



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA

All University Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, June 18, 1981
12:45 - 3:00 p.m.
Regents Room

1. Fix agenda
2. Minutes of May 28 (sent previously)
3. Report of Chair (enclosed)
4. Report of Student Chair
5. Report on Regents meetings
6. Committee reports
 - a. UCBRBR (Budget; UCBRBR materials coming to you separately)
 - b. Other
7. Newsletter
8. Women's intercollegiate athletics/ Big Ten (enclosure)
9. Continuation of discussion with Vice President Keller 1:30
(enclosures)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER
June 18, 1981

MINUTES

The meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Chairman Marcia Eaton at 12:50 p.m. on June 18 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall. The other SCC members present were Orhan Arkan, Bob Brasted, Julie Bates, Keith Jacobson, Doug Pratt, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Donald Spring, Pat Swan, and Bruce Thorpe; and members-elect John Howe, Dave Lenander, Marvin Mattson, Rick Purple and Kit Wiseman. Guests present included Vice Presidents Keller and Hasselmo, Carol Pazandak, Maureen Smith (University Relations), Liz Fuller (Daily), and Rick Linden, Chairman of MSA's University Resources Committee.

at the request of the Chair

1. Agenda. Two items added: (a) Consent decree implementation update and its entanglement with controversy over Patricia Faunce's single quarter leave status; (b) student resolution regarding proposed dedicated 3% tuition surcharge, brought by Bruce Thorpe.

2. Minutes of May 28. Correction to page 2, paragraph 3, last sentence should read "...Hobbie said he was suggesting a tax of around \$50 each." (Not Physics was suggesting. Correction received by telephone. Minutes approved with that correction.

3. Report of Student Chair. Sue Pribyl introduced the new student SCC members Kit Wiseman and Dave Lenander and announced that Keith Jacobson will continue as Morris' student representative.

She reported that the Student SCC had understood it was to appoint a student member to fill a vacancy on the President's Student Behavior Review Panel. Since that body has been inactive, the position is not to be filled. The new Student SCC will hold the names of interested people in case the need arises to fill the slot.

Pribyl will provide orientation this summer to the new student SCC members.

4. Report of the Chair.

a. Senate Committees. Irwin Rubenstein has accepted with pleasure the SCC's request that he chair the Planning Committee for 1981-82.

b. Regents.

(1) Faculty Salary Resolution. Peter Robinson and Marcia Eaton met June 12 with the Regents who spoke supportively of the faculty salary resolution and adopted President Magrath's form of the resolution, which differed from SCC's by including the condition, "if the situation warrants it," (the University would request legislation in the next session for augmentation to the salary increase item).

(2) Consent decree implementation. The Regents Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee has requested presentations on July 9 from the SCC, the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, and the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women (which initially requested time at the June meeting), and from central administration, on the topic of consent decree implementation. Doug Pratt, who will then be SCC Chair, will take part, and probably John Howe, who can describe the process of naming those 5 of 7 members of the CEEOW who were chosen University-wide.

Pratt asked what the issue would be at the meeting, since the University, by declining to request a review of the Special Masters' May 19, order removed the FACW's original complaint. Vice President Keller said the FACW is expected to raise three questions: Is the University working assiduously enough in affirmative action? Is the administration working assiduously enough in helping people pursue grievances? Is there administrative harrasment of complainants?

Purple urged that the University show statistics on proportions of hiring males and females over the past ten years. Keller is not sure those data are available, but said the University will show department-by-department ratios of males and females hired and the numbers of each in the pool for each field. The docket should include all the information which is to be the basis of discussion, from the SCC, FACW, CEEOW, and the administration. The administration appreciates the chance to respond to any allegations raised which it thinks lack a reasonable basis.

Howe observed that both the SCC and central administration appear to be on the defensive since they are always put in a position of responding to allegations of the FACW. Keller said the administration will prepare a position document regarding its progress in consent decree implementation.

The rationale contained in Vera Schletzer's statement to the special masters' May 8 hearing, and a summary of the SCC's relevant discussion and action this year, were recommended by those present for inclusion in SCC's presentation.

5. Consent decree implementation entanglement with Professor Faunce's single quarter leave controversy.

Vice President Keller explained that he wanted to describe the details of the issue to the SCC because the SCC has suggested the administration facilitate the work of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women and should be aware of the broad interpretation being placed on that in viewing the appropriateness of the administration's raising questions about the proper use of the single quarter leave by Professor Faunce.

