



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING AND
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

January 19, 1984
12:45 - 3:00
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

1. Minutes of January 5 (enclosed).
2. Report of Student Co-Chair (Paul Schulte).
3. Report of the SCC Chair (John Howe).
4. Finance Committee Report (Irwin Rubenstein).
5. Reports on Regents' meetings (John Turner, Marvin Mattson, Deon Stuthman, John Howe).
6. Senate Rules Concerning Questions to the President
(See attached letter from Rick Purple, Chairperson, Business and Rules).
(Note: letter is bound in FCC volume, meeting of 11/10/83)
7. Andersen Commission
(See attached memo from Rick Heydinger to President Magrath).
8. Newsletter (sketch to be distributed at meeting).
9. Discussion with the President.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
January 19, 1984
1:00 - 3:05
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Charles Farrell, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Van Hayden, John Howe (Chairperson), Susan Hunstiger, Marvin Mattson, Lisa McDonell, Jack Merwin, Mitch Richter, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Scott Singer, W. Donald Spring, Deon Stuthman, John Turner.

Guests and visitors: Vice Presidents Keller, Vanselow; Jim Borgestad, Alice Edwards, John Hughes, Maureen Smith.

Professor Howe reported briefly to FCC members regarding the review of the president.

1. Minutes of January 5. Corrections:

a. Page 3, paragraph 4, second sentence:

"...December Regents meetings ~~a~~ several student representatives..."

b. Page 3, second paragraph from the bottom, first sentence:

"Mr. Singer said he had ~~felt threatened~~ by taken as a threat..."

The minutes were accepted with the above two corrections.

2. Reports.

A. The Student Co-Chair. Mr. Schulte.

At the January 6-8 retreat focusing on the Student Senate, the Student SCC together with other student leaders, and including three coordinate campus representatives, refined their task force structure and defined their questions. They have asked Professor Spring, who chaired the special Senate committee to revise the constitution in 1979-80, to serve on their task force.

Mr. Schulte, Ms. McDonell, Ms. Iverson and Mr. Farrell will visit with students and administrators next week at the Morris and Crookston campuses.

SSCC wrote to Vice President Keller requesting that a student be added to the search committee for the Assistant Vice President for Information Processing, and proposing a specific student. Vice President Keller later indicated to the meeting that he had agreed to the proposal and nomination.

B. The SCC Chair. Professor Howe.

(1) Note in the circulating file an advertisement for the position of Director of Physical Plant Operations, a position of interest to the SCC.

(2) Associate Vice President Hewitt's report, "Review of Remodeling Costs of Projects Constructed by the Physical Plant Department," is available for SCC circulation.

(3) Review of the sexual harrassment policy and procedures. According to Professor Bognanno, Chairperson of Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the special review committee will report by the end of Winter Quarter; SCC and others can discuss the report early in Spring Quarter, in time for the required Senate decision by the end of Spring Quarter.

It is SCC's understanding that the entry level for complaints has been moved from Assistant Vice President Robinett's office to the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

(4) Proposed policy statement regarding Senate committees and administratively-appointed task forces has been distributed to SCC members and will be an agenda item on February 2.

(5) Because President Magrath will probably be unable to meet with SCC this afternoon, the item on the Vice President for Planning and Academic Support Activities was moved to the FCC agenda.

Professor Howe reported that FCC, PResident Magrath, and Vice President Keller had an extended discussion on the nature of the position, whether the vice president would be a member of the Budget Executive, whether the Budget Executive is being redefined, the make-up and size of the search committee, and other units which might be included under the office of the new vice president. There remains some flexibility as to which units will report to it.

SCC will schedule soon a discussion with President Magrath and Vice President Keller on the structure and composition of the Budget Executive.

Professor Merwin noted, from his having served on the committee that proposed the creation of a Budget Executive, that it was to fill the need for some entity to prepare and present to the President a budget for the whole University. Its make-up was determined by the President, who initially included three vice presidents-- Academic Affairs, to chair, Finance, and Health Sciences.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Rubenstein.

At its last meeting SFC discussed further the legislative initiatives. Today's agenda consists of (1) the instructional cost study model with data from David Berg; and (2) the 1984-85 retrenchment and reallocation, with Vice President Keller.

