



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA (K)

All University Senate Consultative Committee
Law School #381 (Rare Books Room), West Bank
1:15 - 3:00 p.m.
Thursday, February 19, 1981

1. Fix agenda.
2. Minutes of February 5 (enclosed).
3. Report of Chair (oral).
4. Report of Student Chair (oral).
5. Committee reports.
6. Reports from Regents meetings.
7. Amendments to proposed new Senate constitution, by-laws, rules. (Bring text plus amendments from Daily.)
8. Draft of plan for emergency preparedness (enclosed).
9. Items to discuss with the President on March 5.
10. Old Business.
11. New Business.
12. Adjourn.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
February 19, 1981

APPROVED 3/5/81

The twelfth regular meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee of the 1980-81 academic year was called to order by Marcia Eaton, Chairman, at 1:25 p.m. in Room 381 of the Law School. Other members present were Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Russell Hobbie, Keith Jacobson, Judy Nord, Douglas Pratt, Sue Pribyl, Paul Quie, Dennis Sargeant, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan, and Bruce Thorpe. Guests were Carol Pazandak, Mary Jane Plunkett, Liz Fuller (Minnesota Daily) and Maureen Smith (University Relations).

1. The agenda was fixed.
2. The minutes of the February 5 meeting were approved as written.
3. There was no report of the Chair.

4. Report of the Student Chair. Sue Pribyl reported that the Student SCC had discussed reorganization and financial exigencies, and several other agenda items on which she would comment as they arose.

5. Committee Reports.

A. Grievance and Legal Concerns. Professor Eaton reported that SCFA would meet February 20 to consider the latest draft of the "Policy Statement on Sexual Harrassment" and "Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harrassment Against Academic Staff."

Professor Schletzer pointed out that the review committee on the sexual harrassment documents chose not to heed the SCC's advice on the composition of the new board. The number of faculty proposed has been raised from 3 to 4, the A.P. representative removed, Civil Service representation (1) and student representation (2) proposed to stay the same; persons in the latter two categories are to serve only if one of their peers is a party in the case. Professor Schletzer pointed out that, among other consequences and implications, this scheme gives faculty the benefit of becoming the most experienced in dealing with such cases.

The wording of the policy statement, Professor Schletzer believes, implies that attempts at blackmail are likely; she fears this strong implication may intimidate victims sufficiently that they do not bring legitimate complaints. She stressed that the subcommittee worked for nearly a year to develop a good proposal and that the review committee has now substantially altered it.

Probably not SCC, but SCFA, the parent committee which the SCC directed to establish and charge the subcommittee, will present the proposal to the Senate. Professor Eaton pointed out that the SCC has given its views to the review committee and can move in the Senate any amendments it thinks advisable.

Professor Eaton observed that while the SCC and members of the subcommittee may be dismayed over the changes in language and tone, there is a fair chance that no such proposal would get Senate approval without specific references to the possibility of frivolous charges or attempts at blackmail. University administrators associated with this effort seem to be trying scrupulously to preserve faculty rights.

Professor Hobbie noted that the proposal for four faculty board members would mean an even number of persons hearing cases involving exclusively faculty. He saw no reason not to return A.P. representation to the board, particularly since presumably they would only serve on cases involving A.P. personnel.

Professor Schletzer and Bruce Thorpe voiced their assessment that the review committee did not appreciate the SCC's disagreement with and disapproval of the implications in the current text that each representative will vote for his/her constituency, and that only faculty are level-headed. Professor Eaton will forward the Consultative Committee's concerns immediately to SCFA.

B. UCBRBR. Professor Swan reported that UCBRRB will discuss at its February meeting next week several planning memoranda and how they may serve as a basis for the next biennial request.

C. Legislative Relations. Professor Pratt reported that several more district meetings have been held. Professor Schletzer reported that the meeting at her house went very well and that both participating legislators had written her letters of thanks. One, Otto Banks, said he had never before been approached by anyone from the University. This revelation leads Professor Schletzer to favor the broad approach to as many legislators as possible.

