



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

April 2, 1987
10:15 - 12:00
300 Morrill Hall

FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

10:15-
10:30

1. Minutes of March 5 (attached).
2. Report from the Nominations Subcommittee:
 - A. Nominations for committees (attached);
 - B. Nomination of a vice chair for the Senate and Assembly;
 - C. Proposed bylaws amendments to be brought by full SCC (attached).

FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION

10:30-
10:40

3. Proposed settlement in Ragender petitions (attached: 3/10/87 memorandum from Vice President Dunham).

FOR INFORMATION

10:40-
10:45

4. Parking policies (attached: 3/9/87 letter from Warren Loud, Chair, Transportation and Parking Committee, to Geoffrey Maruyama, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee).
5. Nominations for Committee on Committees (attached).
6. 1987-88 FCC membership: The Crookston faculty has elected Lynnette Mullins to a three-year term.
7. Planning Advisory Task Force Report: Chair, Charles Campbell.
8. Chair's Report.



DISCUSSION WITH DEAN HOLT

- 10:45-
11:15
9. Resources for Graduate Education.

DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

- 11:15-
12:00
10. Means of communication between faculty and faculty and between administration and faculty.
 11. FCC proposal regarding appointment of President's Student Behavior Review Panel (attached: Professor Berscheid's letter to President Keller).
 12. The President's items.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

Approved 4/16/87

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

April 2, 1987
10:15 -12:15
300 Morrill Hall

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (Chair), Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively.

Guests: Vice President and General Counsel Stephen Dunham; Dean of the Graduate School Robert Holt; President Kenneth Keller; Heidi Schechter (Minnesota Daily); Maureen Smith (University Relations).

1. The minutes of March 5 were approved.

2. Report from chair of the FCC Nominations Subcommittee: Professor Clark.

A. FCC accepted the recommendations of the nominating committee members, except to postpone until a later meeting nomination of the Planning Committee chair.

B. Nomination of a Vice-chair for the Senate and Assembly. FCC agreed that major continuing business in academic planning makes it desirable to recommend re-election of this year's vice chair, Professor Charles Campbell, who also is currently chairing the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning. FCC will ask the full SCC to make that nomination.

C. FCC approved the bylaws amendments that were proposed to shift certain nominating and appointment responsibilities from the FCC to the Committee on Committees.

3. Proposed settlements to two consent decree petitions.

(Copies of proposed settlements to two petitions had been distributed in advance to FCC members.) Vice President Dunham reported that he expected the petition concerning the Academic Staff Professional and Administrative personnel category to be signed promptly. Regarding the petition concerning specificity of standards for promotion and tenure,

plaintiffs ask that a unit not be allowed to hire anyone until it has in place clear and specific criteria for tenure; Vice President Dunham said he was inclined to agree. Plaintiffs also ask that a unit be required to state clear and specific standards for promotion before being allowed to promote anyone; Vice President Dunham was inclined not to agree, principally because the Tenure Code does not require such standards for promotion. However, some FCC members believed that their colleges had required their departments to identify specific and detailed standards for promotion as well as for the granting of tenure. Mr. Dunham told FCC he would investigate what instructions the Office of Academic Affairs had sent to academic units and would report back to FCC on the status of the proposed settlement. In any case, the FCC was sympathetic to the plaintiffs' desire that specific and detailed standards be required for promotion as well as for tenure.

4. Parking policies.

FCC will ask the Transportation and Parking Committee to reopen the issue of the location of reciprocal parking and to inform the Faculty Affairs Committee of that request.

5. Report of the Chair: Professor Berscheid.

A. President Keller will report to the Regents in June last year's Senate vote on ICR distribution. In the interim, further discussions between Provost Benjamin and the Senate Committee on Research will take place to determine if greater rapprochement can be achieved.