D. The January Regents' meetings.

Faculty observers at the several committee meetings summarized the business briefly, noting, among many other items:

- Accreditation: Central administration is somewhat concerned about accrediting agencies duplicating the data bases that already exist

in the respective institutions; (Educational Policy & Long Range Planning)

- Tenure Code revision: Professor Morrison presented the new draft and the Regents reiterated their interest in further discussion with FCC on the subject; (Faculty, Staff & Student Affairs)
- Capital Request; (Budget and Legislative Coordinating Committee)
- Proposals for using funds remaining thanks to favorable bids on University Hospitals and the Music Building; (Budget & Legislative Coordinating, Physical Plant and Investments).

E. First meeting of special ad hoc committee on internal tribunals for Rajender complaints. Professor Merwin.

Most of the meeting was spent in sorting out the exact task. At the next two meetings the committee will receive testimony. Professor Howe may talk further with Professor Striebel (Chr., EEOWC) or Professor Cohn (Chr. of the special committee) on sharpening the definition of the task.

F. January 18 symposium on graduate education. Mr. Singer.

Dean Holt told the assembly the report of the Task Force on Quality in Graduate Education and Research would be out in about a month, and that the Graduate School is already implementing about thirty percent of the recommendations.

3. SCC Discussion with Vice President Keller.

A. Final University arrangements regarding the head football coach, football facilities, and related issues.

Vice President Keller reiterated the public information regarding Mr. Holtz's salary. The only amounts in his contract with the University are for \$75,000 from the University itself and \$25,000 from otherwise uncommitted funds of the University of Minnesota Foundation. Outside his contract, Mr. Holtz himself is making arrangements with the media.

Facilities: The one capital request item which will come before the Legislature is \$1.5 million for 50% of the cost of doming the practice area. There will be private fundraising for the weight training room. The remaining athletic facilities items are already in the current capital request, including the renovation of Williams Arena which, at the Governor's request, will be proposed to be advanced and done all at once.

Professor Howe asked if the athletics request would affect other parts of the University's capital request. Vice President Keller said he thinks it will not affect any academic building requests. The likelihood of the University's getting its recreational sports facility is improved.

Professor Turner noted that reports to the FCC tell of the University's good record in getting outside support. He inquired as to whether the large request for private support for athletics might diminish gifts to the University's academic purposes. Vice President Keller indicated that if the money is raised in the way they expect (from a narrow, specific list), he does not think it will affect other University fundraising. His best judgment, he said, about the

trade-off is that improvement in athletics will have a net positive effect upon fund raising.

Professor Turner asked whether in the light of experience of the process of selecting this coach, the University's carefully developed search procedures have been strengthened, weakened, or not affected.

Vice President Keller told SCC that no search benefits from being in the limelight. The coach search committee followed procedures assiduously up to the development of the list of finalists. It did not damage the University's search processes. However, the whole committee did not interview Mr. Holtz.

Professor Stuthman noted that such is not a requirement; there are other recent examples in which the whole search committee did not interview the finalists.

Professor Howe voiced SCC concern regarding the student side of the student-athlete tandem, particularly in light of the recent press reports on the high proportion of current academic ineligibility on the football team.

Vice President Keller said the commitments from the President, the academic adviser, and the athletics director are reassuring. He thinks people will see real changes. We want athletes to get a degree, he said, and we are not happy with the present record. He added that he would like to see athletes taking advantage of all the undergraduate colleges. Both Professor Howe and Dr. Keller noted that they see it is not the case that one has to get out of big time athletics to be a good university.

B. Institutional Planning Statement: the schedule and process.

Vice President Keller told SCC the new statement is being developed using the 1981 statement, "Institutional Planning Statement--Goals, Objectives, and Priorities--1980-89," as a skeletal document. Our intention is to incorporate into the new Institutional Planning Statement those recommendations from task force reports that the president wants to see carried out. In addition the administration solicited suggestions from the deans. The planning group is working now on the document. It will be institution-wide, is intermediate between the mission statement and the college planning documents, and will not incorporate college plans.

SCC members requested copies of the 1981 document.

Mr. Borgestad noted that the 1979 draft document was never finalized. The 1981 document is the only official institutional planning statement, and fiscal events eclipsed that one in 1982.

In response to a question, Mr. Borgestad said it was his understanding that the Senate Planning Committee is now involved in developing the new statement, and has gotten or is about to get relevant documents. In addition, it has taken on a particular college plan for a sort of case study to compare plans with actual outcomes.

Vice President Keller said every college would know its budget target within four weeks. The Budget Executive has identified what it believes to be acceptable reallocation, and Vice President Keller will discuss those targets with the Finance Committee this afternoon. The next consultation with SFC will concern which collegiate units to assess.