The special masters on June 17 issued a temporary restraining order prohibiting the University from taking any action regarding Professor Faunce's employment. Faunce had at this point been sent a conditional letter stating that she might be relieved of her duties as director of Measurement Services. No letter has been sent saying she has been suspended. The elements in the controversy are (1) Faunce's single quarter leave; (2) Faunce's salary grievance; (3) Faunce's salary augmentation for administrative responsibilities; (4) Faunce's secretary spending University Measurement Services employment time on FACW work.

which had been introduced in court on June 17,

Keller distributed for perusal several sets of correspondence, regarding Faunce's application for a single quarter leave to be taken Winter, 1981, its approval, and subsequent challenges regarding the payment or suspension of

augmentation and the alternation of her schedule for taking the leave. Her original plan for a leave was recommended by Jim Werntz, her immediate superior, and was granted, conditional only upon her explaining how University Measurement Services would be managed during her absence. Werntz wrote Faunce in May, 1980 that it was University policy (unwritten) not to pay augmentation during leave. However, in practice, until about a year-and-a-half ago, each college determined for itself whether or not to pay augmentation. Faunce charges that augmentation has many times been paid, and said the policy, where it has been applied, has been applied discriminatorily. However, the record indicates that men and women were treated equally in both kinds of collegiate practices--receiving augmentation and losing augmentation.

Faunce initiated a survey regarding augmentation payments as a Measurement Services project. Vice President Keller required Faunce's secretary, Kathleen Olson, to send him a list of all people the information request had been sent to, telling her he thought the study inappropriate to the purposes of Measurement Services.

Keller said negotiations with Faunce about her leave (which had been granted for Winter Quarter 1981) broke off in late March of 1981. In April, Faunce wrote to say her lawyer had agreed she could begin to take her leave, one day a week, over a five-month period. Werntz responded at this point that that plan was not in accord with her application and its approval, and that since it did not meet her own criteria for requiring the leave, nor the basic condition of a single-quarter leave, she could not take it in that manner. Although she did not respond, central administration later became aware that she had begun taking days on that basis. Werntz and Keller then wrote her to say that they understood she was taking her leave despite written notice to her that she could not.

In addition, Faunce has a sex discrimination charge pending against the University regarding salary. Following her promotion in spring of 1980 to Professor, at a salary of \$37,000, she requested of Vice President Keller a \$30,000 raise. Keller denied the request. Faunce alleged that he was denying it out of a pattern of discrimination.

The Special Masters' temporary restraining order prohibits the University from taking any action against her. On June 23 the Special Masters will hold a hearing at which time they are expected to issue a preliminary injunction forbidding any University action regarding Faunce's employment until all of her grievances under the consent decree have been settled.

In the ensuing SCC discussion, there was criticism of the Consultative Committee by some of its members that it had done nothing a year ago to try to prevent this consent decree from being effected. Others accept the decree as appropriate but believe that certain elements of its implementation exceed the court's proper authority. Members expressed deep unhappiness at the current instance of court interference in faculty self-governance, and a sense of unease at where it all might end. Several members pointed out that the SCC had been in no position a year ago to take action since the court had prohibited the administration from consulting with the Committee on the nature of the agreement it was negotiating. Vice President Keller and a number of SCC members affirmed that, moreover, the main thrust of the consent decree is just and requires policies and practices that the University should have implemented some time ago on its own. Keller said reasonable goals must somehow be separated from unreasonable abuses.

Keller stated that the special masters appear to believe the administration is bent upon thwarting implementation of the consent decree. Hence, the administration

has lost its credibility to dispute the discrimination charge. He believes that the faculty still has credibility and can play a role in distinguishing for the Special Masters between abuse of the competitively-awarded faculty privilege of single-quarter leave and the administration's stance toward the FACW. The special masters gave no indication at their June 17 hearing of comprehending the University's case regarding Faunce's single quarter leave. Keller asked if it can be demonstrated that the faculty and the administration positions are consistent in this instance.

Schletzer asked if there had actually been an agreement between Faunce's and University attorneys that she could begin her leave on her terms. Keller said that Sprenger explained in court Wednesday that what was agreed between the attorneys was simply that she could take her leave without salary augmentation at any time.

Eaton voiced her horror that the privilege of a single quarter leave is being abused, and said she intended to speak as a faculty member to the Special Masters at the hearing scheduled for June 23.