Legislative liaison Peter Robinson has given Professor Pratt the names of members of the Education Subdivision of the House Appropriations Committee with the request to organize evenings around them. Most, however, reside in rural Minnesota. Professor Pratt said several meetings would be held for these legislators. He reemphasized the difficulty in compiling the lists of faculty by legislative district.

D. Outreach. Professor Brasted reported the swift Regental acceptance of the policy to implement the Outreach recommendations (inloading excepted). The Regents, he said, were pleased to have something positive before them on Outreach. The approved implementation plan includes adding an assistant vice president for Outreach. Professor Brasted expressed the hope the SCC will have close ties to that person.

He repeated his concern that SCEP is not doing the actual cost factfinding he believes necessary. Before commencing inloading, it is necessary to know how much it will cost to do with permanent faculty what each department now does through extension.

E. Reorganization. Professor Spring reported his plan to make a brief prefatory statement to the Senate this afternoon on the new constitution, by-laws and rules.

6. Reports from Regents meetings.

A. Professor Swan's report from the Committee of the Whole was circulated.

B. Orhan Arkan summarized orally the items in the Committee of the Whole: appointment of Walter Mondale and two research assistants approved; a proposal presented to continue the surcharge into Summer Session, with some Regents speaking against it; discussion on University debt service; information on domed stadium--divergent views of students and the intercollegiate athletics personnel speaking; Regental rejection of the HECB's proposal to remove Waseca and Crookston from the University in a restructuring of two-year college program governance; Regental acceptance, after a brief discussion, of the same severance of Waseca from the Senate as they had resolved for Duluth.

7. Editorial revisions, and amendments to the proposed new Senate constitution, by-laws and rules.

The Joint Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization accepted as editorial revisions a number of modifications which it received from individuals and committees to correct ambiguities, inconsistencies and oversights. All these, the subcommittee judged, met the spirit and the intent of the documents. Professor Spring explained briefly the need for each of these changes, then proceeded to the amendments submitted. There was brief discussion on each, but no positions voted. Professor Spring sketched the rationale and context of each proposed amendment.

Amendment 1. As approved by the Waseca and the Crookston Assemblies, the amendment provides continuous 3-year terms on the SCC for a faculty member from each campus and a regular 1-year term on SCC for a student from each campus each year, and adds a faculty and student member from both Waseca and Crookston to the Committee on Committees. The joint subcommittee, Professor Spring said, felt it had insufficient time to formulate a substantive response, and did not take a position. He pointed out the now familiar issues of proportionality: of 10 faculty on the Committee on Committees, 4 would be from outstate campuses; of 7 students, 4 would be from outstate campuses; of 11 voting faculty on the SCC, 4 would be from outstate; of 9 students, 4 from outstate.

Professor Swan suggested that if the amendment on SCC membership passed, it would tend to push the Assembly steering committee to become more active on issues concerning this campus. Professor Hobbie expressed his concern that if vote count within the SCC is important, then giving each of these two very small campuses a vote could distort the voting. On the other hand, he said, if the SCC is largely a consensus-operating body the coordinate campuses could usefully send a representative who would participate but not vote. Both Professors Hobbie and Eaton said the same arguments would not pertain to the Committee on Committees since each campus representation

has the specific need to identify potential committee members from that campus. Sue Pribyl reminded the SCC that this question has had repeated discussion over the past three years, and that one of the critical questions on the Crookston campus was over administrative support, particularly funds, to pay travel costs for a non-voting representative.

SCC generally sensed that Twin Cities vs. outstate divisions do not and are not likely to occur. Professor Spring reminded the SCC that the four outstate campuses differ enormously from one another. He did anticipate, however, that on priorities rather than on specific votes, Twin Cities members and outstate members might incline differently. Professor Swan asked the SCC to distinguish between its consultative role, in which the President listens and uses the advice as he wishes, and its steering role, in which the various campus assemblies can decide issues specific to each campus.

