



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

TENTATIVE AGENDA (A)

All University Senate Consultative Committee
Campus Club - Room 624 - 12:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Thursday, September 25, 1980

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Approval of minutes: July 9, August 4, August 6, August 26 (with the President and deans), August 26 (with V.P.s Keller and Hasselmo)
3. Fix SCC meeting times and places for the year (schedule distributed in July)
 - a. St. Paul meeting?
 - b. Coordinate campus meeting?
4. Administrative organization for SCC (nominations):
 - a. UCBRBR
Faculty: Patricia Swan, Chair
Faculty alternate: Robert Brasted
Student: Bruce Thorpe
Student alternate:
 - b. Senate Reorganization:
Faculty: Donald Spring, Chair
Marcia Eaton
Student: Orhan Arkan
 - c. Grievances and Legal Concerns
Faculty: Vera Schletzer, Chair
Paul Quie
Student: Julie Bates
 - d. Outreach
Faculty: Robert Brasted, Chair
Student: Judy Nord
 - e. Planning Issues (Barriers to increasing faculty productivity?)
Faculty: Russell Hobbie, Chair
Skip Scriven
Student:
5. Report of the Chair (enclosed)
6. Student SCC report
 - a. Student Employment/Financial Aid
 - b. Senate and Campus Assembly constitutions
 - c. Other

7. Subcommittee Reports
 - a. UCBBRR (P. Swan)
 - b. Senate Reorganization (W. D. Spring)
 - c. Grievances and Legal Concerns (V. Schletzer)
 - d. Outreach (R. Brasted)
 - e. Others
8. Agenda for October 2 meeting with the President
9. Vice President for Finance
10. Newsletter
11. Business Enterprises Policy
12. University Policy Agenda (enclosed)
13. Old Business
14. New Business
15. Adjournment



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/23/80

Senate Consultative Committee
September 25, 1980

The first regular Senate Consultative Committee meeting of the 1980-81 academic year was called to order by Chairman Marcia Eaton at 12:30 p.m. on September 25 in Room 624 of the Campus Club. (For attendance, see page 6.)

1. The agenda was fixed with the additional items of (a) a nomination for the President's Student Behavior Review Panel and (b) action on the formation of the University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women.

2. The minutes for the special meetings of July 9, August 4, August 6, and August 26 (2) were approved without dissent.

3. The schedule of meetings for the year, distributed in July, was adopted. It was agreed to schedule a spring meeting of the SCC on the St. Paul campus. There was discussion on whether to hold one or more meetings on coordinate campuses this year. Professor Spring asserted the importance of such meetings to give the Consultative Committee an opportunity to see what has happened on another campus and to give that campus community a look at the operations of the committee. He recommended visiting each campus once in four years. Bryan Jamison moved to wait until next year to make the decision on a rotation of visits. Sue Pribyl and Professor Schletzer voiced a fear that the SCC would thereby set a trend of not visiting. Jamison accepted Spring's substitute motion to visit Waseca this year. The motion to substitute was approved without dissent and the motion then carried without dissent. The chairman and secretary are to make arrangements.

4. SCC administrative organization. The following committee and subcommittee nominations were moved and approved without dissent:

University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review (UCBRBR): Faculty, Patricia Swan, Chair; Robert Brasted alternate; Student, Bruce Thorpe, alternate to be named.

Joint Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization: Faculty, Donald Spring, Chair; Marcia Eaton; Student, Orhan Arkan.

Subcommittee on Grievances and Legal Concerns: Faculty, Vera Schletzer, Chair; Paul Quie; Student, Julie Bates.

Subcommittee on Outreach: Faculty, Robert Brasted, Chair; Student, Judy Nord.

Subcommittee on Senate Budget: Faculty, Russell Hobbie, Chair, plus one to be named; Student, to be named.

In addition, when President Magrath, in collaboration with the SCC, selects one project from among the three topics suggested by the Planning Council for intensive study by the University during 1980-81, the SCC will name a subcommittee to participate in that study.

5. Report of the Chair. Professor Eaton reviewed the items in her written report with special attention to the tasks the SCC will undertake or monitor during the coming year:

- (a) Senate reorganization.
- (b) Academic Staff proposal: It is assumed the Tenure Committee will consider the extensively revised proposal and channel its recommendation through the SCC to the Senate. Grievances and Legal Concerns is SCC's liaison subcommittee.
- (c) Sexual harrassment (see 7.c.iii. below).
- (d) Refundable Daily fee: Monitor the experiment and bring the issue to the Senate in the spring.
- (e) Humphrey Institute (see 13.a. below).
- (f) Affirmative Action (see 7.c.i. and 9. below).
- (g) Library: The nominees for the library governance review committee have not yet been formally asked to convene and serve.
- (h) Legislative relations: name a faculty liaison to the legislature.
- (i) Regental relations: Professor Eaton is requesting a system of rotating SCC faculty and student attendance at Regents meetings.
- (j) Communicating with the University community (see 10. below).
- (k) Collective bargaining: When Duluth names a bargaining agent, a Senate constitutional amendment may be necessary to resolve the issue of Duluth representation in the Senate.
- (l) University policy on business enterprises: still undergoing administration revision.
- (m) Departmental search committee guidelines.
- (n) Outreach (see 7.d. below).
- (o) Planning.
- (p) Consultation: an SCC practice of vigilance to bring to light items under discussion in one part of the University which are of concern elsewhere and hence should receive broader discussion.

