



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 7, 1982

12:30-3:00

Dale Shephard Room, Coffman Union

Est. time

- 12:30 1. Update on Regents' agenda re collective bargaining (FCC).
- 12:45 2. Committee and Task Force memberships: (FCC)  
-Planning Committee  
-Faculty Workload Task Force  
-Charitable Drives Committee.
- 12:50 3. Fix SCC agenda.
4. Minutes of September 30 (enclosed).
- 1:00 5. Report of the Chair (oral).
- 1:10 6. Report of the Student Chair (oral).
- 1:20 7. Task Force on Human Services (steering business).
- 2:00 8. Student Pay Plan proposals (Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee).
- 2:15 9. UMD student presentation on the possibility of a faculty strike (Hull, Ziegelmann).



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
Thursday, October 7, 1982  
12:40 - 2:30

APPROVED 10/21/82

Members present: Ronald Bonaguidi, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Barry Hogen, John Howe, Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dennis Kronebusch, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marv Mattson, Doug Pratt, W. D. Spring, Burt Sundquist, Pat Swan, Kathy Watson, Vern Ziegelmann.

Guests present: Mary Jane Plunkett, Maureen Smith, Randy Mickelson.

Chairman Pat Swan convened the SCC meeting at 12:40 following an SCC social hour in the Dale Sheppard Room of the Campus Club. She reminded the faculty members that they would need approximately ten minutes following the SCC meeting to complete their closed meeting business from September 16.

1. Agenda. The agenda was approved as prepared with one addition: Someone was expected to bring in a report at the conclusion of the Regents' closed meeting on collective bargaining issues.

2. Minutes. The September 30 minutes and record of the conversation with the President were approved as submitted.

3. Report of the Chair. Professor Swan will place various items in the circulating file for information. Members should feel free to introduce discussion of any of those items into the agenda.

4. Report of the Student Chair. Mr. Lenander reported the Student SCC held its first full meeting preceeding today's SCC meeting. (a) They have begun to look at the constitution for the Student Senate. (b) They have four positions to fill on the President's Student Behavior Review Panel. (c) They heard a report from their UMD and UMW representatives. (d) Mr. Lenander voiced his concern about student participation in Senate committees. He or other student SCC members intend to attend the upcoming meetings of the Senate and Assembly Facilitative Committees.

Professor Swan said committee chairpersons can have an opportunity to comment on student participation in their respective committees at the Facilitative Committee meetings.

5. Report on the Task Force on Human Services. Professor Swan reminded the meeting that six task forces have been appointed to study programs which cross college lines. The SCC requested the Vice President for Academic Affairs

to submit a copy of each report to the SCC. How would the SCC like to deal with these reports? The first one completed, that on Human Services, has come to the SCC. It will not precipitate any immediate action except the appointment of another working group.

The human services units addressed by the task force are (1) Department of Family Social Science (College of Home Economics), (2) Center for Youth Development and Research (College of Home Economics), (3) School of Social Work (CLA), (4) School of Social Development (UMD), (5) General College's educational programs in the human services area, and (6) Continuing Education in Social Work. The report, submitted by task force chairman John Wallace, describes the task force's progress:

- They identified considerations to bring to bear on discussions so that further processes can do a more defined task.
- They found there needs to be a review of the continuing education program in each of the units involved in human services.
- They found no program duplication but recommend the question of course duplication be studied.
- They suggest that the School of Social Work, the School of Social Development, the Family Social Science Department and the Center for Youth Development and Research be brought under a single administrative umbrella.

While there was an inclination on the task force to recommend a single unit under the College of Home Economics, it was recognized that such a move might affect the School of Social Work's accreditation. The report urges that studies of this nature always involve students from the affected units.

Mr. Ziegelmann expressed his concern as a student in social work at UMD that if the program, which has a large enrollment, were dropped to a lower eschelon it would receive fewer resources. Professor Swan stressed that the report lays out pros and cons of several options but does not make specific recommendations.

Regarding an appropriate role for the Senate, Professor Howe asked if the Senate would play a part in the creation or termination of an academic program. It seems that at least in the last several years the Senate has not been involved in such questions. Professor Howe added that the SCC would probably have an interest in the relationship between the results from these task force reports and college planning documents.

Professors Howe and Spring suggested appointing two SCC members to study each report with sensitivity to its implications and to report on it to the SCC. Since the University allows an appeal from a college to an all-University system where a college feels its terrain has been invaded, it is possible that units may solicit SCC's help in response to proposals from some task forces.

Professor Swan pointed out that SCC did receive a few such requests last winter when program priorities were announced, but declined to serve in any

appeals capacity and insisted that providing an appeals mechanism was an administrative responsibility.

