



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH INTERIM PRESIDENT KELLER

November 1, 1984
300 Morrill Hall
10:15 - 12:30

AGENDA

- 10:15 1. Report of the Chair.
- 10:30 2. Anticipating the legislative session. Guest: faculty legislative liaison Phil Shively.
- 10:45 3. Krislov resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate on June 7. (Enclosure to FCC: portion of Faculty Senate minutes. Note that we will be concerned with point #1 only.) Guests: Professors Fred Morrison, Sam Krislov.

DISCUSSION WITH INTERIM PRESIDENT KELLER

- 11:00 4. Tenure Code. (Enclosure to FCC: Morrison memorandum suggesting some alternative language.) Guest: Professor Morrison.
5. Development of the short mission statement.
6. Other.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

APPROVED 11/15/84

November 1, 1984
10:20 - 12:40
300 Morrill Hall

Members present: Shirley Clark, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Burt Sundquist.

Guests: John Aune (Daily), Dr. Keller, Professors Krislov, Morrison, and Shively, Associate V.P. Perlmutter, Maureen Smith.

1. Report of the Chair.

A. Requests being made of the Senate and Senate committees. Professor Merwin previewed this November 15 agenda item.

Dr. Keller recently invited Professor Merwin to attend a meet and confer session between officers of the University Education Association (UEA) and officers of the University, because a part of their agenda was UEA's request to be more informed about governance via agenda and minutes of certain Senate committees and for Senate funding for UMD and UMW representatives to travel to the Twin Cities to attend some committee meetings.

Professor Merwin had also received a letter from Julie Bates, chair of MSA's Research and Planning Committee, requesting copies of the minutes of Senate committees. The Senate constitution gives SCC discretion over access to the minutes of Senate committees. However, it's important to keep in mind that meetings are, except in rare circumstances, open. The cost and effort of sending such information would be small.

UEA's request for travel funding, though, requires more serious thought. There was a very brief discussion on how SCC might respond to the requests.

B. Meeting with Dr. Keller. Professor Merwin and Dr. Keller touched on a number of topics in their October 19 meeting. Dr. Keller asked Professor Merwin if he would co-sign a letter to go to all faculty in support of the Consolidated Fund Drive already underway. Professor Merwin did sign as chair of the Consultative Committee, but not for the committee.

They discussed the recently released AAUP salary data and a recent survey of local salary increases in business and industry, both of which provide more supporting evidence to the state of the University's need to get at least a 7% increase for faculty salaries in each year of the biennium.

The FCC's meeting with the Regents to discuss the Tenure Code is set for November 9 at 10:15 a.m.

C. Associate chair Professor Freier reported on the reception for Dr. and Mrs. Magrath. Invitations to the reception, for which FCC and the Office of Academic Affairs are co-hosts, are going out to all departments and notices will appear in Brief and in the Daily. The subcommittee is pleased with the arrangements and hopes for an excellent turn-out.

2. Legislative relations.

Faculty legislative liaison Phil Shively spoke with FCC regarding the University's legislative request in the 1985 session. Copies were distributed of Vice President Kegler's September 26 memorandum on spending imperatives and on priorities in the O&M and the State Specials requests.

Professor Shively said awareness is increasing at the legislature of the losses the University has suffered over the last decade. One sees candidates vying for the edge in promising their support for higher education. AAUP's press conference on salary data was outstanding. The Faculty Association (UMFA), and particularly its president, are working effectively in assisting candidates and in talking individually with many legislators and candidates. Professor Shively has been keeping in touch with House candidates and has been working in coordination with UMFA president Pat Swan and Vice President Kegler.

FCC members and Professor Shively discussed the O&M items briefly, and Professor Shively provided clarifications where needed. For example, #4, "Professional Colleges Tuition Remission" seeks an appropriation so that students in professional schools would not be included in the calculation of 32-33% of instructional costs.

Professor Merwin told Professor Shively the FCC wants to continue to serve as a sounding board as the session proceeds. Professor Shively invited members to let him know about any legislative items in which they have a special interest.

