



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klaeber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

November 18, 1977

AGENDA (E)

Senate Consultative Committee  
December 1, 1977  
Dale Shephard Room - Campus Club  
12:30 - 4:00 p.m. \*

Action Item:

1. Approval of Minutes

Information Items:

2. Chairperson's Report (Professor Robinett)
  - a. Meeting with Legislators - November 15, 1977  
(Glick, Holt, Purple, Robinett)
  - b. Donahue Accepts Appointment to Board of Student Legal Service
  - c. Facilitative Committee Meeting - November 16, 1977

Action Items:

3. Administrators as Grievance Officers (Professor Zaidi)
4. Senate Consultative Committee as a Steering Committee (Professor Robinett)
5. Admissions & Records Problems \*\* (Ms. Lewis)
6. Student Access Report  
(distributed on 11/17/77)
7. Adams' Report to the Planning Council (Professor Zaidi)  
(mailed 11/10/77)
8. Student Evaluation Project (Mr. Marchiniak)
9. Winter Schedule for Senate Consultative Committee
10. Discussion with Representatives Faricy and Moe (2:30 p.m.)

\* change from previously distributed schedule which shows 12:30 - 2:30 p.m.

\*\* faculty may wish to bring a list of items of concern to them



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klaeber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of December 1, 1977

The All University Senate Consultative Committee convened its seventh meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, December 1, 1977 in the Dale Shephard Room of the Campus Club.

Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Ann DeGroot, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Harriet Lewis, Terry Marchiniak, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett (chairperson), and Mahmood Zaidi.

The meeting was called to order at 12:40 p.m. by Professor Robinett.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes for SCC meetings held on October 6, October 20, and October 27, 1977 were amended to delete reference to members' absences. The October 27 minutes, page three, Item 8, was changed to read Graduate Student Legislative Relations Advisory Committee, rather than Students' Legislative Relations Advisory Committee. The minutes for these three meetings were approved as amended.

MOTION  
PASSED

2. Chairperson's Report (Professor Robinett)

a. Meeting with Legislators

Professor Robinett reported on a dinner meeting with legislators and legislative staff members which she and Professors Glick, Holt, Purple and Student Chairperson Harriet Lewis had attended on November 15. Professor Glick agreed with Professor Robinett that the meeting had been a positive move toward improved relations with legislators; Professor Holt differed in his perception. He felt some legislators who were present felt the meeting was an attempt to lobby for additional funding for research at the University.

Professor Robinett reminded Consultative Committee members that Professor John Brandl had suggested that only those legislators who have expressed an interest in research at the University be invited to meetings such as the one held on November 15. Professor Purple commented that most of the legislators who were present that evening were from the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature. Professor Robinett asked the SCC members on the Legislative Relations Advisory Committee to raise the question with that committee concerning the selection of participants for future meetings with legislators.

b. Donahue Accepts Appointment to Board of Student Legal Service

Professor Robinett told the committee that Professor George Donahue had agreed to serve on the Board of Directors of the Student Legal Service. He will serve with Professor Fred Lukermann.

c. Facilitative Committee Meeting

\* Professor Robinett reported to the committee that the Senate Facilitative Committee had had its first meeting of the academic year on November 16. She said that members of the Consultative Committee would receive minutes of the meeting.

3. Educational Development Program -  
Inquiry from Professor Gordon Kingston

Professor Robinett had received an inquiry from Professor Gordon Kingston, Acting Dean of University College, concerning SCC's response last year to the retrenchment in the Educational Development Program budget. Professor Robinett reported that last year's minutes mentioned that Professor Keller was to write a letter to Vice President Koffler expressing the SCC's concern over the retrenchment in the budget of the Educational Development Program, but that apparently in the transition period between '76-'77 and '77-'78 the letter was not sent.

