



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 18, 1985  
11:00 - 2:00  
626 Campus Club

AGENDA

Approximate  
time:

- 11:00 1. Evaluation of final candidates for Director of Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, leading to a communication to the president. (NOTE: Because it is a personnel item, this portion of the meeting will be closed.)
- 11:20 2. Minutes of April 4 (enclosed).
3. Reports:
- A. Student SCC Chair
  - B. SCC Chair
  - C. Senate Finance Committee
  - D. Pre-Accreditation Site Visit Self-Study Committee
  - E. From Regents' meetings.
- 11:45 (Lunch break)
- 12:15 4. Nominating a vice chairperson for the Assembly and Senate.
5. Nominations required to two non-Senate bodies:
- A. President's Student Behavior Review Panel (one faculty member for a three-year term; four students for one-year terms).
  - B. Recreational Sports Board of Governors (one faculty member for a two-year term; student positions as well).
- 12:30 6. University survey on sexual harassment (item continued from April 4 meeting). Guest: Richard Purple, chair, Review Panel on Sexual Harassment.
- 1:00 7. Wrapping up Senate business for the year (docket deadline for last meeting is May 2):
- Update on Computer Committee
  - Report due Faculty Senate from Library Committee

- Other Senate business which should come forward this spring?
- Agenda for spring quarter meeting of Facilitative Committee.

1:30

8. Civil Service non-voting representation on several Senate and Assembly committees: The three-year experiment concludes within 1985-86. How does SCC want to evaluate the experiment it initiated? (2 enclosures.)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
April 18, 1985  
626 Campus Club  
11:10 - 1:50

APPROVED 5/2/85

Members present: Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chair), Paul Schulte, Deon Stuthman, Wesley B. Sundquist, Bruce Williams; Shirley Clark and David Shope joined the meeting at approximately 12:45.

Guests present for the open meeting: John Aune and Joy Connelly (Daily), Richard Purple, Maureen Smith.

NOTE: The first twenty minutes of the meeting were closed for the Committee to assess the candidates for the position of Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action in preparation for a report to the president.

1. Assessment of OEO/AA directorship candidates.

In a closed session, the SCC members discussed, based upon biographical information and interviews, the strengths and possible weaknesses for this position of each of the four final candidates. The SCC outlined points to be contained in a letter reporting to the president. Discussion also touched upon two non-personnel points: the desirability of the OEO/AA office's being able to have a positive, pro-active role in addition to its law enforcement role, and the possibility of the Senate's undertaking development of a policy regarding equal opportunity and affirmative action.

2. Minutes of the April 4 meetings. The SCC and FCC minutes of that date were approved as distributed.

3. Reports.

A. Student SCC. Mr. Melby.

SSCC's main concern has been over legislative appropriation activity. SSCC has just examined the Student Senate budget. Committee will meet at UMW this week-end.

B. SCC Chair. Professor Merwin.

- Added SCC meeting on Friday, April 26, 1:15 - 3:00 in 327 Coffman Union.  
Agenda: governance.

- The Forum on a possible Twin Cities Campus changeover to the semester system is set for 2:15 this afternoon.

- At today's Senate meeting the Faculty Affairs Committee will seek to move its motion regarding a survey of faculty on the question of the possible changeover from the Senate docket to the Assembly docket because the president's charge to the working group concerned a change for the Twin Cities Campus.

- SCC's annual report is due in the Senate office on May 1. Rough drafts were distributed at the meeting to members and their suggestions requested.

- The SCFA extended subcommittee to design principles for salary distribution has been named and will first meet next week. The group has among its reference materials the budget principles which the Regents currently have under discussion and which appear to be in considerable part a restatement of principles accepted last year.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman.

The April 4 meeting focused on the crisis of that date ignited by signals from the legislature. Committee discussed ways the University could most effectively respond to the threats of an enormous budget reduction. SFC did not discuss the Budget Principles currently before the Regents, but Professor Stuthman reported he does not find inconsistencies between them and earlier presentations the Finance Committee has heard.

D. From the Regents' meetings.

Educational Policy and Long Range Planning. Professor Melsa reported that the move to permit UMC and AVTI's to issue joint Associate of Arts degrees has been tabled until June because of a bill in the legislature that would permit the AVTI's to grant their own such degrees even though classes would still be taught jointly.

Physical Plant and Investments. Professor Stuthman reported that the transit plan is progressing; the University has hired a consulting firm and there is University-community communication. The concept is now moving forward.

4. Nominating a vice chairperson for the Senate and Assembly.

Professor Hogenkamp (Biochemistry) has declined to be nominated. Professor Hamilton (Anatomy) has agreed to be nominated. Three SCC students met with him and the SSCC supports his nomination.