Purple observed that the current controversy is an exceptional matter and can distort our perceptions of the nature of the consent decree. Even if the University should lose on this issue, he urged all concerned to put it then behind them and adhere to the spirit of the consent decree. He cited a departmental instance of the "old boys network" attempted in a very recent hiring to emphasize that the constraints are necessary.

Pratt moved the SCC support Eaton's stance before the Special Masters. The points the faculty wants to make to the court are these: (a) Abuse of a single-quarter leave must not be confused with a charge of sexual harrassment or discrimination; (b) the faculty has an abiding interest in the integrity of the single quarter leave program; (c) the faculty are accountable to one another for using leaves for the purpose intended; (d) this particular challenge is simply not appropriate under the consent decree. Some members felt it essential to establish principles as to what the Special Masters can and cannot do; others cautioned that a public challenge would be imprudent. Swan recommended a preamble to the statement: "Because we believe the matter at issue to be a question of the proper use of a single quarter leave, and not a question of an individual being singled out for unnecessary examination..."

The motion for SCC support of Eaton's presentation along these lines to the Special Masters passed without dissent.

6. Committee Reports. Senate Finance Committee (Formerly University Committee for Biennial Request and Budget Review.) Options for Selectivity/Crisis Planning. Professor Swan, Vice President Keller.

Advance materials for background included a memorandum of Eaton's telephone conversation with Fred Horne, her counterpart at Michigan State, and a story from the Wall Street Journal on Ohio University's process of retrenchment.

Vice President Keller said that the internal and external pressures at Michigan State in reaction to proposed cuts were about what one would have expected. He has spoken with vice presidents at both the University of Michigan and Michigan State, and they have confirmed his assessment that the major difference in their

susceptibility to damage resulting from cuts from the state was the lack at Michigan State of centrally held contingency money.

Howe asked how the University of Minnesota stands now in that regard. Keller responded that the University used up most of the reserve last year but is beginning to rebuild and is also asking deans to retain some funds centrally within their respective units. Sources for the reserve will be tuition excess, if any, excess indirect cost recovery, if any, and retrenchment.

Sarles asked what the reserve gains the University. Keller replied that it buys time to plan for rational retrenchment, and also provides flexibility. Parts of a reserve can be used, on a one-time basis, as matching funds, to respond to an immediate need, to experiment, to invest. In 1981-82, central administration will continue its planning process aimed at retrenchments and at contingencies. Central administration, said Keller, ought to be sending out the signals in its normal planning process to indicate what the target areas would be in an emergency. Purple asked if the University can purchase catastrophe insurance.

Keller said program ^{cuts} (retrenchment) are the only reliable source for a contingency fund. One budgeting change will be bringing to light certain peripheral undertakings whose funding has not previously been defined. Some of these have emerged as clearly important and worth continuing in their own right.

The overall scheme to balance the biennial appropriation is to borrow in 1981-82 from the 1982-83 monies, taking this year to plan the necessary retrenchment. The only retrenchment that could be undertaken at this point, without further planning, would be across-the-board. The University is permitted to carry forward a limited deficit.

Keller said the Budget Executive is thinking in terms of 3-4% retrenchment, and he asked that SFC, SCC and central administration all consider what would be a desirable proportion.

Purple asked whether, should the University not need to retrench as much as anticipated, central administration would be allowed to use its contingency monies to recreate the Regents' Reserve. He expressed the hope that a contingency fund can become more than soft money to be parceled out and instead grow to serve as a buffer against catastrophe. Keller said it would be allowed, but there are several reasons not to use it so. The contingency funds are targeted for purposes not involving permanent personnel expenditures. Moreover, both the legislature in determining appropriations and the faculty in seeking to meet SEE and special needs see a Regents' Reserve as a ready resource.

Swan voiced the concern of herself and the Finance Committee about building a reserve at the expense of the units. Swan and Keller expressed agreement that the Budget Executive and the Finance Committee should, by fall, jointly look at criteria for retrenchment. Keller added that Vice President Bohlen wants to take a hard look at the University's operations outside its academic sphere. This is not an accounting question, but a matter of "strategic financing:" What is the University's strategy regarding its support structure? Vice President Bohlen hopes also through modifications in the University's accounting system to make possible rational retrenchment beyond the academic units.

Vice President Hasselmo stated that the planning memoranda to the support units ask systematically about the relative costs of services obtained within and outside of the University.