MOTION  
MADE  
&  
WITHDRAWN

Professor Robinett asked the committee members how they wished to respond to Dr. Kingston's inquiry. Professor Morrison made a motion that a letter be written to Vice President Koffler with a copy to Dr. Kingston; however, the motion was withdrawn following some discussion of the appropriateness of this year's committee completing action initiated by last year's SCC. Professor Blake requested more discussion of the issue by this year's committee. Ms. Lewis asked what kind of time constraints applied, to which Professor Robinett replied that since Dr. Kingston's group would not be meeting until March 1978, there would be enough time to defer a general discussion of the issue until a later meeting of the SCC. However, a reply needed to be made concerning Dr. Kingston's request for information on what actions, if any, were taken last year by the SCC on this subject. Professor Morrison moved that Professor Robinett write a letter to Dr. Kingston, quoting therein the two pertinent excerpts from last year's minutes. The motion passed.

MOTION  
PASSED

4. SCC Faculty Members' Dinner Meeting with the Regents on December 8

Professor Robinett asked for a show of hands from those who would be attending the dinner meeting with the Regents. Professors Barber, Blake, Glick, Holt, Morrison, Purple, Robinett and Zaidi planned to be there.

(Mr. Marchiniak asked at this point that agenda Item 8 - Student Evaluation Project - be considered earlier in today's meeting because some of the student members had to leave early to attend a Student Senate election meeting. The item was moved up on the agenda.)

5. Administrators as Grievance Officers (Professor Zaidi)

Professor Zaidi gave the committee some background information on previous Senate actions which have resulted in the present policy of prohibition of administrators acting as grievance officers. Also, because Professor Zaidi was chairperson of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) last year, during which time this matter was discussed by that committee, he was able to provide the SCC with detailed information on how the issue came to be before the Senate and SCC again this year.

A request from Dean Warren Ibele of the Graduate School to SCFA for its sanction of an action by the Graduate School to appoint an interim grievance officer (an administrator) had precipitated the renewed consideration of the Senate ruling. At the November 16 meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee, Professor John Chipman,

this year's chairperson for SCFA, referred the request to Professor Robinett for action by the SCC.

Professor Holt expressed the opinion that since the Senate has consistently maintained that it wishes to have a faculty member as grievance officer, it would seem the SCC could take no effective action at this time to have the Senate modify its position on this matter in relation to a few special cases. (At issue are grievance officers in the Continuing Education & Extension Division, the Graduate School, and the Office of the President.)

Professor Morrison described the position of grievance officer as that of a high-level clerk who performs the function of a "gatekeeper," referring grievances that cannot be resolved at an informal level to the formal grievance committee. Professor Barber likened the role of the grievance officer to that of a "traffic cop" who directs the flow of grievances to the appropriate bodies for review. Professor Purple felt that the people who have consistently voted against allowing an administrator to serve as a grievance officer were particularly unwilling to see department heads and deans serving in such a capacity. Professor Zaidi concurred, adding the suggestion that the SCC take a look at correspondence dealing with what the grievance officer has done in the past. He felt that this might clarify for the committee what type of individual(s) would be suited for and successful in such a position. Ms. Lewis said that in the dealings of her office (Graduate Assistants Information & Assistance Office) with graduate students' grievances, she has found it very helpful to have an administrator as grievance officer.

It was then recommended that the SCC bring this matter before the Senate at its next regular meeting. Professor Morrison argued that it is not the business of the SCC to bring this matter up before the Senate unless the purpose of so doing would be to specifically cite those units in the University system that are in violation of extant Senate policy. He continued, saying that he felt the SCC should not be responsible for discussing the merits of the ruling made by the Senate on this issue.

MOTION  
PASSED

The discussion of the role of the grievance officer, such as responsibilities and expectations, continued for some time. A motion was eventually made and passed which directed Professor Robinett to write a letter to the three units mentioned, stating that it is the Consultative Committee's understanding that these units are operating in violation of the Senate's policy on grievance officers, and that the committee is asking the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to consider bringing the matter before the Senate once again. A copy of these letters will be distributed to SCC members for information. Copies will also be sent to Professor John Chipman, Chairperson of SCFA, and to Professor Gerhard Weiss, Chairperson of the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, the group that originally brought the matter before the Senate in 1974.

Professor Holt registered an objection to making this a formal motion, to which Professor Zaidi responded that this motion is meant to deal with a procedural issue and is not intended as a statement of policy or an endorsement of policy by the SCC.