3. The Faculty Senate's charge to the Library Committee and Tenure Committee.

The Faculty Senate on June 7 adopted a resolution presented by Professor Krislov, as follows:

"University colleagues, whether serving on faculty status or on professional/academic status, have interdependent responsibilities and concerns. The Faculty Senate wishes to reiterate and underscore its responsibility and its commitment to assuring full protection of academic freedom to all colleagues and its desire to help develop appropriate classifications, standards, and procedures for all colleagues. Accordingly we direct:

1. The Library Committee and Tenure Committee to study and to report to the faculty, no later than for 1985, patterns consistent with the tenure code allowing libraries with research and bibliographic commitments appropriate and flexible faculty status within departmental ranks."

(Note: a second directive follows which deals with evaluating the P/A classification.)

Professor Morrison told FCC that before the Tenure Committee picked up this charge, they wanted to have considered whether it could go directly to a special committee such as that requested in directive #2 to be created in 1986 to evaluate P/A.

Professor Krislov told FCC it would be appropriate to have an ad hoc committee work through the Library Committee instead of using the two full committees jointly. There emerged a consensus of opinion that the Library Committee, augmented by a member of the Tenure Committee, could appropriately take on the charge.

Professor Clark urged that the first and second directives in the resolution remain separated because the second proposes to address the whole of the P/A system. This system has developed considerably since 1980, she noted; it has its own active advisory committee, and there are large categories of employees in units other than the library (i.e., Student Affairs, Agricultural Extension). Hence the committee formed to work on directive #2 should be broadly representative of the employees in the classification.

Professor Morrison requested the FCC to ask the Senate to redirect its charge for #1 to the Library Committee.

MEETING WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

4. The Tenure Code.

The FCC, Tenure Committee chairman Fred Morrison, and Dr. Keller discussed in general terms those sections of the tenure code where the views of the Faculty Senate in the document it approved differ from the views of the central administration and the Regents. Upcoming meetings intended to work toward a resolution include the Tenure Committee's November 2 meeting with President Keller and the November 8 meeting of FCC and Professor Morrison with the Regents.

5. Developing a thematic statement for the University.

President Keller said the statement would not propose programmatic decisions, but would deal instead with general areas, including things we can do to improve research, graduate education, and support. Business we can make progress on this year includes some of the task force recommendations.

At his press conference this afternoon, he will point out that the decline in numbers of students can give the University the opportunity to improve. Now that this is a relatively good time for the state, the University will ask if it can have restored what it lost when the state was in hard economic times, in part by not decreasing resources strictly proportionally as enrollments decline.

Dr. Keller invited further faculty thoughts on the development of the statement.

6. Faculty-student governance relationship. During the course of the FCC meeting, copies were delivered of the text of a new motion submitted by an individual senator for the November 15 Senate meeting. The motion calls for a University Senate which would consist of faculty members plus the student body presidents of the five campuses. FCC members' immediate reaction was to consider the motion together with other approaches the Consultative Committee is discussing, prior to Senate action.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

October 25, 1984

Dr. Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President of Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

The Faculty Consultative Committee would like to talk further with you about the Tenure Code on November 1, preliminary to the Regents' meetings. We want to explore the extent to which we can reach some agreement, and will take as a starting point Fred Morrison's proposed language changes which you have already distributed to the Regents' Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs Committee.

Next, we wonder if there is more you would like to talk about with us at this point regarding your developing the short mission statement. As you know from our October meeting together, FCC has a keen interest in your project, and we want to be helpful.

Finally, let's follow up on the FCC's understanding with you in the October 4 meeting regarding SCFA's inloading motion. I want to assure you that when the FCC receives your letter stating the administration's reservations about that policy statement, we will arrange to take those up with the Faculty Affairs Committee. This item requires no agenda time on the first.

As always, we invite you to add your own items to the agenda. The usual time is reserved for our conversation -- 11:00 to 12:30.

Cordially,

25 /
Jack Merwin, Chairman,
Faculty Consultative Committee

JM:mp

cc: Dr. Magrath
Dr. Vanselow



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

October 29, 1984

To: Faculty Consultative Committee
Tom Clayton
Fred Morrison

From: Jack Merwin

Re: Meeting with the Regents

Our meeting with the Regents on the Tenure Code is scheduled for 10:15 a.m. on Thursday, November 8, in the Regents Room.