B. Tony Potami, Assistant Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer Administration, will work with the Senate Committee on Research and other committee representatives to develop a detailed conflict-of-interest policy. FCC recommended that the Conflict-of-Interest Policy Development Committee include representatives from Faculty Affairs (and, possibly, Tenure, which reports through SCFA) and Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals, as well as the Office of Academic Affairs. It is understood that the Senate Committee on Research, after approving a policy proposal, will take it to the Senate.

6. Resources for Graduate Education: Discussion with Robert Holt, Dean of the Graduate School.

Dean Holt reported the value of support given as \$6.5 million (\$1.5 million for first-year fellowships and dissertation fellowships; \$1.5 million in block grants to departments; \$3.5 million in revenue loss for tuition fellowships). Support of graduate students, he said, is good but needs to improve. Competition for graduate students will escalate because of a shrinking pool and because other institutions (e.g., University of California) are planning large increases in graduate programs. Our \$8,000 fellowship stipends must be increased to be competitive; thirty to forty multi-year fellowships should be awarded; the size of the block grants should be increased. The quality of our graduate students is going up. He believes there should be some Graduate School responsibility

for cross-college and multi-departmental programs.

FCC members see the situation as improved; they encourage the dean to continue his good efforts.

Discussion with President Keller.

7. Improving communication between faculty and faculty and between the administration and faculty.

FCC and President Keller discussed the possibility of a very small weekly newspaper, half of which would normally be devoted to faculty-to-faculty communications (governance committee reports, opinion pieces) and half to administration communications to faculty; distribution would be to University faculty. The president cited costs, staffing, and the cooperation of contributors as the principal considerations. FCC asked that the newspaper be printed in addition to "Brief." President Keller told FCC he would take the proposal to several associates, including people in University Relations, and designate someone to report back to FCC.

11. FCC request to shift to Committee on Committees responsibility for nominating members of the President's Student Behavior Review Panel.

President Keller agreed to the request and will so write to FCC.

12. Legislative update.

A. The legislature is asking the administration to indicate, prior to making an appropriation, the distribution plan for faculty salary increases. President Keller called for recommendations from at least one broadly-concerned committee in addition to the Faculty Affairs Committee. FCC agreed with the Chair of Finance's recommendation that the FCC, rather than Finance, would be that committee. FCC members noted the advantages of special salary funds to be distributed on a competitive basis.

B. Commitment to Focus. The University has been asked to report to a caucus at once the minimum necessary CTF appropriation.

C. Continuing issues cited by President Keller:

(1) Challenge to assess the quality of education;

(2) Growing sentiment, nationally, to tie financial aid to service and to increase academia's involvement in addressing community and state needs.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant

MAR 11 1987



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the University Attorney
330 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 624-4100

March 10, 1987

TO: ✓ Ellen Berscheid, Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee
Geoffrey Maruyama, Chair, Senate Committee on
Faculty Affairs
Clarice Olien, Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity for
Women Committee
Amos Deinard, Chair, Judicial Committee
George Copa, Chair, Tenure Committee
Gregory Fox, Chair, Academic Staff Advisory Committee

FROM: Stephen S. Dunham *SSD*

RE: Rajender Petitions

I enclose a copy of proposed settlements in the Rajender petitions dealing with tenure and promotion criteria and the professional and administrative classification. I also enclose a copy of the petitions.

These drafts have not been approved by either the plaintiffs or the University, but they do represent advanced discussions between counsel. One or both of the proposed settlements touch on matters within the jurisdiction of each of your committees, and I am writing to solicit your comments. Because of time pressures (we have a March 19 conference with the Special Masters), I am requesting that you call me with any **comments by March 18.** If you feel strongly that the University should not proceed with the settlements without fuller discussion and the March 18 date is an **impossible deadline**, please call me.

If you would like to discuss any of these matters, please do not hesitate to call. The litigation/settlement process and the academic consultative process do not mesh easily, but your comments are important and I will do my best to answer your questions.