#### 6. Admissions & Records Problems (Ms. Lewis)

Ms. Lewis reviewed the background of this issue which was first raised by the students at the October 27 meeting of the SCC. (Reference SCC Minutes - 10/27/77.) Professor Robinett read to the committee some items that Professor Stuhler had asked

to have added to the original list of problems which was compiled by the students and distributed at the October 27 meeting (Professor Stuhler was out of town and unable to attend today's meeting). Ms. Lewis called for any other additional items from the faculty present: there were none. She then asked if the committee wanted her to compose a letter to James Preus, Coordinator of Student Support Services, Office of Admissions & Records. There was some discussion of the impact of such a letter and whether it would be advisable to invite Mr. Preus to speak to the SCC on this concern.

Professor Glick asked if there had been any contact with the coordinate campuses to see if those students have any concerns which should be brought to the attention of Admissions & Records. Ms. Lewis said that there had been no additional special concerns which students on the coordinate campuses had expressed; their problems were not markedly different from those experienced by Twin Cities' students. Professor Blake volunteered to assist the SCC student members in getting together with St. Paul students; Ms. Lewis and Ms. DeGroot said that the St. Paul student body's concerns were already included in the list and that the Assistant Director for Admissions & Records in St. Paul has been very cooperative in response to requests from the Student Senate group working on this issue.

Professor Keller asked Ms. Lewis whether a study had been done by her group of the incidence of such problems in institutions of comparable size and complexity. He urged the student group to obtain and consider some comparative data. Ms. Lewis offered her positive experiences with the Admissions & Records Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.) as a distinctly contrasted situation to that which one encounters at the University of Minnesota. The response from those faculty members present was that M.I.T. is a considerably smaller institution than the University of Minnesota and as such is not an appropriate subject for comparison.

MOTION PASSED \* A motion was made and passed requesting that Ms. Lewis compose a letter to Mr. Preus, confer with Professor Robinett, and send the letter to Mr. Preus. A copy of the letter is to be sent to Professor Schletzer, Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations.

#### 7. Student Evaluation Project (Mr. Marchiniak)

Mr. Marchiniak recited the extensive history of this project as an introduction to his agenda item. The Student Evaluation Project is an attempt on the part of students, specifically Mr. Marchiniak as project director and his assistants, to assess, through the use of questionnaires completed by University of Minnesota seniors, the quality of teaching delivered in the classroom by instructors and professors on the Twin Cities' Campus. The study is modeled after work done in this area of research by educational institutions in California and Michigan. It relies on student evaluations of faculty in the senior's major area of study and looks at such variables as class organization, teaching skill, class assignments, class environment, and the faculty person's empathy with students. The project at the University of Minnesota is being sponsored by the All Campus Council.

Professor Robinett asked if Mr. Marchiniak had been in contact with Professor Robert Brasted, who heads a task force which is looking into the matter of excellence in teaching. Mr. Marchiniak had not, but made a note of this resource.

Professor Barber asked Mr. Marchiniak what the purpose was of having the SCC discuss the study. Mr. Marchiniak replied that he hoped the SCC would endorse the study and expedite the work of the research team by issuing a statement to department heads which would encourage the timely response by the departments to the research team's initial inquiry (this asked for a list of faculty currently teaching in each department).

In its initial request to departments, the research team had also asked the departments to supply an operational definition of a "senior." This last item triggered questions from the SCC to Mr. Marchiniak about the criteria used to select seniors as the survey's population. A question was also raised by Ms. Lewis concerning the apparent contradiction between the focus of the study -- faculty -- and the eventual users of the survey results -- primarily freshmen -- who encounter teaching assistants, not regular faculty, as instructors in many of the classes taken the first year at the University.

Mr. Marchiniak elaborated further on the purposes of the survey, saying that the results should help departments in their evaluation of teaching efforts of faculty. Professor Morrison expressed the concern that the issue of confidentiality needs to be considered more seriously by the student researchers before results are published. He also referred Mr. Marchiniak to the Task Force on Excellence in Teaching, Professor Brasted's committee, which maintained the confidentiality of the results of its research. Professor Morrison then asked Mr. Marchiniak whether he intended to take the results before the Senate, to which Mr. Marchiniak replied no. This response resulted in a further discussion of the appropriateness of this matter as an agenda item before the SCC.