Professor Merwin urged speed in the process as deans need to know how much money they will have for new hiring.

C. Budget Principles. Vice President Keller responded to points in Professor Howe's January 16 letter on behalf of the SCC. The phrase "...and encourage" regarding adjusting the size of the work force to cover negotiated salary increases was included, he said, so the units involved wouldn't take alternative means of securing the necessary funds. Rejecting those particular words was, he said, a point well taken, and he reiterated that the current budget principles pertain only to the 1984-85 budget.

Graduate stipends increase clarification: the meaning is that they should be increased by at least the percentage provided for in the legislative appropriation. He cautioned that our comparisons (on tuition and net cost or net income to graduate students) are not always made on the basis of complete information. For example, Purdue pays out of research grants the out-of-state tuition for the out-of-state graduate students.

Asked whether there might be selective tuition rates, he replied that central administration is not considering it but the graduate school is. No tuition schedule has been set yet for 1984-85.

Elasticity in undergraduate tuition revenues may provide the University with funds to put into graduate tuition aid, he said. The administration is considering how to improve financial assistance for graduate students.

D. Searches: update.

IT Dean: Search closed.

Ag. Dean: Search closed.

School of Management Dean: Final candidates being interviewed.
Won't move on for 3-4 weeks.

UMD Vice Provost: Still accepting applications.

Medical School Dean: Nominations closed; large group of applicants/nominees.

Public Health Dean: Reopened; not yet to the point of interviewing candidates.

Administrative Data Processing Head: Search started.

4. Senate rules and interpretations of rules.

The SCC had questioned Rule K which empowered SCC to select which questions are submitted to the President for response in Senate meetings. Professor Richard Purple, Business and Rules Committee Chairperson, has written SCC explaining the need for some official oversight of that process. SCC accepts the rule as revised by Business and Rules;

"Questions shall be submitted in writing to the clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall review the questions. Because only one-half hour of meeting time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The Committee will also be guided by the

breadth of interest in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topic, and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may, if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question."

5. The Andersen Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

Mr. Rick Heydinger had encouraged the SCC to write to the Commission presenting its viewpoint on certain of the issues the Commission is addressing. There was general SCC agreement in the meeting that SCC needs to find out what, if anything, the University has written to the Commission. SCC and Central Administration could perhaps send a joint document or two complementary documents. SCC will inquire further.

6. SCC Reports (Newsletter).

Professor Howe distributed a list of the possible contents. Professor Turner said the newsletter's purpose should be to point out the importance of governance. The SCC Chair's introduction should state achievements of the governance committees which redound to the welfare of the University students and faculty. Most faculty members aren't aware of what we do and the importance of it. All SCC members were encouraged to call in to Professor Howe appropriate items for the accomplishments list.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant

C O P Y



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

January 16, 1984

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Re: January 19 meeting with SCC

Dear Peter:

We have identified several issues that we would like to discuss with you when you meet with the SCC on January 19.

We might talk first of all about the search process for the Vice President for Planning and Academic Services. Perhaps you could also bring us up to date on the status of other major administrative searches, including the several college deanships.

We talked with you several weeks ago about the search for a new football coach. Now that the process has been completed, we would appreciate an update on final salary and facility arrangements.

We remain somewhat unclear about the schedule and process for developing the new Institutional Planning Statement. Perhaps you could clarify what they will be.

As always, we request your initiatives in bringing before us issues of general University importance.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

John Howe, Chairperson,
Senate Consultative Committee

JH:mp

cc: Senate Consultative Committee
Vice President Kenneth Keller
Vice President Neal Vanselow

Planning Assumption
of
Institutional Planning Statement: Objectives

1. Increase the UM proportion of high-ability students enrolling in higher education by targeting recruiting efforts to the upper 20% of high school graduates without reducing access to UM for all interested students. Improve the student climate, services and aid with an emphasis on able and motivated students.
2. Attract and retain high quality, productive faculty by improving the total environment (high-ability students, better compensation, improved facilities for teaching and research, recognition for accomplishments, fostering a community of scholars, expanded prerequisites, etc.), targeting benefits to the more productive faculty whenever possible.
3. Encourage and facilitate communication and cooperation between academic activities and business/industry/communities.
4. Enhance the international aspects of UM functions by supporting the programs (i.e., International Agriculture and Business, China Center), faculty and support services (i.e., I.S.A.O., I.S.T.C., International Program Office) which have international functions.
5. Emphasize UM's unique educational role as part of an interrelated group of state educational systems. Help to define appropriate roles for the cooperating systems.