SSD/mam
Enc.

cc: President Kenneth H. Keller
Vice Presidents
Director Patricia A. Mullen
Associate Vice President Betty W. Robinett
Associate Vice President Cherie Perlmutter

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The individuals who have signed Exhibit A ("Petitioners") and the Regents of the University of Minnesota ("University") agree to settle the cases listed in Exhibit A as follows:

1. The University agrees that by December 31, 1987, it will study and produce a written report on the issues listed in paragraph 2, below. Petitioners understand that some of the reports called for by this agreement already exist or are in preparation. Petitioners understand further that the study and report(s) required may be undertaken by administrators and will not necessarily lead to specific recommendations or changes. The report(s) will include recommendations, as appropriate.

2. (1) The manner of selection of the members of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee, including whether the members should be elected directly by academic unit or otherwise;

(2) whether some or all fringe benefits should be extended to academic employees (including professional and administrative employees) holding part-time appointments;

(3) to what extent professional and administrative employees who are not on a continuous appointment should be eligible for the University's home mortgage program;

(4) a description of the personnel policies and procedures which deal with academic employees (including faculty as well as professional and administrative employees);

(5) to what extent professional and administrative employees should be represented on University Senate committees;

(6) to what extent, for purposes of participation in the University's retirement program, prior University service by professional and administrative employees in a different job classification system should be credited towards the required minimum years of service;

(7) to what extent female professional and administrative employees are represented at the top levels of management and what goals the University has set related to this;

~~report~~ (8) whether professional and administrative employees may apply for grants as principal investigators;

(9) to what extent professional and administrative employees receive centrally approved professional leaves and whether the method of funding for such leaves ought to be changed;

(10) the number of professional and administrative employees appointed to probationary and continuous appointment positions; and

(11) whether multi-year rolling appointments ought to be used more widely.

3. Prior to completing the report(s) referred to in paragraph 1, above, appropriate University administrators shall offer to meet and discuss these matters with the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee, the Academic Staff Advisory Committee, and petitioners.

4. The parties agree to enter into a Stipulation of Dismissal without Prejudice in the form attached hereto as

Exhibit B to be filed with the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

5. The University will pay to petitioners and their attorneys, Carol A. O'Toole and Carolyn Chalmers \$_____ and \$_____, respectively, for legal fees and costs.

6. There are no covenants, promises, undertakings, or understandings outside of this Settlement Agreement nor other than as specifically set forth herein.

Dated: _____

Betty W. Robinett

Dated: _____

Carol N. Campbell

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Stephen S. Dunham

Carol A. O'Toole

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The individuals who have signed Exhibit A ("Petitioners") and the Regents of the University of Minnesota ("University") agree to settle the cases listed in Exhibit A as follows:

1. The University agrees that by June 30, 1987, each academic unit will have a departmental statement that meets the requirements of Section 7.12 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, effective July 1, 1985 ("Regulations"). The University believes that Section 7.11 of the Regulations and other appropriate documents already meet the requirement of Part VI.A of the Rajender Consent Decree that each academic unit shall have sex neutral criteria for granting of tenure. On this basis, the University agrees that by June 30, 1987, each academic unit will continue to have sex neutral tenure criteria that meet the requirements of Part VI.A of the Consent Decree.

2. (a) Before December 31, 1987, each academic unit must provide each regular faculty member with a copy of the departmental statement and must provide each regular faculty member the opportunity to comment on the statement. This provision is satisfied if an academic unit has already provided an opportunity for its regular faculty members to comment on the departmental statement. The departmental statement shall be provided to each new probationary faculty member.

(b) In the event a regular faculty member believes that his or her academic unit does not have a statement that complies

with Section 7.12 of the Regulations, he or she may take the complaint to the head of the unit. They shall discuss whether or not the statement is in compliance with Section 7.12, and the unit shall make changes, if necessary, to insure continued compliance. If a dispute over the departmental statement is not resolved at the departmental level, any regular faculty member may submit the matter to the dean of the college to which the unit belongs. The dean or a designee shall consider the complaint and take appropriate action. A regular faculty member may also send a complaint to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs which shall review it and take appropriate action.