Ours is the second item in this added meeting for the Regents, which begins at 9:30.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Exclusive Representative for the University of Minnesota, Duluth Faculty and the University of Minnesota Technical College, Waseca Faculty

437 ARROWHEAD PLACE
205 WEST SECOND STREET
DULUTH, MN 55802
218-723-2306

10/23/84

President,
Duluth

Virginia T.
Katz

UEA ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROVIDED TO AND DELIBERATIONS OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND THE SENATE PLANNING COMMITTEE

President-
Elect, Duluth

George M.
O'Brien

1. UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca receive in advance all agendas of SCC, FCC, SCFA, and Senate Finance and Budget Committees

Planning

President,
Waseca

Peter A.
Fog

2. UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca receive promptly minutes of all the above mentioned committees

Vice-
President,
Waseca

Howard
Olien

3. As meetings of above mentioned committees are open, UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca (or their designees) will attend these meetings when items appear on the agenda(s) which appear to be relevant to UMD and UMW concerns. Travel expenses of up to three people for these meetings to come out of Senate Travel Budget.

Chief
Negotiator

Vincent R.
Magnuson

4. Regular (minimum of one per quarter) "meet and confer" sessions with the President and/or appropriate Vice President(s) to discuss items of concern which have come up in the meetings of the above mentioned committees, in addition to other items of concern. These meet and confer sessions are to alternate between the Duluth and Waseca campuses.

5. One meet and confer session per year between UEA and their employers, the Board of Regents (if not the full Board, a delegation from the Board).

UEA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Institutional Relations
232 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2054

September 26, 1984

TO: President Magrath
Members of the Board of Regents
Vice Presidents, Provosts

FROM: Stan Kegler *SK*

SUBJECT: Recommended Priority for Operations & Maintenance
Requested Increases and for State Special Requested
Increases

The Budget Executive recommends the following priority ordering of O & M and state special requested increases. The basic rationale for these priority rankings was to accord highest priority to those items relating to the general strength of the University on all its campuses and installations.

Operations and Maintenance Budget Increases

Imperatives (no priority order; these are items that simply must be funded)

- Fuel and Utilities -- deficit and rate increases
- Operation of New Space
- Disposal of Solid and Hazardous Wastes -- rate increases

Priority-Ranked Items - O & M

1. Academic Salaries -- 7% annual increase
2. Permanent University Fund Offset Removal -- to create endowed chairs (with private matching)
3. Indirect Cost Recovery Offset -- \$5 million each year to fund various research equipment requests, research activities, and the like.
4. Professional Colleges Tuition Remission -- to modify tuition charges in four unique programs.
5. Increase State Allocation Due to Tuition Reciprocity
6. Post-MD Fellows Tuition Scholarships
7. Equipment Replacement Fund
8. Instructional Computing
9. Civil Service Comparable Worth

10. Special Salary Funds for Retention in Certain Disciplines
11. Tuition Scholarships for Graduate Students
12. Program Accommodation Remodeling -- to increase funds for minor remodeling.
13. Faculty Retirement Deficit -- second half of remission of earlier retrenchment by the State.
14. UMD Engineering Programs Operating Fund
15. Library Materials Increases
16. Medical Benefit Improvements for Retirees
17. Skilled Trades Increases
18. Funding of Minnesota Employees Right to Know Act

I should note that these eighteen priority-ranked items and the three "imperative" items represent the smallest list of O & M requests we have submitted in recent years; there were, by way of comparison, 72 separate items in the 1977 request.

State Special Requested Increases - Priority Ranked

1. Supercomputer Institute (increase)
2. Agricultural Research (increase)
3. Human Genetics Institute (new)
4. Biotechnology Center (increase)
5. Micro-Electronics and Information Sciences (increase)
6. Agricultural Extension (increase)
7. Sea Grant (increase)
8. Productivity Center (increase)
9. Mineral Resources Research Center (increase)
10. Geological Survey (increase)
11. International Business Education (new)
12. Intercollegiate Athletics -- all campuses (increase)

The Specials priority listing was especially difficult to recommend; just being on the list at all signified, in the Budget Executive's judgement, a high University priority. You will recall our earlier indication that we intended to take care of many requests (which, in the past, would each have been listed separately) by combining into large requests, such as equipment, instructional computing, and the like. Again, by way of comparison, this list of twelve requests in State Specials, is the smallest in recent years; in 1977 there were 37 individual requests and, in 1971, there were 72.

