



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

## SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### CONVERSATION WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH

October 8, 1981

2:30 p.m. - 3:40 p.m.

Members present: Douglas Pratt, Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton, Virginia Fredricks, John Howe, Marvin Mattson, Richard Purple, Paul Quie, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan, Kit Wiseman, Bea Anderson, Jim Brewer, Dave Lenander, Keith Jacobson, and Dennis Sargent. Guests: Vice Presidents Hasselmo and Keller, Gary Engstrand, Charles Walcott, Vera Schletzer, Vivian Barfield, Bruce Thorpe, Mary Jane Plunkett, and press people Maureen Smith, Don Jacobson and Cathy Gabe.

President Magrath was asked to comment upon a number of issues.

#### U. of Minn. policy on secret research - the case of Dr. Mirocha

The first issue was that of whether or not Professor Mirocha's work on State Department leaf samples was a violation of University policy on secret research. The related question of whether or not the University policy on secret research needs strengthening was also raised. President Magrath replied by saying that the University does have a solid and carefully drawn policy which makes it clear that secret research is not to be carried on by the University. Faculty members can consult for pay but only on a carefully defined basis which involves approval by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Board of Regents. Professor Mirocha's work was not research and was not consultative. The University performs services to the public on an episodic and casual basis by providing information and referrals. Professor Mirocha's activities can easily be placed in this latter category.

Professor Eaton asked what would be the correct reply to a request that testing or results of testing be kept confidential. Vice President Keller replied that the request could not be granted unless the University itself had interests in the work being performed or unless the research was already being carried under the terms of a previously approved consulting contract.

Professor Fredricks wondered if faculty are generally aware that confidential arrangements are not allowed under University policy. President Magrath replied that he thought that most faculty are aware of the guidelines but it is possible that some are not.

Professor Mattson commented that a gray area exists in the matter of providing information on a casual basis since it is not always known exactly how that information will then be used.

### Unit reviews and personnel evaluation

The next question was whether or not unit reviews may include personnel recommendations. President Magrath replied that committees that review units ought not to make personnel recommendations but that assessments of personnel are sometimes inevitable.

Professor Purple commented that this is what happened when the women's athletics department was reviewed.

Dave Lenander suggested that this distinction between recommendations and assessments needs to be more carefully explained to review committee members.

Vice President Keller said that some issues regarding a unit and its personnel are inseparable.

Professor Fredericks asked if a review report that mentions the name of a department chairperson would be entered in the personnel file of that chairperson. President Magrath replied that the report would not be placed the personnel file.

Vice President Hasselmo stated that in an extraordinary situation, a non-public document may be drawn up that reviews personnel. Professor Spring asked if this is what happened in the case of Vivian Barfield. Vice President Hasselmo replied that, since he could not discuss personnel matters with the SCC, he could make no comment. Professor Pratt commented that if rules were allowed to change within the course of a reviewal, then the policy of due process could be violated. Vice President Hasselmo replied that the rules were not allowed to change and procedures followed standardized formats. He said that in the case being referred to the review committee found an unusual situation and called it to the Vice President's attention.

President Magrath said that in a hypothetical case of a departmental controversy involving many letters of complaint against a professor which are sent to a dean, a unit review may inevitably contain rather sharp comments about personnel despite adherence to due process policies.

Professor Howe asked if the distinction between unit and personnel review is made clear to review committee members. Vice President Keller replied that he thought it was. Professor Fredericks said she thought that the distinction had not been clearly delineated.

### Personnel files

President Magrath was asked whether the Administration informs individuals about changes in their personnel files. President Magrath replied individuals are informed and that whatever is in their official personnel file is open to the individual. He added that information in private files must also be made available to individuals upon request. Professor Swan suggested that personnel be issued annual invitations to inspect their files.

Vice President Hasselmo commented that there are problems involving the accumulation of spurious material in files. There is no clear policy on what should be done with such material - should it be sent back to the sender, reported to the subject, held until a situation arises involving the subject? Professor Spring reported that this problem had arisen at the Morris campus. A decision was made to go through each person's file with that person in attendance. Vice President Hasselmo concluded the discussion

by saying it is clear that if anything is going to be used in the review of an individual, it must be shared with that individual.

#### Review Committee Schedules

Professor Pratt asked if it would be possible for review committees to complete their work earlier in the school year or delay action until fall. President Magrath replied that it is difficult to control completely the time period necessary for completion of the committees' work but that an effort could be made to act in a more timely fashion. Vice President Keller commented that a delay procedure could cause problems of its own.