Vice President Keller asked for faculty comments upon Ohio University's retraining of faculty members. Purple said that while faculty are constantly retraining themselves just to keep up in their fields and to pursue what seems worthwhile, any coercion beyond that could well violate academic freedom. Sarles said a change in the present set of disciplines and academic units is conceivable. It is possible through newly-defined "centers" that faculty members can become interested in new directions; he can imagine "retraining" as acceptable. Moreover, the current fix of the curriculum, he said, may not prepare students for the real demands of getting jobs and the jobs themselves. Keller affirmed the likely usefulness of creating flexibility in the structure and allowing people to do what they want. Schletzer pointed out that the reward system would have to change to encourage faculty movement and experimentation.

Dave Lenander said it is students' perception that not all faculty do continue to grow. Tenured professors may not all have the freshness nor the incentive to continue learning and trying new directions. Purple said the granting of tenure should grant the privilege of new exploration. Keller said the criticism relates to the criteria by which tenure is granted, and called giving tenure like giving a 35-year contract. It is not supposed to be a reward, but rather an assessment of potential. The grantors attempt to predict if a person will be productive 30 years hence. Howe suggested portfolios might be restructured; they are not now presented to provide clues as to potential. Sarles added that more than reading papers is necessary for assessment. The administration must get out and see how a person works.

Arkan mentioned the practice in departments at some Universities of deliberately not hiring permanent faculty to fill vacancies. In order to protect their flexibility they hire each year the specialty they need. Keller said a result of that practice is that such institutions do not develop scholars; he recommended, on the other hand, the practice of hiring visiting scholars who have a permanent positions elsewhere.

Mattson asked what schedule was intended for implementing cross-disciplinary studies and flexibility, noting that not all of Crookston's divisions lend themselves well to it. Keller described no schedule but rather repeated his intent to alert all to the need for flexibility and for choices.

7. Administration-faculty communciation. Keller announced he will develop this summer for the University faculty a guide to University budgeting and also a newsletter from Academic Affairs. Purple urged that Academic Affairs consult heavily with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy on academic policies it intends to discuss. Pribyl and Arkan requested the newsletter be sent to student government leaders also.

8. Committee Reports. Finance.

Professor Swan reported that SFC (formerly UCBRBR) had reviewed the University budget, and she turned the conduct of this item over to Keller, who

noted that the Senate Finance Committee had the chance to comment upon the document before the Regents June meeting, when it went to the Regents for information. The Budget Executive, he said, has not made major adjustments in any unit's appropriation, but knowing what the state has granted, will this year plan retrenchments for the second year of the biennium. Those present shared several copies of the Budget Plan 1981-82. The budget proposal for the \$751 million 1981-82 budget from all sources will come before the Regents for approval in July. The state appropriation is \$299 million for O&M and \$43 million for specials. Other sources are federal appropriations, research contracts and grants, other contracts and grants (training), auxiliary services, student aid funds, and the hospitals and other self-supporting services.

Swan pointed out that the state did not really provide \$15 million more for 1981-82, as it purports, than it originally provided for 1980-81, because the revised (actual) 1980-81 budget is reduced on the one hand by the \$14.1 million state emergency cut, and augmented on the other hand by the 10% tuition surcharge.

Keller spoke briefly on many of the specific budget items. The legislature cut out funds for retention and recruitment; therefore, .5% of the eventual faculty salary increase will have to go to meet standing commitments to newly hired or retained faculty.

For new buildings, only 1/4 of the maintenance cost was granted. The state also specified that no new people were to be hired for maintenance of the new buildings. Central administration's plan is to not open most of the new buildings. The legislature provided no money for leased space, so the University will have to crowd most leased offices back onto the campus.

The price level increase granted of \$1,983,400, is approximately 5.9%. Central administration will retain \$150,000 of that for critical needs: \$50,000 to hold some of its leased space; \$50,000 for postage for admissions and records and the graduate school; and \$50,000 for the veterinary teaching hospital (which runs a deficit despite having raised fees). The remainder, \$1,833,400, will be distributed to the units. Deans and provosts are encouraged not to apply these funds across-the-board, but to allocate them on a discretionary basis. Keller said the funds will go to the units in a clear formula way because he has no data on which units have been hardest hit by inflation.

Exhibit IV of the Plan states the components of the \$328,000 '81-'82 retrenchment and reallocation. The Budget Executive made very slight modifications after comparing last year's decisions with the data from the planning memoranda.

Swan reminded the meeting that UCBRBR has pressed the Budget Executive for the past two to three years to retrench and reallocate significantly since all budgets buy less. Keller emphasized that the Budget Executive's plan suggests that any major reallocation should come in the second year of the biennium.