MOTION  
MADE

Mr. Marchiniak made the following motion:

"I move that the All University Senate Consultative Committee recommend that all academic units contacted that have not responded by November 28, 1977 to All Campus Council's November mailing entitled 'Faculty Associated with Academic Units' now cooperate and return their responses."

MOTION  
RULED OUT  
OF ORDER

The motion was seconded by Ms. DeGroot. Professor Holt said that he felt the issue was not under the jurisdiction of the SCC and that the motion was out of order. He called for Professor Robinett to rule on his point of order. She approved his request to have the motion called out of order.

RULING  
APPEALED

Professor Keller appealed the ruling of the SCC Chairperson, saying that the SCC could consider anything of University-wide concern. Professor Robinett agreed that the issue could be discussed, but she felt that the motion was out of order. A vote was called to uphold or not uphold the action of the chair. The vote was six (6) to uphold; (5) to not uphold. Mr. Marchiniak's motion was ruled out of order.

RULING  
UPHELD

Faculty members concluded the discussion of this item by complimenting and encouraging the efforts of Mr. Marchiniak and his fellow students, with a caveat to pay careful attention to the potential danger in drawing conclusions from data which will most likely contain a considerable amount of distorted information, given the methodology being used and the diversity among the survey population.

8. Winter Quarter '78 Schedule of Meetings

There was some discussion of the proposed schedule for committee meetings next quarter. After some minor changes were made, the schedule was adopted by the committee. (Refer to schedule dated 12/1/77.)

The committee was invited by both the Duluth and Morris members to meet on their campuses during the year. The times will be worked out later. Professor Blake offered to coordinate a meeting on the St. Paul Campus for one of the scheduled times for Winter Quarter, but this invitation was accepted instead for a time during the Spring Quarter.

\* Professor Robinett asked the committee about publishing an advertisement in the Daily and out-state campuses' newspapers which would show the committee roster and the schedule of meetings for Winter Quarter, in addition to a statement of purpose and an invitation to the University community to consult with committee members and/or attend meetings. The committee directed the advertisement be placed.

9. Student Access Report

\* Ms. Lewis asked that this agenda item be deferred until the next full SCC meeting, when more students would be in attendance and able to comment on the report. Professor Robinett asked Ms. Lewis and Professor Purple, both of whom had expressed a particular interest in the report, to form a subcommittee of two that would review the document and present it at a future meeting of the SCC.

\* Professor Keller thought the committee chairperson should write a letter to President Magrath requesting more time to deliberate on the study before the President refers it to the Regents for action. Professor Robinett agreed to write such a letter.

10. Increase in Graduate Tuition Rates

\* There was a discussion of the projected impact of the proposed increase in graduate tuition rates. Professor Keller mentioned that today's (12/1/77) Daily contained an editorial outlining some of the disadvantages to the proposed system. Professor Zaidi said there was some difference of opinion among directors of graduate studies as to the ramifications of changing the tuition requirements. He also pointed out that the increase in revenue generated by the new system will be going into general funds for the University, not into Graduate School funds, as some believe. Professor Keller felt part of the financial problems that more graduate students would encounter under the new system could be alleviated by an increase number of graduate fellowships. A full discussion of this problem was deferred to a future SCC meeting.

11. Equity Funds - Salary Equalization Study

\* Professor Robinett reported to the committee that the President had said the Salary Equalization Study being prepared by Vice President Koffler's office would be made available to the SCC some time next week. There was some concern expressed by members of the committee that this gave the members very little time to review the document adequately before making a recommendation to the President on its contents. A meeting was set for December 8 at 3:00 p.m. to discuss the study. Ms. Lewis said she felt that it would be difficult for student members to attend

during finals' week, but that since the report was of concern mainly to the faculty, she had no objection to having the meeting held on December 8.

- \* Copies of the Salary Equalization Study will be delivered to committee members by the committee secretary (for those on campus) or sent by first-class mail the same day they are received from the President's office.

12. Textbooks Written by Professors (Professor Morrison)

- \* This item was tabled until a later date so adequate time would be available for discussion.