#### State financial crisis

Professor Pratt asked if there was anything more that could be done in the light of the state's financial crisis. President Magrath replied that it would be useless to speculate but rather that he would consult immediately with the SCC should any important changes or developments occur.

Vice President Keller added that he has scheduled conferences with the deans' budget units for October and November to discuss programmatic curtailment for the coming years. Patricia Swan reported that the Finance Committee of the SCC would welcome more discussion with the Administration. Vice President Keller replied that he felt the lines of communication were open but would welcome comments, recommendations, etc. Professor Eaton asked if specific programs had been discussed with the deans and whether that information had been passed on to the colleges. Vice President Keller replied that specific programs had been discussed, for reallocation, not for cuts, and documents sent to President Magrath who has been in constant communication with the Board of Regents.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

#### AGENDA

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
Thursday, October 22, 1981  
9:30 - 11:30 a.m.

University of Minnesota, Morris

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of October 8 (if available in advance).
3. Report of the Chair.
  - a. Written report enclosed.
  - b. Oral report on the Regents meetings.
4. Report of the Student Chair.
5. Committee Reports.
6. Old Business.
  - a. Committee on Communication, Computation and Information - relation to Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
7. New Business.
  - a. Recognition of service on Senate committees.
  - b. Composition of Facilitative Committee of Senate.
  - c. Policies and Procedures governing University service testing laboratories.
  - d. Matters SCC should pursue or monitor this year.
  - e. Agenda for FCC-Regents meeting.
8. Adjournment.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA All University Senate Consultative Committee  
TWIN CITIES

220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
October 22, 1981

University of Minnesota, Morris  
Edson Hall Lounge

The regular meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was called to order by Douglas Pratt, Chair, at 10:05 a.m. in the Edson Hall Lounge on the Morris campus of the University. The other members present were Bea Anderson, Robert Brasted, Jim Brewer, Marcia Eaton, Keith Jacobson, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marvin Mattson, Paul Quie, Dennis Sargeant, W. Donald Spring, and Kit Wiseman. Stacy ~~Milovich~~ <sup>Milavetz</sup> of the Minnesota Daily also attended.

1. The agenda was fixed with the addition of one item under New Business: a proposal that Faculty Affairs be requested to develop a draft policy for the University on maternity leave.
2. The minutes and record of the Conversation with the President from October 8 were approved with two corrections: the spelling of 'Brasted' and the addition of Rick Linden's name as guest at both meetings.
3. Report of the Chair.
  - a. Professor Pratt summarized and in some instances elaborated upon his written report. Item (4) concerned recognition of service on Senate committees and Committee on Committees' difficult time this year in identifying persons willing to serve as chairs of Senate committees. The revised constitution makes the body responsible for choosing committee membership also responsible for naming the chair. Professor Spring explained that the Constitution committee anticipated that there might be some difficulty and recommended to the naming committees that the University President, as Chair of the Senate, could continue to send out the same kind of notification of committee membership and chairship as formerly.

Professor Pratt pointed out that the Committee on Committees feel they should not send to the President the name of an individual unwilling or unable to serve, and hence the necessity of obtaining the person's agreement in advance. Professor Spring urged that the Committee on Committees do what it in practice did formerly, which was to identify the individual most qualified to chair a given committee and forward that name to the President. He agreed that it is important to build service recognition into the reward system.

- b. Professor Pratt reported that he will convene the Facilitative

Committee early in November. Because not all of the chairs were filled, it was not possible to gather this group earlier. One of his objectives is to get news from these University-wide committees into Brief.

There followed some discussion about press relations generally, and the need for more public information about the contributions the University makes to the state. Professor Pratt will contact Vice President Kegler and ask if it would be appropriate for his assistant, Bob Anderson, to discuss with the SCC ways to get more press coverage for the University.

c. Report from Regents meetings. Professor Pratt attended the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee meeting of October 15 and, at the request of Vice President Hasselmo, reported on the Faculty Senate position regarding the proposed unisex retirement system. The change which both the Senate and central administration favor provides that distribution of contributions made prior to the date of effectiveness of the new policy will not change, but that distribution of all contributions made after that date will be strictly on a unisex basis. The Regents have been wary of implementing a change until suits against TCIA-CREF in other states where changes to unisex systems have been made. Vice President Hasselmo has written Professors Williams (Faculty Affairs) and Pratt that their testimony was very helpful in persuading the Regents of the fairness of instituting the change without further delay. Both have been asked to attend once again in November when the Regents will vote on the question.