Exhibit V summarizes the budget allotments from Indirect Cost Recovery Funds. Keller explained that whatever money the University gains through these recoveries is reduced from what the legislature gives the University. He added that the research enterprise has for years funded a large part of library acquisitions. He said that central administration would retain centrally \$400,000 from the ICR funds, not dedicated, and consult with appropriate groups on how that sum should be used for research development. Scriven asked that serious consideration be given to allotting the \$400,000 to library acquisitions, which Keller called the highest among several extremely important needs.

Library and Instructional Equipment Fee. Swan reiterated that the Finance Committee did concur in this budget, but had indicated that they might wish to discuss further with Vice President Keller the special fee.

Bruce Thorpe presented two documents, a letter and a resolution, challenging the rationale for the special fee of a 3% tuition surcharge, 2% of which is designated for library acquisitions and 1% for other instructional equipment. He questioned first of all the precise amount of 1%, since that would raise but \$500,000, when the request to the legislature justified \$2 million more than it granted. He regards the 2% library surcharge as more questionable, particularly for the undergraduate students to pay, since faculty and graduate students appear to be the primary beneficiaries of the numerous scholarly periodicals. He questioned whether library acquisitions are genuinely as high a priority for the administration as it states; if they are, he would have expected any funds retrenched elsewhere to have been diverted directly to the libraries. Some specific needs may not remain, for they were to have been acquisitions requested by faculty members for specific undertakings which have now in any case been completed. Moreover, he argued, the 2% increase is contrary to the Regents policy of equalizing proportional costs per collegiate unit. The surcharge appears to be simply the easiest way to raise a bit of money.

He summarized by saying that the student leaders do regard the libraries as an important resource for the University; they do think the libraries are falling behind and that that hurts the University; however, they think students do not uniquely benefit and hence should not uniquely pay.

Dave Lenander reported that the Library Committee had listened to Eldred Smith's presentation recently and had supported a resolution to provide the full funding of the University Libraries legislative request. He agreed he was convinced the money must be restored to the libraries, but not convinced that a surcharge should be a standard operating procedure. It was well known months ago that the legislature would not fund the full increase, he noted.

Keller described tuition as the difference between what the state has allocated to educate the people of the state and what it costs to do that. The University has no other real sources, he said. Central administration has determined that the University cannot afford to reallocate half of the SEE monies to the libraries because that would cripple all units too severely. Retrenchment is already apparent to students, he said, as in handouts not being available and students having to copy their own. Furthermore, he said, University funds are so co-mingled that they cannot be neatly distinguished. For instance, research monies have bought undergraduate books in addition to funding the acquisition of research journals. However, Thorpe's figures indicated that research monies account for about 45% of acquisitions, and that 55% of CLA acquisition funds are spent for periodicals and 85% of IT funds spent so. Keller noted that an IT undergraduate is more likely to use journals than a CLA undergraduate.

Another example of co-mingling of funds Keller cited is in the spillover of computer center funds on behalf of undergraduate computer education. The integration of teaching and research also co-mingles the funds.

Schletzer asked why not, if everything is co-mingled, simply raise tuition by 13%? Why single out any specific accounts for raises? Keller replied that library acquisitions and instructional equipment were the two essentials whose funding was wholly inadequate. Also, the administration wants to separate clearly questions of supply, equipment and expense from questions of faculty

salaries. Basically, there has to be a compromise between funding the necessities insofar as possible, and holding tuition at a reasonable level.

Howe suggested it might make more sense to direct the increase into areas more explicitly connected with undergraduate education, and shift monies from there to libraries and equipment. Thorpe asked for consideration of other possible revenue sources, such as solicitations from alumni for library acquisitions, a technique used successfully at some universities. Keller agreed that might provide excellent relief in the future, but could not come in time for the new fiscal year.

Thorpe said that the actual increase for students has been 20% for tuition over two years. Any increase in costs limits access. His own priority would be to pay more for his faculty and be assured he is getting the best possible faculty.

Swan stated that if the Regents vote to assess the 3% fee, it must be subject to special accounting, so that one can assess at the year's end whether the intended plan was followed. ✓

Keller displayed a chart showing relative library sizes and their current acquisition budget; Minnesota's acquisition budget is far too low in relation to the size of the library. The intention regarding the 3% fee, he said, is to spend the greater part on equipment in the first year and the greater part on library acquisitions in the second year.

Sarles said there is a need for a higher forum which will talk about educational needs more than budgetary needs.