5. Nominations to two non-Senate bodies.

The SCC is asked to nominate members for the President's Student Behavior Review Panel and the Recreational Sports Board of Governors. The SCC chairman will propose some faculty names to SCC later this spring.

6. Senate business.

A. Forming a computer committee. Professor Merwin reported that the Educational Policy Committee is creating a subcommittee on computing and information

systems to provide policy guidance to Assistant Vice President Wolfe until a Senate Committee can be formally created. SCEP has invited nominations for membership on this subcommittee.

Professor Stuthman proposed Professor Tom Scott (Political Science, CURA), because of his 1982-83 work in chairing the Task Force on Information Processing and Management. SCC agreed his name should be forwarded to Professor William Hanson, chair of the subcommittee and chair-designate for SCEP.

B. Other Senate business this spring: the Student Senate amendments.

C. Spring Quarter meeting of the Facilitative Committee: recommendations for the agenda. SCC members proposed:

- (1) Dividing up among Senate and Assembly committees, as appropriate for their study and response, President Keller's commentary on the planning task force recommendations. The President's response is currently being printed;
- (2) Discussion of how chairs can help their successors get off to an early start in the fall;
- (3) Chairs' planning for their respective committees' budgets for the upcoming year;
- (4) Taking a lesson from the students and compiling an orientation packet for new committee members.

7. Proposed University survey on sexual harassment (item continued from April 4 meeting). Guest: Professor Richard Purple, chairperson of the Sexual Harassment Board.

Professor Merwin summarized SCC's concerns about the scope of the undertaking, particularly the estimated costs. Professor Purple noted that the Senate vote in Spring 1984 on University policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment had mandated a survey but had not specified clearly who would be responsible for conducting it. The Board is proposing a mechanism for carrying out that survey. The Board's major goal is for a good, professional survey that will be useful in administering the University's policy. It will not be an attitudinal survey.

Board membership includes two specialists in surveys -- Professors Ellen Berscheid and Will Craig. Cost estimates to the Board range from \$20,000 to \$40,000 and up. Professors Berscheid and Craig and Mr. Darwin Hendel will report firm costs.

The Board wants a professional document which would hold up in a refereed journal, Professor Purple told SCC. A return rate of under 50% would not be acceptable. For reliability in a survey in this area a high rate of return is required. Costs rise because of the need for follow-up reminders. Mr. Hendel believes he could do the model this spring and carry out the survey in the year 1985-86.

The Board and others believe it would not be difficult to raise private funds for this purpose at foundations, if SCC and others are worried about the expense. The Board believes such donations would not come at the expense of other gifts to the University.

Professor Purple told SCC the Board believes it is important to have Mr. Hendel, a research associate in the Office of Academic Affairs, designated the Research Officer of the Senate for purposes of this survey so that it is clearly identified as a Senate project. For a high rate of return participants must be assured the survey is confidential and is separated from the administration. SCC members indicated their hope that such a designation would not be merely superficial.

Professor Clark noted that Mr. Hendel is well known among faculty for his work at the Measurement Services Center. She urged that the letter accompanying the survey take pains to explain his background and his assignment to the Senate for this special purpose. It should also explain, she added, how the data will be treated and protected and specify to whom Mr. Hendel will report -- presumably the Sexual Harassment Board.

Professor Sundquist moved the SCC support in principle the Sexual Harassment Board in its approach to carrying out the survey. The Committee approved the motion without dissent.

8. Civil Service membership on Senate and Assembly committees: assessing the experiment.

Professor Merwin called for suggestions on procedures to evaluate the three-year trial period of having two civil service, non-voting representatives on eight committees of the Senate and Assembly. (Note: Following civil service recruiting and screening, those representatives were appointed by the president in Spring 1983.)

SCC members made the following recommendations:

- (1) Survey the civil service people who have served, asking how much time it required of them and how helpful it has been to them;
- (2) Survey some of the non-civil service members of the committees;
- (3) Survey the chairs of the participating committees;
- (4) Tabulate the attendance.

Professor Sundquist noted that the move for this representation had arisen when the University was in a retrenchment mode and civil service employees feared there would not be adequate consultation and that central administration might see civil service as the easiest place to cut. He and Professor Stuthman both remarked that the Senate Finance Committee has had very good input from the civil service people appointed to it. Their practical backgrounds in their units have resulted in their adding a particularly useful perspective to the Finance Committee.

Professor Merwin noted that SCC would need to formulate a proposal for the Senate and Assembly not too late in the 1985-86 year.

9. Motion regarding the Twin Cities student body president vis a vis the Assembly and Senate.

Ms. Emanuelson presented to SCC the following motion:

"To make the student body president of the Twin Cities campus an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and the University Senate."