SBK:glf

cc: Dave Berg	Vic Vikmanis	Prof. Jack Merwin
Mary Des Roches	George Robb	Rama Murthy
Ivan Fletcher	Prof. Phil Shively	Cherie Perlmutter
Chet Grygar	Duane Wilson	
Clint Hewitt	Student Representatives to the Board	
Richard Sauer		

From the Faculty Senate minutes of June 7, 1984

NEW BUSINESS

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION:

University colleagues, whether serving on faculty status or on professional/academic status, have interdependent responsibilities and concerns. The Faculty Senate wishes to reiterate and underscore its responsibility and its commitment to assuring full protection of academic freedom to all colleagues and its desire to help develop appropriate classifications, standards, and procedures for all colleagues.

Accordingly, we direct:

1. The Library Committee and the Tenure Committee to study and to report to the faculty, no later than for 1985, patterns consistent with the tenure code allowing libraries with research and bibliographic commitments appropriate and flexible faculty status within departmental ranks.

2. The establishment in 1986 of a special Senate committee to evaluate the professional/academic classification with special attention to the following issues:
 - a. Any actual consequences for academic freedom for any segment of the professional/academic classification.
 - b. Effects on caliber of those hired under the professional/academic classification (including but not limited to librarians and those in cooperative extension) as well as those in faculty status in regular departments as a consequence of the new classification schemes.
 - c. Fairness and appropriateness of standards of evaluation developed for those covered by the professional/academic classification and new tenure code for such individuals.
 - d. Appropriateness of coverage under the professional/academic classification of various groups and of faculty groupings as well.

SAMUEL KRISLOV
Senator

Substitution of "special Senate committee" for "task force" was accepted as a friendly amendment; the motion as amended was approved.

ADJOURNMENT



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

November 20, 1984

Regents Professor John Chipman
Chairman, Senate Library Committee
Department of Economics
1122 Management and Economics

Dear John:

As you may recall, the Faculty Senate on June 7 approved a resolution submitted by Professor Sam Krislov relating to librarians and to the professional/academic employment classification generally. I am writing you in regard to the first of the two directives in this resolution. Here is the motion on full:

"That the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION:

"University colleagues, whether serving on faculty status or on professional/academic status, have interdependent responsibilities and concerns. The Faculty Senate wishes to reiterate and underscore its responsibility and its commitment to assuring full protection of academic freedom to all colleagues and its desire to help develop appropriate classifications, standards, and procedures for all colleagues.

Accordingly, we direct:

1. The Library Committee and the Tenure Committee to study and to report to the faculty, no later than for 1985, patterns consistent with the tenure code allowing libraries (sic) with research and bibliographic commitments appropriate and flexible faculty status within departmental ranks.
2. The establishment in 1986 of a special Senate committee to evaluate the professional/academic classification with special attention to the following issues:
 - a. Any actual consequences for academic freedom for any segment of the professional/academic classification.
 - b. Effects on caliber of those hired under the professional/academic classification (including but not limited to librarians and those in cooperative extension) as well as those in faculty status in regular departments as a consequence of the new classification schemes.

Professor John Chipman
November 20, 1984
page two

- c. Fairness and appropriateness of standards of evaluation developed for those covered by the professional/academic classification and new tenure code for such individuals.
- d. Appropriateness of coverage under the professional/academic classification of various groups and of faculty groupings as well."

The Faculty Consultative Committee recently discussed the first directive jointly with Professors Krislov and Morrison (Tenure Committee chairman). It was the group's consensus that it would be most appropriate for the Library Committee, augmented by one member of the Tenure Committee, to take on the charge in #1 above. We hope that your committee, so augmented, will be able to complete the assignment in time to report to the Faculty Senate on May 16, 1985.

You may wish to discuss with Professor Morrison who from his committee might best serve to work with your committee on this matter. I am sure that Professor Krislov would be glad to talk with you or the full Library Committee to explain more fully the intent of the motion, if you would find that helpful. Please feel free also to call me if you have other kinds of questions about this request.

Sincerely,

Jack Merwin, Chairman,
Faculty Consultative Committee

JM:mp

Attachment: membership roster, Senate Committee on Tenure

c: Fred Morrison
Sam Krislov