6. Report of the Student Senate Consultative Committee. Sue Pribyl, Student SCC Chairperson, and Bruce Thorpe surveyed the topics of concern to the student community:

- (a) The University proposal to change student employment into a form of financial aid, whereby students in need could have priority in being hired. Students see existing guidelines determining need as inadequate and fear students already receiving grants and loans will be eligible for more help through jobs while other students who need jobs will be ineligible. Several student groups are working to establish more suitable guidelines.

(b) Constitutional and practical revisions: Because of overlaps among the constitutions of the Senate, Student Senate, and Campus Assemblies, some committees have absorbed some of the responsibilities of others.

Fees mechanism: The Office of Student Affairs is advising that a study of the entire fees system take place this year to consider whether to maintain the current structure or make changes. This is an issue of central importance to the students, and it includes the question of the Daily fee.

(d) MSA, with the assistance of the Sociology Department, is surveying large numbers of Twin Cities campus students regarding many campus-related matters.

(e) The new business enterprises policy: following development.

(f) Students on Senate committees report: among all Senate committees, all student representatives but three have now been named.

(g) MSA is attending also to numerous smaller issues.

6.5. Nomination for President's Student Behavior Review Panel. The name of Stuart Ruckert was approved for forwarding to the President.

7. Subcommittee reports.

(a) UCBRBR. Professor Swan announced that UCBRRB's first meeting will be October 9th, with Vice President Keller, to discuss the budget reductions. She reported on the meeting of the Planning Council at which Mr. David Berg had presented some of the data he has been gathering from the Association of American Universities to use in the budget-designing model. She asked the SCC to bear in mind that the data being gathered consist almost exclusively of instructional time in terms of student credit hours, with also some data on "contact" hours. She observed that while, on the one hand, the administration is gratified to have a body of data to support decisions, she and other members of the faculty view these data as a restricted base for planning the operations and maintenance budget.

(b) Senate Reorganization. Professor Spring reminded the SCC that there is to be a motion to approve the revised constitution and by-laws before the Senate at its winter quarter meeting, February 19, 1981. The writers have met five times during the past summer. They expect to have completed the re-writing of the Senate constitution and by-laws by October 31; of the Senate handbook by November 30; of the Campus Assembly constitution and by-laws by January 15 and the Assembly handbook by January 31. The process is aided by being able to store revisions in a word-processor. The writing committee reports from time to time to the other members of the Joint Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization. University people will be invited to later meetings to comment upon the revision. At the February 19 Senate meeting, the entire new document will be proposed, as it would be an impossible task to detail a comparison, section by section, of the old and the new. Along with the implementation of the 26 recommendations approved by the Senate last May 15, the writers are trying to eliminate all duplications among the constitution, by-laws, and handbook. The constitutional revision is presently completed for all committees except the Consultative Committee and the new Committee on Physical Plant Services.

The Senate Facilitative Committee and members of the joint subcommittee

will receive clean copies of the constitution and handbook in their present state of revision close to two weeks ahead of their respective meetings on October 13. Spring will discuss the project on that date with each of these groups.

(d) Grievances and Legal Concerns. Professor Schletzer reported:

(i) Her attendance at a summer strategy meeting regarding gaining Judge Miles Lord's approval of the Rajender/class action consent decree;

(ii) She announced Equal Opportunity Officer Lillian Williams' workshop on October 2 at the Earl Brown Center on the St. Paul Campus concerning affirmative action and the use of that office's new forms;

(iii) She reported on the progress of the Sexual Harrassment subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. The subcommittee met in spring and summer and has issued a report of a rather complex process for dealing with allegations of sexual harrassment. She sketched the proposed process:

a. The complaint goes initially to a body of two persons with law training and legal counseling skills, who attempt to bring the parties together and resolve the issue; b. unresolved charges would next go to a sexual harrassment board which apparently could convene either formal or informal hearings and which would c. take their findings and recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Beyond this step, d. appeal would be allowed through the Judicial system. Severe penalties are proposed for repeated offenders.

for sexual harrassment

SCC reaction: Several members sensed that the proposed system effectively substitutes legal harrassment¹. Professor Spring emphasized that the key to meeting the problem is that assistance be accessible to the person who feels harrassed. Schletzer noted that recent court rulings have held the employer ultimately responsible for instances of sexual harrassment. Those findings could be significant for a university as employer.

Professor Hobbie asked what process can assure speedy attention to a legitimate complaint without encouraging frivolous complaints. Schletzer replied that the first level in the proposed system addresses that dilemma-- by bringing the two parties face to face. Hobbie asked if, instead of creating an additional campus legalistic structure for sexual harrassment, a complaint which is unresolved at the first level could be moved into an existing structure, most likely the All-University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. Eaton requested that Schletzer write subcommittee chairman Raskind the SCC's concerns expressed here.