The purposes are to give that person an official role in the University Senate and the Campus Assembly and enable him or her to be eligible for election to the Senate Consultative Committee.

Discussion:

The mechanics of MSA's election process, and the bylaws of the Senate, now make it very unlikely that the above results can occur.

Mr. Melby advocated going further by specifying that the student body presidents of the coordinate campuses are to be their respective campuses' student members on SCC. However, coordinate campus members at the meeting did not favor that requirement, and noted that since they elect student SCC members in the fall, when the student body president has already been chosen, that option is already available to each campus.

There followed brief discussion of whether changes in MSA rules and election scheduling could permit the desired result.

Profesor Stuthman said that the student voice is rendered somewhat ineffective because there are many official student voices which are not all of one mind. He urged facing this issue, saying it might gain students a stronger voice. Mr. Shope agreed with the assessment of many voices, but argued that to some extent having numerous actors is desirable for the student body because it allows one leader to take radical positions while another "holds the ropes."

After a short exchange on whether current or incoming SSCC members should address the question, the motion was continued to the May 2 meeting. Ms. Emanuelson will in the meantime submit it to the Business and Rules Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

April 19, 1985

President Kenneth H. Keller  
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

The Senate Consultative Committee appreciated the opportunity to interview the four candidates for the position of Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. We are very much aware that having the best possible leadership in that office is important to the University's health.

A reading of the biographical materials and interviews by those able to attend the scheduled meeting with each candidate left us with enough questions that in some cases we followed up with discrete contacts, in confidence, with individuals we knew could provide information regarding track records at the candidates' current institutions. Based upon this input, we judged two of the candidates, Diane Rausch and Pat Mullen, to be outstanding. We comment below on each of the candidates.

Patricia Mullen. She enjoys our high regard for the good quality of her work here on campus. She is always cordial but at the same time straightforward so that one always knows clearly what she means. Some of us have observed her ably-done workshops. The SCC member of the presidential search advisory committee was impressed with the competence and style of her assistance there, and noted her having exactly the right sense of what to draw to the members' attention. When requested to help out she performs very well.

Sue Rausch. All of us who talked with her were favorably impressed. She struck us as sensible and capable. We liked her calm, cooperative, non-confrontational operating style. It is clear she has a good grasp of her field. We gathered from what she said that her approach is to anticipate where difficulties might arise and to work to obviate them, rather than waiting to react. We see her as not inclined to upset tradition, and we regard favorably the very high degree of administrative support she seems to enjoy. That is surely essential to the effectiveness of the EEO officer.

President Kenneth Keller  
April 19, 1985  
page two

Sue Kindred. We were impressed with her description of the educational undertakings she has initiated at Ohio State. We recognize that the different distribution of equal opportunity/affirmative action responsibilities at OSU provides her with more time to fulfill this function, but we respect her alertness in recognizing needs and her apparent vigor in meeting them. She exudes self-confidence that might well be viewed by some as abrasiveness that could interfere with development of the very important interrelationships that must be built by the person in this position.

U. Harold Levy. We saw him as an energetic individual, but in experience and self-presentation not of the caliber of the other candidates. We suspect he would be a less effective communicator who might tend to alienate some people instead of bringing them along in an educative way.

The interview series and our April 18 discussion inspired SCC members to hope the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action can take on a more positive role than just enforcing the law and handling allegations of sexual harassment. We found ourselves asking if the University community could not benefit by pro-active movement from that office. To the extent that present limitations are imposed by the Rajender Consent Decree, we must be patient and prepare to take forward-looking initiatives in 1989. But our interviews left us with the feeling that given the needed resources, the office could play a leading role in establishing a broader, more solid base for a University-wide positive approach toward meeting our moral as well as legal obligations in regard to non-discrimination.

Sincerely,

*Jack C. Merwin*  
Jack C. Merwin, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee

JCM:mbp

CU 500 5-2



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President  
202 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
(612) 373-2025

April 25, 1985

Professor Jack C. Merwin, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall

Dear Jack:

Thank you very much for your letter of April 19, 1985, summarizing the views of the Senate Consultative Committee on the four candidates for the position of Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. I appreciate and agree with your suggestions that we try to make the office more pro-active in the future to the extent that the law allows. Indeed, I believe we should examine what flexibility the law may provide if we approach the matter in a creative way.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Ken', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:kb

18 April 1984

MOTION

To make the student body president of the Twin Cities campus an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and the University Senate.

RATIONALE

In an effort to centralize the authority of student government, and since the student body president is the logical focal point for MSA activity, it seems only reasonable that the president should be able to participate directly and officially in the decision making processes of the University Senate. This motion will also enable the president to be eligible for election to the Senate Consultative Committee.

Submitted by: Beth Emanuelson

IT Senator