3. The procedure set forth in paragraph 2 above, is without prejudice to the complainants' right to argue that he or she is adversely affected by the disputed departmental statement within the meaning of Section 15.1 of the Regulations and as such may pursue the appeal procedures set forth in Section 15.2 et al of the Regulations. By this Agreement the parties express no opinion on this jurisdictional issue.

4. Exhibit B, which is attached to and incorporated in this Agreement, lists the academic units for which departmental statements are required by Section 7.12 of the Regulations. On June 30, 1987, the University shall notify _____ whether or not each of those units listed in Exhibit B is in

compliance with Section 7.12 of the Regulations. As to those units not in compliance on June 30, 1987, the University shall provide to _____ monthly status reports until such time that all academic units are in compliance with the Regulations.

5. The University agrees that, after June 30, 1987, it will not approve a Form 16 for a probationary faculty position in any academic unit which does not have a departmental statement approved by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may authorize an exception to this provision when, in his or her judgment, the unit is proceeding in good faith to develop a departmental statement and a delay in hiring will cause substantial harm to the University. The University shall report any such exception to _____

6. The University agrees that within thirty (30) days after execution of this Agreement it shall send a copy of the Agreement to all regular faculty members.

7. The parties agree to enter into a Stipulation of Dismissal without Prejudice to be filed with the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C.

8. The University will pay petitioners reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as set forth on the attached Exhibit D.

9. There are no covenants, promises, undertakings, or understandings outside of this Settlement Agreement nor other than as specifically set forth herein, except that nothing herein shall be construed to constitute a waiver of any claim, legal or otherwise, of any individual faculty member arising out of Section 7.12 of the Regulations.

10. The undersigned, by execution hereof, state that this Settlement Agreement has been read by them and by legal counsel, and that the undersigned understand and fully agree to each, all and every provision hereof and acknowledge receipt of a copy hereof.

Dated: _____ Betty W. Robinett

Dated: _____ Carol N. Campbell

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Stephen S. Dunham

Carolyn Chalmers

Andrea F. Rubenstein

CLAIM/PETITION FORM

SPECIAL MASTER
United States District Court

COURT USE ONLY:	
Claim Number	
Date Filed	

- CLAIM FOR INDIVIDUAL RELIEF UNDER PART II OF CONSENT DECREE
- PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF UNDER PART III OF CONSENT DECREE
(CHECK ONE. IF YOU WISH TO PURSUE BOTH, YOU MUST FILE TWO FORMS.)

CLAIM AND PETITION FORM UNDER CONSENT DECREE: Any women seeking to file a Claim Form or Petition asserting that she has been discriminated against because of her sex by the University of Minnesota or any of its constituent units shall do so by filing this form by mail to: Special Master, P.O. Box 2070, Loop Station, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402.

TIME LIMITATIONS: A claim or petition asserting that a then existing, continuing, or newly initiated employment practice, policy or procedure of the University or any of its constituent units is discriminatory may be made at any time under the Decree. A claim relating to acts occurring on or after September 1, 1980 must be postmarked no later than sixty (60) days after you learn or have notice of the action which is the subject of your claim. A claim relating to acts occurring on or after March 24, 1972 and before September 1, 1980, must be postmarked no later than June 1, 1981.

1. Your name, address, zip code and phone number:

2. Name the academic unit(s) or otherwise describe the person(s) who discriminated against you.

All University units making recommendations or final judgments on applications for promotion or tenure.

3. In what area did the discrimination occur? (Please check one or more)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - tenure or tenure track | <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - other | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy, practice or procedure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary | |

4. Set forth a brief statement of fact and describe the act, decision, employment policy, practice or procedure which is the subject of the claim. (You may submit a detailed separate statement setting forth all the particulars.)