Mr. Lenander pointed out that units involved in program priorities changes addressed the Senate last year; the Senate took no action on those reports. Professor Fredricks and other members recommended the SCC be ready to forward a task force report to an appropriate Senate committee, particularly to the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Freier noted that the SCC would also like to be sure that the report of each administratively-appointed task force is distributed to all the units involved. Professor Mattson recommended that units should be made to feel free to address questions through the SCC if they want to. Professor Spring commented that because the SCC is sometimes seen as a last resort and a route to the President's ear, appeals might come to it. He recommended the SCC wait to see what happens regarding appeals, and respond then.

Professor Swan summarized the points of the discussion:

- The SCC should be alert to each report;
- A few members should read each report and summarize to the SCC;
- SCC should then keep alert to the aftermath of the report.

Professor Spring concluded that if the SCC did these things, its stance might lead it into the issue-orientation of the Planning Council.

Professor Swan reminded the SCC that it will discuss Cycle II of the planning process with the President on October 21. Professor Howe asked the committee to be vigilant in this consultation at the outset of Cycle II. Professor Spring noted that the Senate Planning Committee, by providing the faculty members who sit on the Planning Council, is in a position to serve as a liaison between faculty and the Planning Council.

SCC members who will review the Task Force Report on Human Services are Mr. Lenander and Mr. Ziegelmann. They will speak to SCC on November 4 and comment on whether they recommend SCC should do anything with respect to this report at this time.

The Consultative Committee will ask Academic Affairs to provide it with the charge to the task force at the same time it gives SCC a copy of a task force's report.

#### 6. Student pay plan proposals. Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering

Committee business. Mr. Lenander requested the steering committee to send the discussion paper from the Office of Student Affairs to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs for comment and request that it report directly to the Office of Student Affairs. SCC could also request receiving a copy of ACSA's comments and consider whether the University Senate should concern itself with the issue. Mr. Lenander referred to two conditions affecting pay determinations which may be in conflict--the concept of equal pay for equal work, and the administration decision of approximately a year and a half ago to regard all part-time student work as financial aid and hence not tied to bargaining unit regulations.

The SCC agreed that, rather than forward the Office of Student Affairs' paper, it would request Vice President Wilderson to solicit responses from ACSA and comparable groups on the other campuses to the pay plan proposals.

7. UMD and UMW student anxiety about a faculty strike, and efforts to prevent one.

Mr. Verne Ziegelmann of the Duluth campus distributed copies of a resolution drawn up by the UMD Student Association. The resolution asserted the high cost and serious educational disruption for students from any faculty strike and urged the Board of Regents to enter into binding arbitration with the UEA. Mr. Ziegelmann stated his own deep concern and asked for SCC support of the resolution. Mr. Dennis Kronebusch, of the Waseca campus, also expressed the students' concern over the possibility of an interruption to their education. Mr. Ziegelmann reported that representatives from UMD and UMW will attend the October 8 Regents meetings.

Several faculty members described their dilemma. On the one hand, they know the students' reasons are valid and important and that the students simply want the two bargaining sides' differences settled. The faculty are aware of the disruption and difficulty a strike would cause students. They hope a strike would not occur. On the other hand the FCC, along with the Regents, believe strongly that a principle, in this case a principle on determining compensation, cannot be submitted to binding arbitration. The students' resolution does not address this principle. It would be inconsistent for the FCC to support the students' resolution, having adopted a resolution on September 30 urging against binding arbitration regarding unit equalization in salaries. Professor Swan pointed out that dollars, however, could be arbitrated.

Mr. Lenander noted that the Senate Consultative Committee has not taken a position regarding binding arbitration, and he recommended it not do so. He further stated that certain principles are also involved in the question of keeping the Duluth and Waseca campuses open.

Report from the Regents meeting. Dr. Jim Borgestad arrived to report on the outcome of the closed meeting among the full Board of Regents, the President, and members of the negotiating team. At a press conference immediately following the meeting, Regent Lauris Krenik read a Regents' resolution which contains instructions to the negotiating team to continue negotiations with the UEA. Dr. Borgestad reported that the President read a statement to the effect that the Regents believe in equity and that equity is not the same thing as equality. President Magrath cited to the press relevant 1980-81 data which indicate UMD and UMW salaries to be 97% of those in comparable Twin Cities units. There is no narrower gap between different kinds of units within a major university system than there is at the University of Minnesota, the President told the press. The two-year increase the University is offering UEA includes a compounding of the 1981-82 increases to the non-unionized campuses, and comes to 18.7%. If that were given, the average salary for a full professor at UMD would be above \$35,000. The mediator has called a negotiating session for the week of October 11. The consequences for students of a strike were apparently not discussed in today's Regents meeting.