13. Task Force on Overload Teaching

- \* Professor Robinett reported that an inquiry had been received concerning the membership and functioning of this task force. After checking last year's minutes and files, it appears that the task force was named but not assembled. Professor Keller confirmed this and said he would follow up on this and report back to the SCC at its next regular meeting.

14. Adams' Report to the Planning Council (Professor Zaidi)

Professor Zaidi reviewed what had been discussed at the November 9, 1977 meeting of the SCC. (Reference SCC Minutes - 11/9/77.) He said President Magrath has requested a discussion of this report at the next SCC/President meeting (1/19/78). Part of the reason for the timing of this request is that this will give the President an opportunity to discuss the report further with Vice President Brown and whoever is appointed as the new Vice President for Administrative Operations.

Professor Morrison made some comments about his impressions of the report as they related to an apparent shift from a faculty theory of governance for the University to an administrative one. He felt the governance structure seemed somewhat ambiguous. Professors Morrison and Keller raised the question of whether this matter was properly the business of the SCC or perhaps that it should be considered by the Committee on Committees instead.

Professor Zaidi commented that the Adams' document is a beginning on solving the problem of improving interaction between Senate bodies and the administration. Professor Keller agreed that the report represented a positive initiating point and that it will help sort out issues which come before the Senate and SCC as to their relevance to those units of governance.

Professor Glick suggested that the SCC devote an entire meeting to the full discussion of this report. January 5 at 12:30 p.m. was set as the time for the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee will be held on December 8 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 608 of the Campus Club.

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda L. Compton  
Administrative Fellow  
Senate Consultative Committee





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klæber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

SCC file  
see "Grievance  
Officer... admin  
activities"

December 7, 1977

Gerhard Weiss, Chairman  
University Appeals Committee on  
Academic Freedom and Responsibility  
221 Folwell Hall

Dear Professor Weiss:

Letters concerning administrators serving as grievance officers in the Office of the President, in the Graduate School, and in Continuing Education & Extension have been referred to our committee, and it is our understanding that the Senate is clear in its mandate of April 1974 and again in March 1977 that such a practice is not in keeping with Senate rules. However, we feel that in these three instances there is good reason for allowing administrators to so serve (and from correspondence on the matter carried on by you last year, we see that your committee concurs). We also feel that if these reasons were well-documented and carefully explained, the Senate would probably agree to waive the stipulated non-administrator as officer in these three cases. Then, the present impasse would be avoided. We would like to suggest therefore, that you again take this matter to the Senate at its next meeting with a specific request for excluding from the overall Senate policy on grievance officers these three offices: the Office of the President, the Graduate School, and Continuing Education & Extension.

If there is any way we can be of help, please call me.

Sincerely yours,

Betty Wallace Robinett, Chairperson  
Senate Consultative Committee

BWR:llc

cc: C. Peter Magrath, President  
Warren Ibele, Dean, Graduate School  
Harold Miller, Dean, Continuing Education & Extension  
John Chipman, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University  
Senate Consultative Committee  
154 Klaeber Court  
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

December 7, 1977

C. Peter Magrath  
200 Morrill Hall

Dear President Magrath:

A question regarding the appropriateness of an administrative officer serving as the grievance officer in the unit you direct has been referred to the Senate Consultative Committee. It is our understanding that this is clearly not in accordance with the present Senate procedures (see Senate minutes, April 1974 and March 1977). We understand, however, the difficulty this poses in certain units such as yours; we are, therefore, referring this matter to the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility with the recommendation that this matter again be presented to the Senate. Although it has already been appealed once, it seemed to the members of our committee that with ample documentation of the difficulties involved in following the mandated procedures in the units involved -- the Office of the President, the Graduate School, and Continuing Education & Extension -- it is hoped that the Senate would waive the stipulation disallowing administrative officers from acting as grievance officers in these three cases.

Sincerely yours,

Betty Wallace Robinett, Chairperson  
Senate Consultative Committee

BWR:11c

cc: Members of the Senate Consultative Committee  
John Chipman, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Gerhard Weiss, Chair, University Appeals Committee on  
Academic Freedom and Responsibility

SCC Members Note:

Similar letter was sent to:

Harold Miller, Dean  
Continuing Educ. & Extension

Warren Ibele, Dean  
Graduate School