Purple questioned whether rising costs have actually decreased student accessibility, even though that is what is expected. The University is over-enrolled now, contrary to expectations. Are there data showing increased charges have driven students away? The data show that the number of students who choose not to come to the University per percentage point rise of tuition is not statistically significant--it is less than the quarter-to-quarter variation in enrollment.

Howe said there is a pattern of temporary surcharges becoming permanent. For temporary specified fees also to become permanent would be questionable strategy, he said. Keller said it is contrary to the overall strategy--the University has steadily been removing specialized fees. But the University, when the legislature has provided inadequate funding, can either charge more, or provide less--reduce programatically, which also reduces access. Using the University at Morris as an example, Keller asked whether it would be a greater disservice to students to close Morris as the appropriations shrink, or to raise tuition at Morris. ✓

Keller also asked if the SCC and the Finance Committee would support extra retrenchment of one to three million dollars in the coming year, instead of imposing the 3% tuition fee, to prevent library deterioration? Pratt responded that it would be intolerable to think all units would have to live with no SEE increase at all, even for a cause as important as the library.

Bruce Thorpe moved adoption of the following resolution:

That the All University Senate Consultative Committee is in basic agreement with the several aspects of the 1981-82 Budget Proposal but urges the Board of Regents to oppose the added 2% Tuition charge for the Library and ask for more information (list of "most needed" equipment...) regarding the 1% charge for instructional equipment.

The motion failed on a divided vote.

Spring moved the SCC accept the Finance Committee's report on the budget and forward it to the President. Swan reported that because of time constraints the Finance Committee had sent its report directly to the Budget Executive with a copy to the President. Spring withdrew his motion.

Swan moved the SCC concur in principle with the Finance Committee's report approving the budget. Purple moved to amend the motion by adding that SCC commended the SFC for its labors. Motion, as amended, passed without dissent.

9. Newsletter. How should the SCC communicate, and to whom? The obvious means are an occasional or periodic page in the Daily to report significant Senate committee news, or a newsletter on the order of "Brief." Should it be sent to Senators only, plus student leaders, or to all faculty? Brasted asked that a committee consider the possibilities and make a recommendation to the SCC.

10. Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: Conference issue. Eaton reported that Connie Sullivan, Chair, Business and Rules, had observed that the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics had recommended to President Magrath that the University of Minnesota women's intercollegiate athletics join the Big Ten. Sullivan challenged the process, viewing the matter as of sufficient importance that it should go before the whole Assembly.

Schletzer recommended SCC put the item high on a future agenda and call in ACIA and other interested parties to consider the question. By its June vote, ACIA, she said, reversed its position of approximately a year ago. Moving into the Big Ten is the first step to moving into NCAA which, she said, has never yet supported women's athletics.

Hasselmo said the University does not have to comply with a July deadline. One of the options on the ballot is to take no position at this time. He said the question on this campus is part of a major jurisdictional battle on the national scene (between AIAW and NCAA). However, he said that not everyone interprets a Big Ten affiliation as necessarily requiring severing the ties with the AIAW and joining the NCAA. He has asked Vivian Barfield to report to him what she and what her coaches think the University should reply. He awaits their answer. One should also consider, he said, that the University, by postponing a decision, stands to lose the opportunity to be part of the formative stage of women's athletics within the Big Ten, if it does get underway.

Eaton will write to Vice President Hasselmo that it is the consensus of this meeting to report that it has discussed the question and wants the administration to indicate on its ballot that it will make no decision at this time on its women's programs joining the Big Ten. The Assembly Consultative Committee will direct the matter to the Assembly for its consideration.

Mattson asked which way other Big Ten schools are going with their women's intercollegiate athletics. Schletzer reported that two have severed their ties with the AIAW, and the other seven are still considering the question.

It being the last regular meeting of the year, there were thanks and acknowledgements all around. Professor Swan proposed a resolution of thanks, which was acclaimed by the meeting, for the excellent work by Marcia Eaton as

Chair, by Don Spring, the Associate Chair, for the Senate Constitutional revision, thanks to the secretary and to the members who are retiring from the committee this year (Arkan, Bates, Pribyl, Schletzer, Scriven, Spring, Thorpe). All the rest of the committee expressed heartfelt thanks to these.

11. Collective Bargaining Election. Vice President Hasselmo reported that the Minnesota Bureau of Mediation Services' Public Employee Relations Board has ruled that it has no jurisdiction to decide the appeal made to it by the UMEA. The appeal must be made instead to the Minnesota Supreme Court.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele,
Secretary.