radiation and Environmental Health	(.078)	.078
Technical Services Shops	(.141)	.141
Research Grant and Contingency Funds	(.394)	.394
High Tech Research Computing	(.305)	.305
	<u>\$410.127</u>	<u>\$4.463</u>

Balance for Central Research Support and Distribution
to Colleges, Departments, Investigators \$4.737

* Includes \$400,000 pay equity

add sec's FC 7/186

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Proposed State Special Budgets for 1986-87

Title	1985-86	1986-87	Deduct Unallotments	Adjusted 1986-87
Agricultural Extension	\$11,656,300	\$12,114,500		\$12,114,500
Non-Recurring		1,797,500		1,797,500
Agricultural Research	11,834,900	12,798,300	(353,000)	12,445,300
Non-Recurring		290,000		290,000
Fire Center	100,000	(1)		
Disadvantaged Students	51,500	53,600		53,600
Industrial Relations Education	638,600	664,100	(12,000)	652,100
Mineral Resources Research Center	719,000	738,700	(23,400)	715,300
Lake Superior Basin Studies	137,800	143,300		143,300
Sea Grant Institute	275,200	305,200		305,200
Rural Physicians Associates Program	528,500	549,600		549,600
Institute of Human Genetics	300,000	485,000		485,000
Hormel Institute	367,300 ⁽²⁾	374,000	(200,000)	174,000
Medical and Cancer Research	2,155,800	2,242,200		2,242,200
Intercollegiate Athletics	2,824,000	2,896,900		2,896,900
Coleman Leukemia Research Center	226,300	235,300		235,300
Geological Survey	895,300	923,100	(23,400)	899,700
General Research	1,959,500	2,037,900		2,037,900
Plant Biomass Energy Research	136,100	141,500		141,500
Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory	1,222,800	1,271,700		1,271,700
Microelectronics & Information Science Center	617,500	642,200		642,200
Productivity Center	309,000	321,400		321,400
Natural Resources Research Institute	2,315,300	2,408,000	(90,000)	2,318,000
Biotechnology Center	532,600	599,900		599,900
Supercomputer Institute	6,000,000	6,000,000		6,000,000
Underground Space Center	206,000	214,200		214,200
Talented Youth Mathematics	157,800	247,800		247,800
China Center	77,200	80,300		80,300
County Reimbursements	1,700,000 ⁽³⁾	1,700,000	(600,000)	1,100,000
Special Hospitals, Service & Educational	13,326,900	13,859,900	(221,000)	13,638,900
Student Loan Matching	95,600 ⁽⁴⁾	99,400	(50,000)	49,400
TOTAL	\$61,366,800	\$66,235,500	\$(1,572,800)	\$64,662,700

- (1) Transfer to Vocational Technical Institute.
- (2) Reduced by \$200,000 in 1985-86 for State Unallotment.
- (3) Reduced by \$600,000 in 1985-86 for State Unallotment.
- (4) Reduced by \$48,000 in 1985-86 for State Unallotment.