It was pointed out that reports from other university campuses indicate that the fact of a university president's making a strong public statement on sexual harrassment causes a decline in such cases. Eaton announced that an ad hoc group had met this summer because of the delay in this University's establishing guidelines, and that the result of that meeting is that President Magrath will issue a strong letter on the topic to every member of the University community shortly after the beginning of the fall quarter.

(d) Outreach. Professor Brasted reported that a brief Outreach item for information was on the Regents' agenda this summer. Reportedly some data are now being accumulated in a branch of Academic Affairs from selected departments regarding likely effects of inloading and what real cost increases would likely be. The administration will report to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, which will report to the SCC.

8. Agenda for October 2 meeting with President Magrath. The SCC will ask the President to report on the following: (a) Vice President for Finance selection--update; (b) Budget cuts--update; (c) Council on Undergraduate Education, as recommended in the Watson report--feasibility; (d) Substantive changes in new proposal for academic staff employment category-- explanation by Vice President Keller or, at a later date when she would be available, by Assistant Vice President Robinett; (e) Fees structure-- changes under consideration this year? (f) Business enterprises policy revision-- update; (g) Status and rationale of moving U of M women's intercollegiate athletics into the Big 10, and hence apparently moving them under NCAA jurisdiction. It appears that the Big 10 presidents signaled the move this summer.

9. University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women. SCC members received a copy of the draft motion for the Senate to establish this new committee which is mandated in the Rajender consent decree. Eaton stated her position, which she has reported to Vice President Hasselmo, that Senate approval of the new committee must precede the naming of that committee. Eaton will consult with the Chairman of the Committee on Committees prior to the SCC's proposing the motion to the Senate. Mr. Jamison moved to table the question for a week until Eaton can contact that Chairman. Motion failed for lack of a second. Hobbie suggested the Senate would more likely approve the creation of this committee if it had the approval of the Committee on Committees. Professor Verrill moved that the SCC move before the Senate the establishment of a University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women with the information that the motion is made after consultation with the Committee on Committees. Motion carried without dissent.

Spring observed that the motion as presently proposed is in considerable conflict with the Senate constitutional revision going on. Thorpe moved the SCC refer the motion to the Senate Reorganization subcommittee to make it compatible with the present constitution and convertible to compatibility with the new constitution. Motion carried without dissent.

10. SCC communications with the University community. The chairman and secretary asked the SCC to consider employing a half-column in the Daily following each SCC meeting to report a summary and substantive votes, at a cost of roughly \$40 per issue. A copy of such a summary would also go to each of the coordinate campuses and to the student government office for their own duplication and distribution. The members asked to see a sample. The SCC expressed a strong desire to continue encouraging Senate committees to use a Daily half or full page when they wish to alert the University to important business.

11. University policy on business enterprises. The Office of Student Affairs' proposal to the Regents for a revision is still undergoing change. No discussion at the SCC meeting.

12. University Policy Agenda. SCC members had received copies of the President's response to the Senate request for the agenda; The response is an outline of nine system-wide policy issues warranting particularly close scrutiny during the 1980-81 academic year. The SCC, UCBRBR, other Senate committees, and the Senate as a whole will be variously involved in review and recommendation processes on each of these issues.

13. Old Business.

(a) Humphrey Institute. The SCC would appreciate the opportunity for an early visit with Director Harlan Cleveland to learn about the philosophy for the institute and to discuss the site in view of that philosophy.

(b) Consent Decree. Dr. Pazandak asked if the SCC would want to convene a special Senate meeting prior to the December 4 first regularly scheduled Senate meeting, for the purpose of establishing earlier the University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women. The SCC agreed there was real risk in not obtaining a quorum for a single issue meeting, and also that Eaton's assurances to Hasselmo that the committee could be named immediately following the Senate's presumed approval on December 4, should suffice.

14. Vice President for Finance search--update. (Non-members were excused from the meeting for this personnel item.) Eaton reported that President Magrath two weeks earlier had written an invitation to his first choice among the candidates; he said his intention was to send an invitation to his second choice if he did not have an affirmative response within a week. Spring reported on his meeting with the President earlier this month. The President had read very thoroughly the assessment letter from the SCC. He also had studied the responses from all other interviewing groups, and references and reports from many reliable sources, all unavailable to the SCC. In his conversation with Spring, the President spoke candidly to each of the reservations the Consultative Committee had raised on each of the three candidates. He also stated that he found all three candidates acceptable.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele,
Secretary, SCC

Present for the meeting were SCC members Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton (Chr.), Russell Hobbie, Bryan Jamison, Judy Nord, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, Julie Sellgren, Donald Spring, Pat Swan, Bruce Thorpe, John Verrill, and Al Ward. Visitors were Carol Pazandak, Assistant to the President, Trish Van Pilsum of the Daily, Maureen Smith of University Relations, and Mary Jane Plunkett, student government adviser.