Professor Pratt reported also on the Regents Committee of the Whole, where the dominant topic was University team use of the Humphrey domed stadium. The administration and the Regents have taken the position that the stadium commission is not adhering to the intent of the legislature in making the dome accessible to the Gophers (ticket tax, no concession income).

President Magrath also announced his decision at that Regents meeting not to grant the civil service salary increases at this time. The Civil Service employees hence got only a day or two's notice before the increase was expected to take effect. Unionized employees in the state are now receiving their raises. Jerome Larson of the Civil Service Committee has told Professor Pratt of intense civil service concern about the delay and apprehension that the monies reserved are now vulnerable.

d. Professor Pratt will ask the Subcommittee on Grievance and Legal Concerns to stay in close touch with the implementation of the sexual harrasment grievance policies.

4. Report of the student chair. Kit Wiseman introduced Rick Linden, just elected to the Consultative Committee to replace Heather Bjork, who resigned. She reported that Rick Linden will be the student SCC member on Finance and Nancy Brecht will serve on the Grievance and Legal Concerns subcommittee. Most campuses are now selecting their student representatives to the Board of Regents.

The student governance retreat participants heard from Val Vicmanus, George Robb and Fred Morrison on the state's deficit and its meaning for the University.

Students on most campuses are discussing the student fee system and will report to the Regents in November. Bea Anderson reported UMD students are indicating a willingness to give up some services in order to hold down tuition and fees.

5. Committee reports.

a. Legislative relations. Professor Eaton reported that the subcommittee has met briefly with Peter Robinson, faculty liaison to the legislature. They concluded it is necessary to wait until after the collective bargaining election to establish district meetings between faculty and their legislators. Vice President Kegler's office is preparing mailing lists by legislative district. Because many legislators feel they hear requests on behalf of the University only from people who have a vested interest in the University, the subcommittee began consideration of developing a blue-ribbon committee of individuals not strongly identified with the University who would lobby on its behalf at the legislature.

The subcommittee report stimulated a discussion about the state's deteriorating financial situation and what it would mean to the University. It was recognized that the University's response would have to be swift once the extent and distribution of the cuts are known. The SCC agreed it must insist that it be heavily consulted, and have a genuine part in retrenchment discussions. The SCC wants there to be a University-wide perspective brought to bear on making cuts, not a collection of isolated unit-by-unit decisions. Professor Spring summarized the University's two distinct tasks: first, to make the legislature's treatment of the University as little harmful as possible (assuming there is a special session) and second, to choose and carry out the method by which to determine whatever cuts have to be made.

6. Old Business. Committee on Computation, Communication and Information (CCI) Professor Spring described the discussions the subcommittee on Senate Reorganization had regarding the University Committee on Computer Services. They determined to eliminate that committee, which had been inactive for several years in the face of the power of the administrative committee on computer services. Responsibility was transferred to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to "advise the University Senate on policy matters related to both the research and instructional uses of computers".

Both Professors Eaton and Howe had, following Carl Adams' October 8 report from his committee to SCC, communicated to Professor Pratt their conviction that the educational impact of altered systems be of primary interest to the CCI committee. Professor Spring moved, Professor Eaton seconded, that the chairs of Educational Policy, Research and the Consultative Committee discuss with Carl Adams possible coordination of effort involving his need for student and faculty review of the forthcoming second report of his committee and Educational Policy's need to investigate problems with computer facilities particularly among users concerned with instructional uses. The motion was passed without dissent. The Consultative Committee will suggest that an expanded subcommittee of Educational Policy might be the means of coordination. Such a committee could include an SCC member, and some of the people most concerned with computer use. Professor Pratt asked the SCC members to call him with nominees to propose at the meeting

the SCC has called for.