Mr. Hogen said the SCC should be very reluctant to act as a group on the student resolution. Professor Freier asked if the students had communicated with their faculties, and Messrs. Ziegelmann and Kronebusch replied that they are really not allowed to do so.

Professor Swan acknowledged that the faculty members have been greatly concerned and did not enter into the dispute until they found their own interests at stake. We don't like the fact of the faculty having to divide itself, she said. The comments sound more belligerent than they are intended to be. We do appreciate what the loss of a quarter would mean to students--for many it would effectively mean the loss of a year because of course sequences. We might say we are heartsick that this sort of impasse is looming up, and we hope we will not reach the impasse, she concluded.

Professor Howe assured the students that many faculty have stated their concern for students; faculty want to see that the interests of the students on the UMD and UMW campuses can be guarded.

Mr. Kronebusch stated that he had confidence in Waseca's campus administrators to protect student interests just as far as possible.

The SCC took no action on the UMD student resolution.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Meredith Poppele,  
SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

October 18, 1982

To: Vice President Frank Wilderson  
From: Pat Swan, <sup>Chair</sup> Chair, Senate Consultative Committee  
Re: University of Minnesota Student Pay Rates Discussion Paper

The chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, Dave Lenander, has brought to the attention of the SCC a draft of the discussion paper developed in the Office of Student Affairs on student pay rates at the University of Minnesota. Many interesting issues are touched on in that paper.

If you think you may be pursuing the possibility of a change in student pay policy, we would like to request that you send the current revision of the discussion paper for comment to the Twin Cities Assembly Committee on Student Affairs and the comparable organization on each of the other campuses. We believe these committees could have some useful perspectives on the issues involved.

Thank you for your attention to student-faculty consultation in this matter.

:mbp

cc: Bob Barnett

1982

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STUDENT PAY RATES  
DISCUSSION PAPER

Introduction

For fiscal year 1980-81 students in civil service and undergraduate academic positions earned approximately \$23,965,000 at the University of Minnesota (all campuses). \$22,450,000 was earned by students in civil service classes and \$514,800 by students in undergraduate academic classes. (In 1981, total University 0100 funding for miscellaneous help was 10,342,130 and 18,233,744 for unassigned instruction.)

Between July 1, 1980 and June 3, 1981 15,779 people were paid on student status at the University. This represents approximately 29% of a student population of 55,000. A recent study (Student Life Studies, 1981) showed that 92% of University of Minnesota students work while attending school. Sixty-nine percent are employed both during the school year and the summer.

During the 1980-81 fiscal year the office of Student Employment posted 10,627 University vacancies (9,685 civil service and 942 academic). Of these vacancies 1,749 (16%) were beyond entry level (i.e., positions that required no experience and training). Included in the above entry level jobs were 40 data processing technicians, 23 stores clerks, 15 general staff nurses, 11 hospital central services technicians, 127 senior laboratory technicians, 8 editors, 4 medical technicians, 12 delivery service drivers, 17 communications technicians, 5 junior student personnel workers and 1 pharmacist.

This paper outlines five options regarding the rate of pay for student employees at the University of Minnesota. The following options could be considered for persons employed in civil service classifications through the Office of Student Employment.

OPTION 1: Maintain the Current System

Wage rates are assigned to positions by category according to various criteria such as the market value of the training and experience required to do the job, market comparability for the position itself or level of responsibility assigned to the job. The status of a person - such as "student" has never been a compensation factor. The system considers students as part-time employees and they are compensated according to the same systems used for all other non-academic employees. Salary rates for civil service positions are determined by the Compensation Manager and are comparable to the rates in the State Civil Service system. These policies have been approved by the administration in the Student Employment Rules which govern student employment at the University. In essence, the Rules stipulate equal pay for the same work, whether performed by a student or a non-student. The Rules specifically tie position classification and compensation to the Civil Service system.

In the Spring and Summer of 1981, the supervisory structure for the Office of Student Employment was changed from the University Personnel Department to the

Office for Student Affairs. At that time, students were told that the policies which had governed student employment would remain in tact and that students would continue to receive the same wages and many of the benefits the system had always provided to them. This has been true to this date.

Costs of higher education have risen consistently and significantly during recent years. At the same time, student aid programs have not kept pace with tuition increases. Part-time work for most students has provided the extra necessary funds they have needed to attend the University. Despite these trends, the Office of Student Employment typically has at least 100-200 vacancies at any given time.