Specificity of Standards for Promotion and Tenure

(See attachment.)

5. Please identify by name or as a class or as a subclass, other persons who are similarly affected by the act, policy, practice or procedure which is the subject of the claim. (You need not respond to this if your claim seeks individual relief to you only.)

All female academic non-student employees who are or will be applicants for promotion or tenure.

6. What relief is requested from the Court? (Please check one or more.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - tenure or tenure track | <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits adjustment(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - other | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy, practice or procedure adjustment(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Backpay, costs and/or fees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary adjustment(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) |

7. Have you previously received any determination from any University tribunal of any complaint based on the facts of this claim? (If so, identify the tribunal and date.)

8. Attach any written documentation now available and in support of your claim which may set out the facts and which may describe the act, decision, employment policy, practice or procedure complained of in this claim. (Please do not submit all potential evidence of your claim at this time.)

Date: _____

Claimant's Signature _____

(If more than one claimant asserts that they have been injured by the same act, decision, policy, practice or procedure, you may elect to file a single claim and all others should sign on a separate attachment to the Claim Form.)

4. Specificity of Standards for Promotion and Tenure.

I am a full-time female non-student academic employee of the University. I would have standing to bring an action for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and I believe that the following employment practice, policy and procedure of the University and its constituent units violates the provisions of Title VII.

Pursuant to Section III-B of the Consent Decree:

(1) Employment policy, practice or procedure, claimed to be unlawful.

Subject to very vague and subjective University-wide criteria, it is the policy of the University to permit each reviewing unit to formulate and apply its own standards for promotion and tenure. These standards and criteria need not be explicitly or specifically stated and may vary arbitrarily from applicant to applicant. Further, it is the policy of the University to require no accountability of reviewing units either with respect to the standards and criteria used in a particular case or the details of how these standards and criteria are applied to individual applicants for tenure or promotion.

(2) Persons affected by such policy, practice or procedure.

(See 5. of petition.)

(3) Facts known to the Petitioner upon which the Petition is based.

Lack of specificity regarding criteria for tenure and promotion has a disparate impact on women. Unbridled discretion by the administration allows for arbitrary and capricious awards of promotion and tenure and results in sex discrimination in the promotion and tenure process.

The Findings of Fact by Special Master Edward J. Parker in the claims of Jeralyn Plack and Jacqueline Shick provide a specific fact situation in which lack of specificity of standards resulted in sex discrimination. In summary Special Master Parker stated in his Memorandum at page 3 that, "it was established that the College of Education's facially neutral promotion and tenure criteria and review process are so fraught with virtually unbridled discretion at so many levels that the result is a disproportionate number of women hired or promoted to the rank of Full Professor."

(4) Supporting documentation will be provided later.

(5) I believe that the University policy of failing to require explicit and specific standards and criteria for promotion and tenure has a disparate impact on female academic non-student employees which results in sex discrimination and that this failure to provide explicit standards is motivated in part by an intention to perpetuate and to conceal sex discrimination in the promotion and tenure process.

Rogers
P/A

CLAIM/PETITION FORM

SPECIAL MASTER
United States District Court

COURT USE ONLY:

Claim Number

Date Filed

- CLAIM FOR INDIVIDUAL RELIEF
UNDER PART II OF CONSENT DECREE
- PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
UNDER PART III OF CONSENT DECREE
- (CHECK ONE. IF YOU WISH TO PURSUE
BOTH, YOU MUST FILE TWO FORMS.)

CLAIM AND PETITION FORM UNDER CONSENT DECREE: Any women seeking to file a Claim Form or Petition asserting that she has been discriminated against because of her sex by the University of Minnesota or any of its constituent units shall do so by filing this form by mail to: Special Master, P.O. Box 2070, Loop Station, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402.

TIME LIMITATIONS: A claim or petition asserting that a then existing, continuing, or newly initiated employment practice, policy or procedure of the University or any of its constituent units is discriminatory may be made at any time under the Decree. A claim relating to acts occurring on or after September 1, 1980 must be postmarked no later than sixty (60) days after you learn or have notice of the action which is the subject of your claim. A claim relating to acts occurring on or after March 24, 1972 and before September 1, 1980, must be postmarked no later than June 1, 1981.

1. Your name, address, zip code and phone number:

2. Name the academic unit(s) or otherwise describe the person(s) who discriminated against you.

All University units responsible for the establishment of the rights and responsibilities of the Academic Staff Professional and Administrative Personnel Category (P/A), for the assignment of these P/A positions to University units or for the assignment of individual personnel to these P/A positions.

3. In what area did the discrimination occur? (Please check one or more.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - tenure or tenure track | <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - other | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy, practice or procedure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary | |

4. Set forth a brief statement of fact and describe the act, decision, employment policy, practice or procedure which is the subject of the claim. (You may submit a detailed separate statement setting forth all the particulars.)

P/A Positions
(See attachment.)

5. Please identify by name or as a class or as a subclass, other persons who are similarly affected by the act, policy, practice or procedure which is the subject of the claim. (You need not respond to this if your claim seeks individual relief to you only.)

All female academic non-student employees who are currently assigned to P/A positions or who may be subject to reassignment to P/A positions.

6. What relief is requested from the Court? (Please check one or more.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - tenure or tenure track | <input type="checkbox"/> Benefits adjustment(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hiring - other | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy, practice or procedure adjustment(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Backpay, costs and/or fees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary adjustment(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) |

7. Have you previously received any determination from any University tribunal of any complaint based on the facts of this claim? (If so, identify the tribunal and date.)

8. Attach any written documentation now available and in support of your claim which may set out the facts and which may describe the act, decision, employment policy, practice or procedure complained of in this claim. (Please do not submit all potential evidence of your claim at this time.)

Date: _____

Claimant's Signature _____

(If more than one claimant asserts that they have been injured by the same act, decision, policy, practice or procedure, each claimant must sign this form.)

4. P/A Positions.

I am a full-time female non-student academic employee of the University. I would have standing to bring an action for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2201, and I believe that the following employment practice, policy and procedure of the University and its constituent units violates the provisions of Title VII.

Pursuant to Section III-B of the Consent Decree:

(1) Employment policy, practice or procedure, claimed to be unlawful.

It is the policy and practice of the University to assign female academic non-student employees to the Academic Staff Professional and Administrative Personnel Category (P/A) of employment in numbers greater than their proportion in academic employment. It is the policy of the University that these P/A positions do not provide the promotion opportunities or the academic freedom protections of regular faculty positions.

(2) Persons affected by such policy, practice or procedure.

(See 5. of petition.)

(3) Facts known to the Petitioner upon which the Petition is based.

The Academic Staff Professional and Administrative Personnel Category (P/A) was approved by the Regents of the University of Minnesota in November 1981. This personnel category was conceived by the University's Academic Administration. It eliminates the achievement of tenure comparable to faculty tenure, shifts these academic staff appointees from a collegial to an hierarchical organization, and does not provide the usual academic freedom protections of regular faculty positions.

The P/A category is being imposed on academic women in a disproportionate manner since faculty positions being reclassified as P/A positions in many academic units of the University are those in which women appointees predominate. The University Libraries is an example of one such unit in which the P/A category is being imposed on professional librarians who since 1964 had been appointed at faculty rank and position.

The imposition of this category of professional academic appointment on women results in the isolation of women academics from their colleagues, insecurity of employment and threats to their personal academic freedom.

(4) Kenneth Keller letter re: Appointments in the University Libraries, August, 1982. Other supporting documentation to be provided later.

(5) I believe that the University's policies with regard to the structuring of P/A positions and the assignment of these positions has a disproportionate and unfavorable impact on female academic non-student employees and that this is the result of sex discrimination. I believe the use of these P/A positions is motivated in part by the intention to perpetuate the practice of keeping women in low paying, dead end jobs at the University.

JUL 8 1987



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

School of Mathematics
127 Vincent Hall
206 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

July 6, 1987

Professor Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee

Dear Professor Berscheid:

This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1987 regarding the change in the policy on reciprocal parking. Unfortunately your letter reached me just too late to schedule its discussion at our April 8 meeting, and it has taken rather long to obtain the desired information. I enclose a statement by Mark Pace, who is manager of parking services.

I have asked the committee to react to this statement, and my statement which follows is based in part on their comments. The problem has been the very great shortage of parking places on the Minneapolis Campus in particular. The demand for parking contracts has been much larger than the number of spaces available, and I am sure that many faculty and staff have made the (to me) wise decision to use other means of transportation to campus than personal cars. I remember two years ago when the problem of reciprocal parking was considered by this committee, it was pointed out that the provision of many spaces for reciprocal parking had the effect of reducing the number of parking contracts that could be offered. It was felt by the committee at that time that the reciprocal parking would have to be reduced to satisfy the increased demand for parking contracts. Special note was taken of those with teaching responsibilities on more than one campus who might well have much equipment to transport. Beyond that, I feel that not much weight can be given to the preference for use of one's own car over use of the intercampus bus. The latter often stops much closer to campus destinations than most parking facilities.

I have had some complaints about the increase in parking rates. We considered this matter very carefully. We believe that although by legislative mandate, the parking services must operate as a business, the parking services are managed so as to provide maximum service to the university community and not to maximize profits. For the latter aim a perfectly sensible policy would be to raise prices until demand is sufficiently reduced.

I have also learned that it was not possible to have university parking services continue to be exempt from sales tax, so that (6%) will be collected. The parking services plans to absorb the extra half percent due in Minneapolis.

Sincerely,

Warren S. Loud

Warren S. Loud
Chairman, Committee on
Transportation and Parking

WSL: jm



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Parking Services Administrative Office
216 Printing and Graphic Arts
2818 Como Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414
(612) ~~373-1100~~ 625-3492

June 12, 1987

TO: Warren Loud
FROM: Mark Pace

The reduction of reciprocal parking to specific lots and limiting special requests to direct teaching responsibilities has increased the over sell of contracts by ten percent in the last two years. Around 600 more faculty and staff can obtain a guaranteed contract parking space.

APR 23 1987



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

School of Mathematics
127 Vincent Hall
206 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

April 23, 1987

To: Transportation and Parking Committee

From: Warren Loud

I have received the enclosed letter from Ellen Berscheid, and we will have to discuss this matter at our next meeting. I have asked Mark Pace to provide me with figures.

The question of reciprocal parking came up last year and the year before. The growing shortage of space on the Minneapolis campus meant that Minneapolis faculty had to wait increasingly long times for contract parking because so many spaces were reserved for reciprocal parking. It was felt at that time that reciprocal parking privileges would have to be curtailed, and in general priority was given to people with teaching responsibilities on the Minneapolis campus but offices in St. Paul. Now there are apparently complaints from those with reciprocal parking privileges that their allotted spaces are too remote, and we are asked to re-examine the policy.

I think that the shortage of spaces plus the large demand for contract parking on the Minneapolis campus justifies the present arrangement. It would seem to me that people who want reciprocal parking just because they prefer to drive their own cars rather than use the intercampus bus must adjust to the hard fact that there is a severe shortage of space on the Minneapolis campus. This is my own opinion, and the committee may well think otherwise.

You will be notified of the time and place of the next meeting.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

April 6, 1987

To: Warren Loud
Chair, Assembly Committee on Transportation and Parking

From: Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Assembly Steering Committee

Re: Reciprocal parking 

About two years ago, the University changed the reciprocal parking arrangements available to St. Paul and Minneapolis faculty driving to the other campus. The newly-identified lots at which a parking permit from the opposite campus would be honored were those at the periphery, roughly five blocks from libraries and other academic destinations. When the Steering Committee received complaints and inquired why the change had been made, we were given vague reports of abuses of the privilege.

Now that the new system has been in use for some time, we would like to request the Transportation and Parking Committee to re-examine the change, evaluate its consequences, and consider whether it should be reversed. It is the view of the faculty members of the Steering Committee that there are sound educational reasons for facilitating faculty visits to classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and meeting rooms on the opposite campus.

c: Geoffrey Maruyama
Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Shirley Clark
Associate Chair, Steering Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

January 15, 1987

Professor Warren Loud
Chair, Assembly Committee on Transportation and Parking
Department of Mathematics
109A Vincent Hall

Dear Professor Loud:

Reading the minutes of a recent meeting of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, I noticed criticism of the lack of any space reserved for faculty use in the new Church Street Garage. The minutes indicated that SCFA chair Geoffrey Maruyama would write an inquiry to you.

I want you to know that in one respect the new garage is helping faculty: those faculty members from the St. Paul Campus who come to the Minneapolis Campus for Senate and Assembly committee meetings may arrange for reserved parking in the Church Street Garage for their meeting times. The Senate is paying the cost. We will shortly make a preliminary assessment of this service, but I fully expect that it will be found highly desirable to continue the practice.

The Faculty Consultative Committee worked out this arrangement with Vern Carlson and the Parking Services people in response to appeals from St. Paul faculty. We believe the University should do all it reasonably can to support faculty who are donating time and effort to governance work. This new policy is an important aspect of that support.

Sincerely,

Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Faculty and Senate Consultative
Committees

EB:mp

c: Geoffrey Maruyama

bc: Shirley Clark



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 16, 1987
12:00 - 2:45
626 Campus Club

AGENDA

For Action

- 12:00 1. Approval of minutes of April 2 (attached).
- 12:00-12:05 (5) 2. (Assembly Steering Committee business.) Approval of motion from Assembly Committee on Educational Policy to establish an Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education (attached: revised motion). (Note: SSCC will consider this item on the same date.)

For Information and Discussion

- 12:05-12:10 (5) 3. Motion from Social Concerns Committee regarding CIA recruiting on campus (previously mailed to you: text of motion submitted for Senate docket and FCC chair's cover memorandum to FCC; attached: Brenda Ellingboe's resolution submitted to November 6 Senate meeting).
- 12:10-12:15 (5) 4. Acting administrative appointments (attached: Patricia Mullen's March 24 letter to Professor Berscheid).
- 12:15-12:45 (30) 5. The legislative session. Guest: Professor Richard Purple, faculty legislative liaison.
- 12:45-1:15 (30) 6. Administrative searches and terms (attached: proposal developed by Professors Shively and Brenner; Guidelines for the Performance Review of Administrators; Senate's Search Committee Guidelines).
- 1:15-1:35 (20) 7. FCC recommendation to central administration regarding distribution of faculty salary increases.
- 1:35-1:55 (20) 8. SCEP progress on student contact hours issue (attached: April 6 letter from SCEP Chair Andy Collins to Professor Berscheid).

cont. ...

- 1:55-2:15 (20) 9. University Grievance Procedures: Critique by the Academic Staff Assistance Officer (attached: Dr. Charlotte Striebel's March 6 letter to Professor Berscheid). Professor Paul Murphy.
- 2:15-2:45 (30) 10. Faculty Development Committee report. Guests: Professor Patricia Swan, FDC Chair, and Judith Bennett, FDC staff assistant.

For Information

Attached: Correspondence between Professors Collins and Berscheid. Please note SCEP's progress on the issue of class time per credit hour.

Attached: Position notice in Academic Affairs.