7. New Business.

a. Need for recognition of service on Senate committees. Committee on Committees has asked the SCC to discuss this question in light of the faculty's increased responsibility for making up committees. Kit Wiseman noted that the President's recognition dinner for student leaders is effective. It was suggested that a letter from the President to the department chair of each Senate committee member recognizing the service would be at least a small 'plus' in the faculty member's file. The subject of adequate recognition will receive further discussion at a later meeting. Professor Pratt remarked that committee chairs would especially value secretarial assistance.

b. Policies and Procedures governing University service testing laboratories. Professor Pratt stated that the University appears to have adequate policies and practices governing the acceptance of research grants and contracts and consulting work. Testing, however, which has increased enormously because of rapid growth in scientific information and processes, is under less regulation. The government has discouraged duplication of testing facilities and encouraged specialized services at specific institutions. In addition to accommodating colleagues from other institutions, faculty here are also accommodating private companies, both in Minnesota and outside the state. There seem to be no regulations governing or prioritizing such services.

Professor Brasted stated that he would hate to see a legitimate instance of testing (the recent Mirocha work) used to generate a complex and perhaps rigid governing mechanism to over-control such services. Dave Lenander voiced his agreement with that view. Professor Spring said that while he agreed in part, there might be occasions when it would be useful to have policies committed to paper for reference. The Regents want to discuss the question with the FCC at their November 12 meeting.

c. University policy on maternity leave. Professor Eaton moved that the Consultative Committee ask Faculty Affairs to consider the need for the University to establish a policy on maternity leaves and draft such a policy if it appears needed. The motion carried without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith Poppele*  
Meredith Poppele,  
Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

Report of the Chair for October 22 meeting.

1. Vice President Keller has constituted a Humanities Outreach Task Force. A copy of his letter to the members is enclosed.

2. Committee on Communication, Computation and Information.  
Marcia Eaton and John Howe have both called attention to the educational aspect of changes in the existing system. John Howe asks that educational considerations be primary in the change process. Marcia Eaton points out that the University's Computer Committee has gone out of existence and its charge been transferred to Educational Policy, one of whose responsibilities under the constitution is "to advise the University Senate on policy matters related to both the research and instructional use of computers." SCC will hear a request that it write the CCI committee and ask that it keep the Committee on Educational Policy informed of its progress and plans.

3. Sexual Harrassment Board. In response to the considerable concern expressed that the campus community, and especially the students, be made aware of the new structure for dealing with such harrassment grievances, I am forwarding to our Subcommittee on Grievance and Legal Concerns the documents relating to the new board and its governing policies and asking them to keep abreast of the development of the "Entry Level Office" and especially of how and when the campus will be informed of the existence and jurisdiction of this new office.

4. Senate Committees.

a. Recognition for Service. Committee on Committees has had an unusually difficult time in fulfilling its new responsibility of naming chairpersons for those committees it appoints. They have suggested that now that faculty have considerably increased responsibility for naming committees, faculty should also address the question of how to recognize Senate committee service.

b. Facilitative Committee. It has been impossible to assemble a meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee because a few key chairs went unfilled until last week. I hope to meet with this group in early November. Some reconstitution of the group is in order because of the committee changes under the new constitution.

The participating committee chairpersons in recent years have been those from Academic Standing and Relations (now known as Student Academic Services Committee), Business and Rules, Committees, Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, Biennial Request and Budget Review (now known as Finance), Judicial, Library, Research, Resources and Planning, and Social Concerns. Last year the chair of Tenure was included. Resources and Planning is now

divided into Physical Plant and Space Allocation on the one hand, and Planning on the other hand. The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women has been added to the Senate.

Meetings of the Facilitative Committee of the Senate fulfill, through the chair of the SCC, one of the responsibilities of the SCC which, under the rules, is "to meet with the chairs of selected committees of the Senate at the beginning of each academic year and at convenient intervals throughout the year in order to facilitate the business of the Senate and its committees and the dissemination of information concerning Senate business." It is appropriate at this time to consider which committees' participation is most essential.

5. Policies and Procedures governing University Service Testing Laboratories. This is the range of activity that President Magrath described to us on October 8 as providing service to the public and as being less well-defined than policies on research and on consultation. The item is on the agenda under New Business and relates directly to number 6 directly below.

6. Preparation for FCC meeting with the Regents on November 12. The Regents would appreciate a discussion on "consulting policy", but the specific concerns seem to relate to the service area. They have mentioned Soil Science's Soil Testing Lab and Plant Pathology Extension's Plant Disease Clinic as two on which they would like to learn the policies and practices. The FCC may want to propose additional topics.

Douglas C. Pratt

OCT 8 1981



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs  
213 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October 2, 1981

TO: Ms. Cheryl Dickson, Minnesota Humanities Commission  
Professor Eleanor S. Fenton, Continuing Education and Extension  
Professor J. Dennis Hurrell, College of Liberal Arts  
Ms. Lyndel I. King, University Gallery  
Ms. Barbara Klixbull, Agricultural Extension Service  
Professor Stanford E. Lehmberg, College of Liberal Arts  
Professor David B. O'Fallon, Continuing Education and Extension  
Professor Irene M. Ott, Agricultural Extension Service  
Professor Marcia J. Pankake, University Libraries  
Professor John R. Wallace, College of Liberal Arts/Graduate School

FROM: Kenneth H. Keller, Vice President

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Kenneth H. Keller'.

I write to ask you to serve as a member of the Humanities Outreach Task Force which is being formed to explore new initiatives for making the University's resources in the humanities and social sciences accessible to the citizens of the State. John R. Wallace, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, has agreed to chair the Task Force.

The formation of this Task Force is an outgrowth of informal discussions held last year involving representatives of the humanities departments, the Agricultural Extension Service, Continuing Education and Extension, the Minnesota Humanities Commission, and the Graduate School. It was the sense of these discussions that fresh energy and thought devoted to outreach activities in the humanities will have many benefits. We live in a time of rapid social change combined with slowed economic growth. The humanities disciplines, by providing multiple perspectives on our society and on the societies with which ours interacts, will give people resources and confidence and shared understanding needed for constructive shaping of and adjustment to change. At the same time, the humanities disciplines, in making themselves accessible and relevant to the needs and interests of citizens, will develop new audiences for and new reservoirs of understanding of their scholarly work and of the cultural traditions they have in their care.

I ask that the Task Force: (1) articulate a rationale for outreach activities in the humanities; (2) explore modes of cooperation between existing institutional structures--the Agricultural Extension Service, Continuing Education and Extension, the University Gallery, the Minnesota Humanities Commission, and the colleges of the University which house humanities disciplines--which will make the best use of networks and resources already in place as we foster new outreach activities; (3) oversee the design, implementation, and evaluation of pilot outreach projects; (4) explore the availability of resources, both inside the University and outside it in state and federal agencies and in private foundations, for carrying out pilot projects and putting into place on a regular basis types of projects which prove successful.

Humanities Outreach Task Force  
October 2, 1981  
Page 2

Since the charge to this Task Force falls in areas for which the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has a general responsibility, I ask that the Task Force consult with this committee and that reports on the Task Force be transmitted concurrently to me and to SCEP.

If I do not hear from you to the contrary, I will assume that you are willing to take on this important assignment. I appreciate your cooperation.

:lme

cc: Professor Douglas C. Pratt, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee  
Professor Stanford E. Lehmberg, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy

October 26, 1981

Professor C. Arthur Williams, Jr.  
Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
868a Business Administration  
West Bank Campus

Dear Art:

The Senate Consultative Committee has just been made aware of the lack of a University-wide policy regarding maternity leave, and has also learned that Vice President Hasselmo wrote to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs in August requesting it to draft a policy. The Consultative Committee joins in the request.

The SCC voted on October 22 to ask that Faculty Affairs determine whether there is a need for a University-wide policy on maternity leaves and, if the need exists, to develop a draft of such a policy.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas C. Pratt,  
Chair

DCP:mbp

1951

Professor O. Arthur Williams  
Chair, Senate Committee on University Affairs  
310 Business Administration  
New York Campus

Dear Sir:

The Senate Committee on University Affairs has just been made aware of the lack of a university-wide policy regarding maternity leave, and has also learned that Vice President Lammont wrote to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs in August requesting it to draft a policy. The Committee Committee joins in the request.

The BOV voted on October 22 to ask the Faculty Affairs determine whether there is a need for a university-wide policy on maternity leave and, if the need exists, to develop a draft of such a policy.

Sincerely yours,

Donald E. Pratt,  
Chair

DEP:mpj



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President  
for Administration and Planning  
200 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

NOV 12 1981

November 9, 1981

Dr. Douglas C. Pratt, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee  
220 Bio Sciences Center  
St. Paul Campus

Dear Doug:

I enclose copies of letters that I have written to the Chair of the SCFA, Prof. Art Williams, concerning the need for establishing a maternity leave policy for the University. It is my understanding that the committee will address this issue within the near future. My request was prompted by some petitions received under the Rajender consent decree concerning maternity leaves.

I wanted to let you know about this action since the matter was raised at the October 22 meeting of the SCC.

Cordially,

*Nils*

Nils Hasselmo  
Vice President for  
Administration & Planning

NH:alw

Encl.

CC: Art Williams  
Marcia Eaton

October 20, 1981

TO: C. Arthur Williams, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

FROM: Nils Hasselmo

On August 18, I wrote to you requesting that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs undertake a review of the faculty disability/maternity leave policy at the University. This request was made in conjunction with petitions that have been filed under the Rajender consent decree charging that the University faculty maternity leave policy is discriminatory in relation to the informal policy in effect for illnesses and disabilities. Now that I have received the good news that you have agreed to take on the chairmanship for one more year, I simply want to renew the request.

I am enclosing additional information that I have received on the maternity leave policy in the community college system (contract between the Minnesota State Board for Community Colleges and the Minnesota Community College Faculty Association).

Could an informal hearing on the issue be scheduled by the committee within the next few weeks? If so, I would like to inform the petitioners so that they can be present.

Your committee's assistance in the review of this policy will be much appreciated.

PW

cc: Bobby Robinett  
Lillian Williams  
Joel Tierney  
Pat Mullen

Encl.

August 18, 1981

TO: C. Arthur Williams, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

FROM: Nils Hasselmo, Vice President, Administration and Planning

I am writing to request that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs undertake a review of the faculty disability/maternity leave policy. This request is made at this time because petitions have been filed under the Rajender consent decree charging that the University faculty maternity leave policy is discriminatory in relation to the informal policy in effect for illnesses and disabilities.

I am enclosing a copy of the Faculty Information Bulletin (see pages 24 and 25 for descriptions on "sick leave" and "maternity leave" policies) and also a copy of the Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Program at the University of Minnesota (see page vi for "administrative policy on maternity leave"). A formal disability policy to encompass all medical situations and to comply with Title VII regulations, is necessary in order to respond to these petitions. Your committee's assistance in developing such a policy would be greatly appreciated. I would be happy to meet with your committee to discuss these concerns.

IN

Encl.

bcc: L. Williams  
B. Robinett  
J. Lavintman

OCT 15 1981



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
MORRIS

Office of the Dean  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

October 14, 1981

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair  
All-University Senat&Consultative  
Committee  
220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Dear Dr. Pratt:

Thank you for your letter to me as Chair of the UMM Curriculum Committee. The Committee met yesterday, and I urged all the members to attend the SCC Open Forum on the Morris Campus on October 22. We also discussed issues and questions about curriculum which might arise. The members of the Committee felt that they had no questions requiring information which would have to be gathered in advance. We look forward to the discussion with you.

Let me also note, for your information, that the UMM Seminar and Independent Study Committee also met yesterday, convened by Dr. Arnold Henjum, Education, and that the members appeared to have no special concerns to bring to you. They, also, will try to attend the forum and will be glad to try to answer any questions the SCC may have.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elizabeth S. Blake".

Elizabeth S. Blake  
Academic Dean

ESB:hd

September 28, 1981

Morris Consultative Committee  
c/o Professor Dwight Purdy  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Dear Professor Purdy:

The members of the All University Senate Consultative Committee are pleased to have the opportunity to meet on the Morris campus on Thursday, October 22. W. Donald Spring has arranged our schedule and given me the names of contact persons on your central campus committees. I am writing to you as a member of Morris's Consultative Committee to invite you and the other members to join the SCC in its open forum which will be held at 2:30 on that date in the Edson Hall Lounge. Since this year's chair for the MCC has apparently not yet been named, I would appreciate your discussing with your fellow committee members issues, questions and concerns any of you would like to raise with the Senate Consultative Committee, and encouraging them to attend and participate in the forum.

We also invite any of you to submit in advance questions which might require information-gathering. If you could telephone or mail to me any such inquiries no later than Monday, October 19, I will ask a member of the SCC to try to be prepared to respond with the desired information on the 22nd.

The SCC will also hold its regular semi-monthly business meeting in the morning of October 22, from 9:30-12:00, again-- I believe--in Edson Lounge. Members of the Morris campus community are welcomed to attend.

Cordially,

Douglas C. Pratt,  
Chair

DCP:mbp

✓ Morris letters of invitation to go to:

✓ Professor James Togeas  
Vice Chair, Executive Committee  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

✓ Professor Roland Guyotte, Chair,  
Scholastic Committee  
UMM  
Morris...

✓ Consultative Committee \*  
c/o Professor Dwight Purdy  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

✓ Professor Laird Barber, Chair,  
Teacher Education Committee  
UMM  
Morris...

✓ Professor Joseph Latterell  
Chair, Morris Campus Planning Committee  
UMM  
Morris.....

Seminar and Independent Study Committee  
c/o Professor Arnold Henjum  
UMM  
✓ Morris...

✓ Dean Elizabeth Blake, Chair,  
Curriculum Committee  
UMM  
Morris ...

✓ Student Affairs Committee  
c/o Professor Kenneth Hodgson  
UMM  
Morris...

✓ Professor Clyde Johnson, Chair,  
Financial Aids Committee  
UMM  
Morris...

✓ Morris Campus Student Association,  
Randy Gerdes, President  
UMM  
Morris ... (with request that he  
circulate the message to all the  
student leaders on campus)

✓ Professor Richard Grant, Chair,  
Library Committee  
UMM  
Morris...

✓ Professor Dennis Templeman, Chair,  
Minority Experience Committee  
UMM  
Morris...



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FROM THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE'S OPEN FORUM ON  
THE QUESTION OF OPENING UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE <sup>PROCEEDINGS</sup> ~~PROCEDURES~~, 1/22/81, 3:15-5:00 p.m.,  
MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM.

(The Minnesota Daily's January 26 editorial contains a good encapsulation of the arguments presented at the forum.)

Approximately 40 people attended the forum. The following organizations and committees were represented by these faculty spokespersons: UMEA, Richard Sykes; AAUP, H. E. Mason; University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, Laura Cooper and Patricia Faunce; Senate Committee on Social Concerns' Subcommittee on Equality of Opportunity for Women, Rosalyn Rubin; Faculty Advisory Committee for Women, Clare Woodward. In addition, five persons spoke as concerned individuals, and prepared statements were read from two faculty members unable to attend.

The position of the executive committee of the AAUP favors restricted confidentiality: that the findings of the Judicial panel should be released without constraint once they have been sent to the President, and that there be no restraints beyond that time upon observers of the proceedings. The executive committee as a whole was uncertain whether greater openness would lead to greater fairness.

The position of every other participating group and individual, including the AAUP spokesperson speaking for himself, was in favor of open grievance proceedings. The question was considered largely in terms of the consequences of open and of closed hearings. These were the arguments advanced against closed hearings and in favor of open hearings:

1. Credibility. The public perceives that someone has something to hide in a closed meeting. Public scrutiny will enhance the credibility of fair procedures.
2. Fairness. Public scrutiny will force a change in any unfair practices.
3. Tradition. Anglo-Saxon society and its descendants have a thousand-year history of public trials in legal proceedings, a tradition which has been repeatedly reaffirmed by judges and lawmakers.
4. Accessibility of the record. A petitioner or potential petitioner ought to have access to the record of past hearings. An individual can learn therefrom what kinds of cases have usually prevailed and what kinds have failed, and what the telling arguments have been, thereby being in a better position to judge the worth of bringing a case. The same University lawyer has joined all Judicial hearings for 15 years or more, hence has immediate acquaintance with the precedents which lawyers for claimants lack.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

To: Senate Consultative Committee  
From: Meredith Poppele  
Date: October 16, 1981  
Subject: MEETING NOTICE

SCC Visit to the University of Minnesota, Morris Campus  
Thursday, October 22  
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Travel: Everyone who will make the round-trip flight from the Twin Cities, please assemble at 8:00 a.m. on the Minneapolis campus between Morrill Hall and Northrup Audit. by the stairs which lead to Parking Lot #1. Bob Brasted, Marcia Eaton and Paul Quie have offered to drive the group to and from the Anoka County Airport. Take-off time is 8:30 a.m. The flight takes about 40 minutes. The Twin Cities-Waseca-Duluth group and the Crookston and Morris groups will meet at the Morris campus.

Meals: No breakfast service. Lunch will be served at Morris.

Schedule at Morris:

approx. 9:15	Arrival Morris airport
9:30 - 11:30	SCC meeting
12:00 - 12:45	Lunch
12:45 - 1:15	Presentation - a profile of Morris and its governance structure
1:15 - 2:15	Tours
2:30 - 3:30	Open Forum - SCC and the UMM community
approx. 4:00	Departure from Morris airport