#### • Advantages

1. Recruitment and employment flexibility for hiring departments: the current system allows University departments to recruit and hire students in a wide variety of positions. With minimal constraint, departments are free to require the same minimum qualifications for recruiting students as they require for non-students. If students drop out of school the department may continue employment without adjusting the duties or salary, if employees enter school, they may retain their job and move to student status.
2. Administrative simplicity: the University is required to administer only two compensation systems: academic and civil service.
3. Market competitiveness: for certain types of work, such as systems software programming, the University is able to maintain competitiveness with other area employers who have attractive trainee programs.
4. "A defensible posture for equal pay for equal work": the Regent's resolution of February, 1981 that "all current policies and practices concerning employment and wages continue when the (student employment) department moves over to the Office of Student Financial Aid" is upheld.

The current system rewards students for comparable work and allows departments to assign comparable work to students and non-students.

5. Provides approximately \$24,000,000 in student earnings and provides approximately 16,000 employees for the University.
6. The current system is probably the most desirable from a student point of view. In this sense it provides an attractive reason for students to seek on-campus employment which may, in turn, cultivate a stronger identification and sense of community with the University. This is a particularly important benefit to a large commuter campus such as the University of Minnesota.

#### • Disadvantages

1. Dependency on University Civil Service and State pay increases: recent rapid increases in salary rates and movement upward of salary ranges have increased some salary rates to beyond market value; increased salary rates have created financial hardships for some departments and campuses and caused restricted opportunities and community criticism.

2. Dissimilarity to other institutions: most other Big 10 institutions and the Minnesota State University and Community College systems do not compensate or classify student employees in as generous or flexible a fashion as the University of Minnesota (see option #4 below). However, on the basis of inquiries received by the Office of Student Employment, it appears that a number of other Big 10 institutions are desiring to move their systems closer to the type of employment system currently used at the University of Minnesota.

OPTION 2: Establish a Part-Time Employee Rate

*How are student workers different from non-student part-timers?*

This option would retain equal pay for the same work for students and non-students but establish a lower wage scale for part-time employees (for example, for all non-academic University employees who worked 29 hours per week or less). This option would be based on the argument that when an employee is not available to a given office or department on a full-time basis, he or she is also not able to provide the continuity or extra assistance needed during peak or emergency periods and should be compensated at a lower rate. In essence, this argument assumes that a full-time (100% time) employee contributes more than twice as much as a half-time employee to the overall productivity of a unit. This option would require the creation of a "part-time" wage for each of the 960 University Civil Service classifications. A percentage of the full-time hourly wage (e.g. 80%) could be designated as the part-time hourly wage; i.e. if the wage were \$5.00/hour for a full-time employee, the part-time wage would be \$4.00/hour.

• Advantages

1. Cost savings: the University will be able to consistently pay less for all part-time employees.

• Disadvantages

1. Implementation and management of another compensation system: there will be costs for the implementation and management of a separate system of part-time salary rates and of rules which would define who is and who is not a part-time employee.
2. Employer-employee resistance: compensation based on number of hours worked rather than comparable work may be resisted by both employers and employees if the University's argument on the worth of part-time employees proves or even appears to be fallacious. In fact, some research on job sharing suggests this is the case. Studies of Wisconsin Civil Service employees and teachers in Massachusetts showed that part-time employees sharing one full-time equivalent position were more productive than their full-time counterparts. Resistance may occur as open and vocal or through sabotaging the system or falsifying job duties to obtain a higher rate of pay. In addition, obvious negative consequences to morale and job satisfaction could result.

*but this is not all the same*

OPTION 3: Control (or Lower) the Civil Service Wage Floor

This option could be designed in one of several but similar ways:

- a) Lower the Civil Service floor (currently at \$4.96/hour) by some arbitrary amount (say for example to \$4.35/hour which is \$1.00 above the federal minimum wage).
- b) Do not raise the floor when subsequent Civil Service increases are provided.
- c) Create new Civil Service classifications with salary ranges that are below the lowest ranges which currently exist (e.g. Office Assistant "trainee" or "assistant" Junior Cashier).

● Advantages

1. Cost savings: the University will be able to consistently pay less to all employees for all types of work.
2. Retention of recruiting and employment flexibility: described under option #1, (advantage 1).
3. Market competitiveness and comparability: for certain types of work, market competitiveness is retained because departments can still recruit above the base; for other types of work, market comparability is achieved as the University avoids paying a salary rate higher than market value.
4. Administrative simplicity: described under option #1 (advantage 2).
5. Retains a defensible posture: "equal pay for equal work": described under option #1 (advantage 4).

● Disadvantages

1. Employer-employee resistance: this would occur only if, under option #3, a, the salaries of current employees were lowered.
2. Implementation: (applies only to option #3, c). There will be administrative costs in the creation and implementation of a number of new classes. Also, the already cumbersome number of 960 different civil service classes will rise.

OPTION 4: Treat Student Employment as a Financial Aid and Pay a Different Rate to Students than to Non-Students

This option would disengage student employment from the civil service classification and compensation system. An entirely new (but limited) set of "student" classification would need to be established (e.g. student worker-01, student worker-02, student worker-03, etc.) that would pay students less than the wages they currently earn in civil service classifications. By establishing more than one "student worker" classification, some recognition that different jobs require more or less skill and include differing responsibilities could be achieved.

This option could be justified on the basis that student work is a financial

*all "Student workers" at State a person. Cf. workers rec. financial aid?*

aid. That is, work is an institutional resource that is provided in order to help students meet the increasing costs of their education. As such, the University has a legitimate interest in determining the rates at which students are paid separate from the rates paid to full-time, career or non-student employees. Treating student work as a financial aid would not require any kind of need analysis system (as do grant and loan programs) and would not jeopardize a student's eligibility for these other forms of aid. This option would resemble the system of student employment currently in place in the State University and Community College systems.

• Advantages

1. Cost savings: the University will be able to pay less to all student employees.
2. Clear delineation of student's work as financial aid: this will further clarify the role of student work and provide greater compliance with the PELRA provisions.
3. Some administrative simplification: there will be fewer options to work with on salary rates and classes.
4. Comparability with other colleges and universities: this advantage assumes that comparability based on affiliation is of value and desirable.
5. Expansion of work opportunities: University departments may be able to employ more students.

• Disadvantages

1. Reduction of work variety and opportunities for students: the restriction of classes and of salary rates may also restrict opportunities. A reduction of opportunities may lead to allocation of jobs based on financial need which would further restrict opportunities for students who do not receive financial aid.
2. Implementation and management of another compensation system: there will be administrative costs for the implementation and management of another system of salary rates.
3. Employer-employee resistance: the University is placed in a position of justifying compensation based on status. If this argument does not appear to be justifiable, resistance may be open and vocal on the part of both students and employers.
4. Violates University Regent's resolution of February 1981: this statement reads that "all current practices concerning employment and wages continue when the (student employment) department moves over to the office of Student Financial Aid."
5. May increase administrative responsibilities of Financial Aid office: this would occur if jobs were allocated on a need basis and significantly add to the administrative problems of an already overburdened financial aid staff.

OPTION 5: Change the Civil Service Compensation Policy from a System-wide to a Campus Based Policy

This option would allow each of the five University campuses to determine compensation for its non-academic employees in a fashion that would reflect the prevailing local economic climate. In other words, a campus such as Crookston would be able to pay its employees a wage that would be more comparable to that of a similar non-University job in the Crookston area. Under this plan, one could assume that Twin City Campus employees would earn the highest wages.

● Advantages

1. Cost savings: coordinate campuses could respond more readily to area market rates which tend to be lower than the Twin Cities.
2. Promotion of good community relations: paying comparable rates is likely to be more favorably received by the communities surrounding each University campus.
3. Increase in number of jobs available: more students and civil service employees is a possible result of this option.

● Disadvantages

1. Weakens the affiliation of University campuses: this option may leave the University more vulnerable to charges that the coordinate campuses should be part of the state college system.
2. Area differentials in student and civil service rates may weaken the arguments for academic salary parity for all campuses.

*not passed by scc*

UNIVERSITY STUDENT COMMUNITY RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, an interruption in the academic year will disrupt and detract from the education of University of Minnesota students; and,

WHEREAS, the cost of a faculty strike will be borne by students on all campuses in the form of higher tuition and/or lower services; and,

WHEREAS, we support the position of the UMD Student Association and the UMW Student Senate;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT:

The University student community urges the Board of Regents to enter into binding arbitration with the University of Minnesota Education Association.

This resolution has been passed by the following student organizations:

1. ~~MSA Executive Council~~ - *Not yet*  
- Bruce Thorpe, Minneapolis Campus President
2. SLAC (Student Lobby Advisory Committee)  
- Wally Hilke, Minneapolis Lobbyist

It is expected to pass:

1. Student Senate, Waseca Campus - *passed*  
- Mike Wittus, President
2. The Forum, Minneapolis Campus
3. Student Senate, Morris Campus - *Barry Hojn says MCSA approves binding arbitration but not this resolution*  
- Lori Skjerren, President
4. Student Senate, Crookston Campus - *passed*  
- Tony Fathe, President
5. ~~All 8~~ Student Representatives to the Board of Regents  
*majority of student representatives*