A straw vote on approval or disapproval of the amendment as pertaining to SCC membership was roughly equally divided.

Amendment 2 proposes to restore student members on the Library Committee from 4 to 8 as in the old constitution. The apparent reason is to preserve outstate student representation. Professor Spring explained that the Library Committee had difficulty achieving a quorum because usually only 1 of 8 students attended. Sue Pribyl reported the SCC students lean towards including 4 students.

Amendment 3 proposes more stringent conditions for CEE student eligibility for the Senate. The student SCC unanimously favored this tightening. Judy Nord proposed changing the wording to "...at least one credited course for each of 3 of the 4 quarters." It was hoped the maker of the amendment would accept the additions as a friendly amendment.

Amendment 4 proposes to strike the passage making All-University Honors Committee meetings automatically executive sessions. Professor Spring said the joint subcommittee learned that the nature of all the sessions of this committee fell under the definition of executive sessions, and accepted it as necessary. Sue Pribyl reported that the Student SCC favors consistency of policy and saw no reason for this committee to be specified separately from the general open meeting policy. Since the committee meets only once a quarter, she said, it is reasonable for it to vote, each time if necessary, to close its meeting.

Amendment 5 proposes requiring that all meetings normally be listed in the Daily or the Daily Bulletin. Spring reported that Marilee Ward presently encourages all committees to so announce their meetings, but sees it hard to achieve consistency among all 27 committees. Sue Pribyl said the students encourage complete announcements, and that student government members regularly check the meetings announcements. She argued that announcements help the community be aware of committee activity and perhaps prepare them to accept what the committees do.

Amendment 6 proposes the addition of the Services for the Handicapped Committee to the Operations Committees grouping. Dr. Pazandak described this as the latest attempt to establish a committee to deal with programs and services for the handicapped, as was recommended by the task force on the

handicapped. The committee belongs in the Senate structure, she said, because it deals with questions of educational policy and is of import to faculty and students.

8. Draft of plan for catastrophic preparedness. SCC members had copies of Professor Eaton's draft as a starting point for discussion.

Professor Schletzer said that one reason to include A.P. personnel in the Senate is that without it, that area of staff would be more susceptible to any cuts.

Professor Swan said that while in evolutionary planning people make adjustments in what they have, catastrophic planning requires a concept of what one wants rather than what one has. The two broadly different ways to approach such a change are to ask, either, "What is essential?" or "What can we do without?"

A considerable discussion ensued as to whether the SCC should seek an initial focus on developing a process for determining cuts, or on establishing criteria whereby cuts will be made. Professor Swan emphasized developing a process, arguing that that can be designed before the philosophical approach is determined. Professor Eaton pointed out that Section 15 of the proposed tenure code says criteria will be established. Professor Swan sees it possible to first establish a process of decision-making and consultation without yet defining whether the criteria will be for carving away or for idealizing.

Professor Pratt recommended the SCC itself as a good, compact forum to work on developing the criteria. He believes a working group would need from the beginning a concept of what the University is and is to be to even develop a process.

Professor Swan suggested that if the people who study the question should decide the Budget Executive, for example, would still be the primary source of decision-making in a catastrophe, they would set up their process around that approach, which could be done without defining criteria. Collegial and institutional organization largely dictates process, she added.

Professor Spring suggested the President be asked to discuss thoughts on catastrophic planning with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and report their views to the SCC.

Professor Pratt stressed the need for a means to provide protection in advance to units which need protection. A purely mechanical description of process, established without reference to criteria, could lead to unfortunate actions, he believed. Planners are inclined to seize upon the criteria favorable to their interests.

The SCC approved Professor Eaton's sending a copy of her draft of planning to President Magrath. Other items to discuss with the President should be submitted to the SCC office by February 26 or 27.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele
Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary