

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, May 22, 1975

3:15 p.m.

Nicholson Auditorium—Twin Cities Campus
Regents Room (520 Administration Building)—Duluth Campus
13 Camden Hall—Morris Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 234, including the president, 160 members of the faculty and faculty Consultative Committee, 73 students and student Consultative Committee. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (117) must be present. Amendments to the constitution require advance notice and 156 affirmative votes at one meeting or 117 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which must be the next regular meeting. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 117 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. The members of the all University Administrative Committee are ex officio non-voting members of the University Senate.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators may be admitted to meetings of the University Senate and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the University Senate. Only elected members of the University Senate, the members of the Senate Consultative Committee, and, in case of a tie, the chairman, shall be entitled to vote.

Any representative may designate any elected alternate from his institute, college, school, or student constituency as the alternate to serve in his/her place and stand by written notice to the clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the University Senate. In accordance with a newly enacted constitutional amendment, each institute, college or school may either elect a pool of alternate representatives or define the pool to be those eligible to vote for senators.

Documents to be handed out at the Senate meeting should be given to the Clerk of the Senate by 1:00 p.m., two days before the meeting, to allow them to be sent to the coordinate campuses. A document that is less than one page long can be accepted by the Clerk before 10 a.m. the day of the meeting for transmission by computer; however, this practice is discouraged if the earlier deadline can be met. If any coordinate campus is linked to the meeting by telephone and the document is not in its hands, the Senate will not consider the document.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected members will be posted at each door of the auditorium. Members, please check your name to indicate your presence. An attendance sheet for nonmembers will also be posted.

A summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the minutes for the last meeting of the year.

RULES GOVERNING THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

(These may be changed by a majority vote at any meeting.)

- A. Any member of the Senate, upon being recognized by the chair, may yield time in debate to a nonmember of the senate.
- B. Senators and non-Senators will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes time on each occasion they are recognized for participation in debate.

Interpretations and Understandings

1. The traditional practice of alternating speakers pro and con a proposal will continue.
 2. The traditional practice of not recognizing members who have already participated so long as there are would-be speakers who have not will also continue.
 3. The usual rules of germaneness and decorum will apply both to Senators and non-Senators.
 4. In the event a Senator yields time in debate to a non-Senator, both shall be considered to have participated in the debate.
- C. Time limits (as specified on the agenda) will govern the maximum amount of time for debate of items for action.
- ### Interpretations and Understandings
1. The time limits set only a maximum time for debate; a call for the question is in order before the expiration of the time limit.
 2. At the expiration of the maximum time for debate, the chairman will put the question to a vote.
- D. No amendment of an item on the printed docket shall be in order unless it has been submitted in writing to the Clerk of the Senate and to the chairperson of the committee submitting the report at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at which the report is to be considered. This rule may be suspended by majority vote.

I. SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES 1975-76

Reported for Action (10 minutes)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING AND RELATIONS: Norman Kerr (Chairman), Frederick Asher, John Detlef, Frances Dunning, Paul Hagen, John Helmsberger, Blanchard Krogstad, James Preus (ex officio), George Robb (ex officio). New members: Donald Kahn, Seymour Levitt, Vera Schletzer.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY: Frank Wood (Chairman), Joanne Arnaud, Ernest Coleman, George Robb (ex officio), Marlowe Smaby. New members: Walter Bruning (ex officio), James Holloway, Gisela Konopka, Susan Willis.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY HONORS: Alfred Nier (Chairman), Landis Boyd, Thomas Clayton, Ed Haislet (ex officio), Russ Tall (ex officio), Harriet Viksna. New members: Caroline Czarnecki, Arnold Lazarow, Albert Linck (ex officio).

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES: Russell Hobbie (Chairman), Susanne Fisher, Deon Stuthman, Veronica Wood. New members: Joseph Altholz, Mario Bognanno, Ruth Eaton.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY: Patricia Swan (Chairman), John Borchert, Bert Ellenbogen, Stan Kegler (ex officio), Robert Kiste, Charles McKhann, Dwight Purdy. New members: Lorne Chanin, Elizabeth Fisher, Willard Hartup, Henry Koffler (ex officio), Fred E. H. Schroeder.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS: Forrest Harris (Chairman), Roland Abraham (ex officio), Shirley Clark (ex officio), Kenneth Egertson, Betty Girling, Joan Leigh, Fred Lukermann, Harold Miller (ex officio), Anna Stansland. New members: Bruce Burnes, Virginia Gray, Morris Nicholson, John Verby.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING FACILITIES: Duane Anderson, Dave Berg (ex officio), Donald Boyd, Russell Burris, Angel Lopez, Frank Verbrugge (ex officio). New members: John Hoyt (Chairman), Richard Skaggs. (One additional member to be appointed.)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND MEDIA: Philip Salapatek (Chairman), Raymond Bohling, Richard Goldstein, Burton Paulu (ex officio), Willard Philipson (ex officio), Robert Raymond, Peter Roll (ex officio). New members: Thomas Bacig, Sue Reitan. (One additional member to be appointed.)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SUMMER SESSION: George Rapp (Chairman), Shirley Clark (ex officio), Virginia Harris, Neal Nickerson, Willard Thompson (ex officio), Mary Young. New members: Loretta Blahna, John Clark, Dale Olsen.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Albert Yonas (Chairman), Walter Fluegel, Mariam Frenier, La Vell Henderson, Peter Roll (ex officio). New members: Arthur Geffen, Thomas Noonan. (One additional member to be appointed to replace Lorne Chanin who has resigned.)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS: Richard Poppele (Chairman), Edward Bouffard (ex officio), Lawrence Bulawsky (ex officio), John Clausen, Thomas Madigan (ex officio), William Rogers, John Taborn, Ronald Violette (ex officio). New members: Nancy Dahl, Albert Linck (ex officio), Ralph Marsden. (One additional member to be appointed.)

COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: (new committee) Anne Krueger (Chairman), Eugene Fabes, Albert Linck (ex officio), Benjamin Liu, Forrest Moore (ex officio), Rama Pandey, Philip Porter, Malcolm Purvis, John Schlottbauer, Martin Snoke (ex officio), Nicholas Spadaccini, Gordon Swanson, Tom Turner, William Wright (ex officio).

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS: Thomas Boman, Leona Clasen, Leonid Hurwicz, Hugh Kabat, Bill Kennedy, William Robbins, Clare Woodward. New members: Mahmood Zaidi (Chairman), Robert Beck, Victoria Coifman, Henry Koffler (ex officio).

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE: Shirley Clark (ex officio), Grace Gray, Helen Jorstad, Michael Root, Thomas Straw. New members: Charles McLaughlin (Chairman) replaces Fred Morrison who is on leave, David Darby, John Overend.

UNIVERSITY APPEALS COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY: Benjamin Bayman (Chairman), James Connolly, Barry Feld, James Grant, Lancia Kaba. New members: Marcia Eaton, Jojoon Lee.

SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: Phyllis Freier (Chairman), Nancy Crewe, Harold Finestone, Madelon Gohlke, Paul Meehl, John O'Leary, Clarice Olien, Constance Sullivan. New members: Ellen Berscheid, Onwuchekwa Jemi, Benjamin Liu, Albert Tezla. (Two additional members to be appointed.)

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE: Charles Hancher (Chairman), Andrew Ahlgren, George Bauer, Ralph Hopp (ex officio), Samuel Kirkwood, Barbara McGinnis. New members: Frank Benson, Jean Gueriguian, Judith Overmeier, William Rosendahl, Walter Runge, Wesley Sundquist. (One additional member to be appointed.)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH: Paul Alkon, C. T. Johnson (ex officio), Stan Kegler (ex officio), W. B. Sundquist, Frank Ungar. New members: Sandra Scarr-Salapatek (Chairman), Reuben Hill, Keith Huston (ex officio), Warren Ibele (ex officio), Henry Koffler (ex officio), John Leppi, Bruce Overmeier, William Peria. (One additional member to be appointed.)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL CARE: Robert Touchberry (Chairman), Kenneth Jordan, Charles Liberty, Patrick Manning (ex officio), George Michaelson, J. Bruce Overmeier, Dale Sorenson. New members: Franklin Enfield, Edwin Haller, Frederick Shideman, E. John Staba.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING: Mary Dempsey (Chairman), Walter Bruning (ex officio), James Gremmels, Chet Grygar (ex officio), Stan Kegler (ex officio), Albert Linck (ex officio), Fred Lukermann, John Mauriel, Thomas Thielen. New members: Roger Benjamin, Leon Green, Robert Lambert. (One additional member to be appointed.)

II. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. Reported for Action (10 minutes)

Amend the By-Laws, Article I, Section 1 to add:

(26) Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service and

(27) Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station to the list of units in which qualified faculty and students shall vote to elect representatives and alternate representatives to the Senate.

2. Reported for Action (10 minutes)

The Constitution provides (Article III, Section 5) that a vice chairman shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one (1) year. He/she shall be eligible for reelection.

3. Annual Report

The University Committee on Business and Rules met once during the year. At other times business was conducted by mail. The amendment to the Constitution requiring removal of members for neglect of meetings was finally passed by the Senate. The relation of the Senate to the old Administrative Committee or the presently active Council of Academic Officers is currently being studied by the Committee on Business and Rules and the Committee on Committees. A change in voting units in the College of Agriculture was recommended to the Senate. The Constitution will be revised and reprinted during the summer.

4. Reported for Information

The following have been elected to the Senate Consultative Committee for a three-year term (1975-78): Kenneth Keller and Barbara Stuhler, Twin Cities; Laird Barber, Morris.

5. Reported for Information

The following have been elected to the Senate Committee on Committees for a three-year term (1975-78): Richard Skaggs and Clare Woodward, Twin Cities; Ted Underwood, Morris.

RUSSELL K. HOBBIE
Chairman

III. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Reported for Action (30 minutes)

Resolution on the Distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery on Research Grants and Contracts:

1. Preamble

The University of Minnesota, as all other Universities, incurs expenses in connection with the sponsored research conducted by faculty members and students. These expenses are recovered by the assessment of an indirect cost rate on research grants and contracts negotiated between the University and agencies that provide external funding. We recognize that the indirect cost rate is a negotiated agreement that largely reflects real costs to the University and that the funds so generated are not generally available for discretionary use within the University.

Funds generated by indirect cost assessment are required for support of the general University budget. Approximately 60 percent of the total indirect cost recovery (ICR), considered to be recurring, is so allocated. Other research-related costs to the University are covered by the remaining 40 percent of the total ICR, considered to be nonrecurring. The University must estimate the amount of ICR for each year and report its estimate to the Legislature, which takes account of these funds in planning its appropriations.

II. Purposes of the Proposal

We believe that the distribution of ICR funds within the University can be improved, however, to accomplish several goals:

- 1) The distribution should better reflect the actual costs to departments and collegiate units of doing research; for example, the administrative costs, especially secretarial and other assistance, are rarely covered adequately by the direct costs of grants or by other departmental funds.
- 2) The distribution should create a more effective incentive system for faculty research efforts by directly benefitting the departments and collegiate units involved. A distribution that reflects both the level of ongoing research activity and the acquisition of new research support would reward those units which already generate research support and provide an incentive for all departments to acquire new funds.
- 3) The distribution should reflect the inequities in funding opportunities available in various fields on inquiry. Departments with worthy research projects but in areas for which research funds are not readily available should share partially in ICR funds.
- 4) The distribution should provide "seed money" for the purchase of essential equipment, travel for potential investigators, pilot research, assistance in the preparation of proposals, and other investments in the early stages of research that often precede the generation of proposals for external support.

III. The Proposal

We propose that a portion of these ICR funds be redistributed to the departments and colleges that generate them and to the Graduate School research fund. These funds can be taken from two nonrecurring sources:

- 1) In recent University budgets approximately \$700,000 has been available for "unassigned research, equipment, and development." Of these funds, \$200,000 goes to the Graduate School Research fund, approximately \$250,000 to the colleges on the Twin Cities Campus and the coordinate campuses, and approximately \$200,000 to other uses. We propose that, unless emergency needs arise, the last amount be reallocated to the departments that have generated the ICR funds.
- 2) Because the University cannot predict exactly the amount of ICR funds, the budgeted figures have in the past been regularly exceeded by approximately \$400,000. These funds, we believe, should be primarily redistributed according to the ratio 2:1:1 to departments, colleges, and the Graduate School research fund.

The funds proposed for redistribution to departments should be allocated by a formula that reflects the proportion of the total ICR funds actually generated annually by each department. This will provide incentives for departments to increase the level of their research support.

The additional Graduate School research funds, which represent an increase of approximately 50 percent over current funding, should be distributed in accordance with the priorities established for the general research fund of the Graduate School.

While we recognize that the shifting financial situation at the University precludes a mandatory allotment of ICR funds in the amounts herein recommended, we endorse in principle this proposal and urge the administration to seek ways in which to increase the use of ICR funds for research-related purposes. We urge the colleges and departments to use these funds to stimulate research activity.

IV. An Example of the Effect of this Proposal

Suppose that \$200,000 were made available to departments from "unassigned research, etc." and \$400,000 to departments, colleges, and the Graduate School research fund from ICR funds above the budgeted amount. By the proposed formula, this latter \$400,000 would be distributed: \$200,000 to departments, \$100,000 to the colleges, and \$100,000 to the Graduate School. This would make a total of \$400,000 to departments. The funds to departments and colleges would be distributed according to the proportion of total ICR actually recovered. Thus, in 1974 the following distributions would have been made.

1. Graduate School \$100,000 (in addition to the budgeted \$200,000)

2. Colleges	Actual ICR	% of Total ICR	To the Colleges	To the Depts.
College of Liberal Arts	\$ 417,245	6.1%	\$ 6,100	\$ 24,400
Institute of Technology	1,706,984	25.0	25,000	100,000
Institute of Agriculture	158,361	2.3	2,300	9,200
Health Sciences	3,362,870	49.3	49,300	197,200
College of Biological Sciences	256,785	3.8	3,800	15,200
College of Veterinary Medicine	67,844	1.0	1,000	4,000
Law School	9,500	0.1	100	400
College of Education	407,826	6.0	6,000	24,000
Graduate School	249,977	3.7	3,700	14,800
College of Business Administration	22,806	0.3	300	1,200
Center for Urban & Regional Affairs	24,918	0.4	400	1,600
Office of International Programs	27,303	0.4	400	1,600
U of M-Duluth	98,577	1.4	1,400	5,600
U of M-Morris	8,260	0.1	100	400
U of M-Crookston	469	0.0	0	0
Total	\$6,827,446	100.0%	\$100,000	\$400,000

Source: Summary of Research, 1973-74, Business Office University of Minnesota

V. The Motion

We move the adoption of this resolution by the University Senate.

SANDRA SCARR-SALAPATEK,
Chairman

IV. REPORT BY THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Information and A Dialogue with the President (30 minutes)

DRAFT 2, MISSION AND POLICY STATEMENT

As described in the printed docket prepared for a meeting of the Senate on April 17, representatives of four Senate Committees, and members of the listening audience, engaged in a conversation with the President on May 1 about *Draft 2, Mission and Policy Statement*. What follows is a brief summary of salient points raised at that meeting. At today's Senate meeting (May 22), Senators are invited to talk with the President further, if they are so inclined, about *Draft 2, Mission Statement*.

1. Gratification was expressed by almost everyone present at the marked superiority of *Draft 2* over *Draft 1*.
2. The intended audience for *Mission 2*.
 - 1) Although the document must also achieve internal compatibility, the primary audience is probably external—regents, legislators, etc.—who, at a given moment in the affairs of the University, have an interest in particular problems and issues.
 - 2) Are the policies in *Draft 2*—addressing themselves, frequently, to contemporary problems—reversible; shouldn't the units involved discuss them? Answer: It is expected that policy statements will undergo continuous revision.
3. Statement of Mission.
 - 1) The document should emphasize strongly qualities such as uniqueness and excellence which a distinguished University requires in fulfilling its teaching and research missions.
 - 2) The mission statement should develop more richly the concept of a land-grant university, to include its interaction both with rural and urban society, national and international forums, etc.
 - 3) It should discuss the university as a community of scholars where teaching and research are interdependent and mutually nourishing (and avoid linking research with economic gain, as in II, paragraph 4).
 - 4) It should stress long-range planning and review.
4. Rhetorical suggestions: organization, arrangement, proportion, deletion, inclusion, etc.
 - 1) Vigorous advocates for a polished and *separate* mission statement proposed that the mission part of the document might even be stapled separately—depending, perhaps, upon the audience addressed.
 - 2) The Foreword (I) should remove section titles (A and B) and the entire Foreword entitled "Historical Perspective."
 - 3) The ordering of policies is sometimes dubious: perhaps in III, items 10 and 14, should be contiguous.
 - 4) In some instances, policies seem to be missions (III, 4., 9., 12., 15., 16.,) and vice versa (III, 7., 8.).
 - 5) Expand concept of land-grant university, (III, 15; see also 3., 2., above) by emphasizing it has a wider concern than with food, fiber, etc. Also merge III, 15. and 16.
 - 6) Include review of undergraduate as well as graduate programs (IV.A., last paragraph).
 - 7) Delete reference to the next biennium by deleting Paragraph 2, Part V.
 - 8) Section about Duluth (IV, B.1.) is too discursive (compare with length of section about Twin Cities, in IV, A.).
 - 9) There was some sentiment for omitting the Appendix (or physically separating it from the rest of the document). But it was also held that these are particular issues signaled for review and discussion, and that the role of Senate Committees in participating in such review will be explored. It was also pointed out that Appendix A, 4., Environmental Concerns, is of a more limited order than the first three; it might be well to replace A, 4. by an item entitled: *Relation of Research to Learning and/or Relation of Public Concerns to Academic Activities*.
 - 10) The document might profitably address itself further to topics such as these: educational benefits from campus life and campus activities, devotion to the principle of due process, the proper role of off-campus service, the role of counseling in the university, the multiple roles of the Graduate School, etc.
5. The overall style of the statement.

Pleas were voiced for a prose style which was ennobling, fluent, refulgent, even heightened, and that passages in that style appear early in the document. And it was suggested that the services of a specialist be secured to write at least the initial parts of the document.
6. Some examples of particular infelicities of style.
 - 1) Avoid use of "high quality" (see II., last paragraph), and "areas of student body" (III., 2); omit "basic" in "basic academic responsibility" (III.1).
 - 2) Delete reference to "low threshold of admission" (III., 5.) and talk instead about making the University available to citizens of the state who can progress in specified programs as far as their motivation, abilities, and performance permit.
 - 3) Despite efforts of participants, no ready substitutes were gleaned for phrases like "coordinate campus" or "adult learners."
 - 4) Define students as part of the university, not constituents of it (II, paragraph 1).
 - 5) The phrase "blend of manipulative and cognitive skills" (III, 15.) is not completely meaningful to some audiences.

LEON REISMAN,
Chairman

V. ANNUAL REPORT, SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for information

By the time the 1974-75 academic year concludes, the Senate Consultative Committee will have met 22 times, including 12 meetings with the President (sometimes with other central administrative officers present). Here are some areas of committee activity and examples of issues considered in each of those areas:

1. The steering role of the committee
 - 1) To inform one another of the focus and direction of their committees' work, and to assist the chairperson of Senate Consultative Committee in his task of steering senate business, the chairpersons of all Senate Committees and the chairpersons of the University Committees on Social

Policy and Business and Rules banded together early in winter, 1975, as a Subcommittee (of the Consultative Committee) to Facilitate Senate Business. During a series of meetings, this Subcommittee permitted chairpersons of key Senate committees to discuss implications for the Senate calendar and docket of such issues as University grading policies, grievance procedures, affirmative action, research questions, etc.; and it endorsed the policy—enormously helpful to the Senate Consultative Committee chairperson—of having committee chairpersons send to him the Minutes of their committees' meetings. The chairperson of Senate Consultative Committee here gratefully acknowledges the assistance he has received from this Subcommittee.

- 2) Liaison between the chairperson of Business and Rules, the chairperson of the Consultative Committee, and the Clerk of the Senate seemed exceptionally amiable this year as they established a Senate calendar, gathered material for Senate dockets, and set the order of Senate business.
 - 3) The Senate Consultative Committee considered matters of concern to students and then steered these questions to appropriate committees of university bodies. Some of the topics considered were definition of residential status, the Student Bill of Rights, registration privileges for student senators, relation of the Senate to the Presidential Task Force on Graduate Teaching Assistants, relation between Twin Cities Student Assembly and the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs, etc.
 - 4) The chairperson of Senate Consultative Committee and chairpersons of other key Senate committees have agreed to act as a steering group in inviting various Senate committees to compose reports for the University, anticipating the visit of the North Central Association Decennial Accreditation Review team to the University early in 1976.
2. The consulting and executive roles of the committee
- 1) The Senate Consultative Committee acted as the consulting arm of the Senate in interviewing top candidates for the offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School.
 - 2) The committee nominated members of the following groups: Task Force on Athletics, Regents ad hoc Presidential Selection Review Committee, the Committee for the Inauguration of the President, the Commencement Committee.
 - 3) The chairperson of Senate Consultative Committee consulted with the Academic Vice President about the possibility of publicizing and thus sharing with the University community various models of department procedures for determining faculty salaries.
 - 4) Conversations between the President and the Senate Consultative Committee during the year ranged over a wide spectrum of topics, from sensitive University situations (like the lettuce boycott) to legislative relations and academic salaries. With the cooperation of the President and other central administrative officers, the Senate Consultative Committee will shortly arrange a Presidential dialog with interested faculty to discuss an academic salary delivery system for 1975-76.
 - 5) With a civilized and unflagging good will on both sides, the President and the Senate Consultative Committee have been developing a consulting style that will permit all parties to perform intelligently, sensitively, and responsibly for the good of the University. The Committee commends the President most warmly for his sincerity in dealing with it and his devotion to the "shared-authority" model of faculty governance traditional at this University (see *Report*, March 15, 1975).
3. Intercampus activities of the committee
- 1) During a February 20, 1975, visit to the University of Minnesota at Morris, the Committee discussed a variety of subjects—perhaps most prominently the role of a liberal arts institution in higher education—with faculty, students, and administrators on that campus.
 - 2) On May 15 (before the deadline for printing this Senate docket) the Committee, together with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, visited the University of Minnesota at Duluth, to engage in a dialog with faculty, students, and administrators.
4. Legislation initiated by the committee
- Although it is authorized to do so, the Senate Consultative Committee does not as a rule initiate Senate legislation, delegating that task to appropriate Senate and University committees. But in two instances it seemed proper for the Committee to accept responsibility for developing studies or procedures for deliberation by the Senate or by Senate and University Committees:
- 1) The Senate Consultative Committee, together with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, proposed the creation of a Task Force on Academic Salaries. The *Report* of that Task Force appears elsewhere in this docket.
 - 2) A subcommittee of Senate Consultative Committee developed Proposed Guidelines for Search Committees for University Administrative Positions. These *Guidelines* are now being reviewed by various Senate and University committees and by other groups in the University.
5. Issues of concern to the University community
- The Senate Consultative Committee accepts the responsibility for concerning itself, on behalf of students and faculty, with issues which seem to involve important principles of faculty governance, and which, therefore, tend to raise anxiety within the University community. Such issues this year, for example, were the relation between the University and public radio, admissions policy of the Medical School, relation between the University and Universities in Chile, personnel questions surrounding the Mischa Penn case, etc. In almost all such instances, consideration of these issues belongs properly within the province of a Senate or University committee—and not with the Senate Consultative Committee—or with a collegiate faculty or administration. Nevertheless, the Senate Consultative Committee agrees to observe the progress of each such case and to encourage the appropriate responsible agency to move toward a reasonable resolution of the problem.
6. Committee budgetary responsibility
- 1) After working last year with the vice presidents on a 1975-77 budget, the SCC must now begin—very possibly through a new type of subcommittee structure—the task of helping to develop a 1977-79 budget.
 - 2) An SCC subcommittee is currently analyzing the budgetary structures used in our Senate budget, and is charged with making recommendations for a more rational and equitable plan for handling Senate finances.
7. Relations with the Regents
- For a somewhat protracted period this year, there was some uncertainty about which Regents would be leaving the Board, and, indeed, who the new Regents would be. During this period and the following weeks of orientation for incoming Regents, after they were selected, the President and the SCC agreed to defer to a more auspicious time a meeting of the Committee and the Board. Such a meeting is now being arranged: a two-hour luncheon on June 12, 1975. We hope that this will inaugurate a trend toward closer relations between the Regents and the SCC, as the consulting arm of the Senate.
8. Relations with the State Legislature
- 1) The chairman of the Board of Regents and Senator Coleman, Senate majority leader, have exchanged cordial letters about our legislation (still inoperative because of "cease-and-desist") on Faculty Consulting Policy.
 - 2) The entire question of faculty participation in the presentation of the University budget before State legislative committees, and a discussion

of the Legislature's response to the University budget figures, tuition freeze, staff salaries, etc. will take place at a "Legislative Post Mortem"—a dialog between the President, other central administrative officers, and interested faculty and students. The SCC will arrange such a meeting.

LEON REISMAN,
Chairman

VI. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES 1974-75

Reported for Information

The major activity of the committee, the nomination of faculty and student members for Senate and University Committees for 1975-76, has been carried out. Comparative statistics on the Committee's faculty nominations and subsequent appointments are shown below.

Senate and University Committees 1975-76 Faculty Nominations (N=130)					
	INSTR	ASST P	ASSOC P	PROF	TOTAL
FEMALE	2 (2)*	14 (10)	5 (4)	5 (4)	26 (20)
MALE		15 (12)	26 (20)	63 (48)	104 (80)
TOTAL	2 (2)	29 (22)	31 (24)	68 (52)	130 (100)

1975-76 Faculty Appointments (N=65)					
	INSTR	ASST P	ASSOC P	PROF	TOTAL
FEMALE	1 (2)	7 (11)	2 (3)	4 (6)	14 (22)
MALE		5 (8)	11 (17)	35 (53)	51 (78)
TOTAL	1 (2)	12 (19)	13 (20)	39 (59)	65 (100)

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEES

Because of the Committee's desire to find more effective ways of procuring student members, alternative procedures were sought. As a result, this year the work of the Twin Cities student members of the Committee on Committees was facilitated by the Student Committee on Committees of the Twin Cities Student Assembly. A student interest card was included with every registration permit given out for Winter Quarter 1975. Items on the survey included names of committees which are open to student membership. A computer printout provided about 1500 names of respondents. A letter was then sent by the Student Committee on Committees informing them of procedures for obtaining more information about membership on these committees. Daily ads and letters to all student organization presidents generated additional names of students interested in becoming involved. Applicants were interviewed by the Student Committee on Committees where they were given the opportunity to ask questions before they committed themselves.

This process generated names of many students who were becoming involved for the first time in University governance; at the same time there was a balance of students wishing to return to the committees on which they were presently serving. The interest engendered through this campus-wide campaign seems to be very much worth the time expended and the cost involved.

TASK FORCE

For the past three years, the Committee on Committees has been studying both the committee structure of the Senate and the operation of the committees. As a part of that effort we appointed in June 1974 a Task Force to direct its attention to problems of uncertainty of initiative and overlap of scope and function which earlier studies had revealed in three of the key Senate Committees: SCEP, SCRAP, and Consultative Committee. The Task Force, which met for a two-day retreat in Fall Quarter, 1974, recommended to the Consultative Committee the establishment of a steering subcommittee to coordinate Senate business. In Winter Quarter the Consultative Committee established the recommended subcommittee (Subcommittee to Facilitate the Coordination of Senate business), and the group has met several times in the interim. Early indications suggest that the subcommittee is serving well the purpose for which it was designed.

At the conclusion of the Fall Quarter retreat, the Task Force created a small subcommittee to pursue further discussion on, and make recommendations concerning, other large issues which the retreat deliberations had raised: (a) a re-writing of the Duties and Responsibilities of SCRAP and (b) the question of Senate input into legislative requests and budget review. The subcommittee has reported and a meeting of the Task Force is being planned to study their report. It is hoped that the Task Force can complete its business and deliver its final report to the Committee on Senate Committees early in Fall Quarter, 1975.

COMMITTEE HANDBOOK FOR CHAIRMEN

This past year the Committee has been working on the preparation of a handbook for committee chairmen which will include procedures for such things as replacing members on the committee and setting up subcommittees for special projects. The handbook will be completed during the coming year. Any suggestions that committee chairmen or committee members would like to make would be very welcome.

BETTY WALLACE ROBINETT,
Chairman

VII. REPORT OF THE ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE Reported for Information

The All-University Honors Committee met three times during the academic year 1974-75, on November 5, 1974, February 21, 1975 and May 16, 1975. Actions resulting from the fall and winter quarter meetings were as follows: One recommendation for an Alumni Service Award and 21 recommendations for Outstanding Achievement Awards. Also recommended were the following changes in building names or facilities: Minneapolis campus, Norris Gymnasium for Women to Norris Hall and Main Engineering to Lind Hall; St. Paul campus, Home Economics Complex to McNeal Hall and Home Economics Gallery to Goldstein Gallery; Duluth campus, Classroom-Laboratory Building to Marshall W. Alworth Hall, Science-Mathematics Building to Mathematics-Geology Building, Plant Services Building to Lund Building and Rockhill Arboretum to William R. Bagley Nature Area. All of the above committee recommendations have been acted upon favorably by the Board of Regents.

At its spring quarter meeting the committee considered four recommendations for Outstanding Achievement Awards, a recommendation for an Alumni Service Award and a recommendation for an Honorary Degree. Also on the agenda were several recommendations for building name changes. Action on these cases will be reported at a later date.

ALFRED O. C. NIER,
Chairman

*Numbers in parentheses indicate approximate percentages.

VIII. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Reported for Information

The committee has held a number of meetings during fall and winter quarters of the academic year 1974-75, and its discussions have concentrated on seeking to obtain an overall view of the University's role in extension and continuing education. The committee has not been concerned with detail but rather with trying to understand the philosophic approach of the University to its outreach activities. The committee in particular reviewed earlier work in the field, notably the Turnbull Report of 1964.

The committee is of the opinion that outreach activities of any major educational institution will increase rather than decline as we move into an age of life-long learning. There are changing patterns of post high school education; there are demands for new vocations or for updating existing educational background; there are the special interests of particular groups such as women to be considered. While the University has had historic concern with extension and continuing education, notably in areas such as agricultural extension and general extension, and while it has developed innovative extension efforts in medicine and municipal affairs, its response in recent years to current, more complicated, needs has been extremely uncertain.

The Turnbull Report of 1964 indicated a decade ago a lack of clearcut understanding by the University of its commitment to continuing education: the report suggested then that there would be increasing rather than declining demand for extension activities on the part of the University; it noted the wide variations in the methods of program initiation, formulation, and approval and the lack of an adequate financial base particularly for program development; in addition, there was little or no coordination or cooperation with other educational institutions in the state. The committee does not see any amelioration of these concerns since the Report.

In light of the problems which it has noted and the uncertainty of the University to date in picking up some of the dilemmas indicated by the Turnbull Report, this committee is unanimously of the opinion that the use of the committee structure of the University Senate would not be sufficient to formulate recommendations in the area of continuing education and life-long learning as suggested in the draft Mission Statement of March 7, 1975. The committee considers that the substantial research and exploration necessary for a major study will require more than the establishment of a University Senate committee and more than the establishment of any extensive special subcommittee framework.

This committee believes that a comprehensive study should be undertaken, authorized at the highest level by the Regents and the President of the University, involving a major institutional commitment and with clearly stated objectives aimed at informing the University and the community at large of the University's mission as it relates to outreach programs. The comprehensive study should be undertaken by a commission whose importance would be enhanced by wide-ranging membership—representatives from the Board of Regents, the State Legislature, the community at large, University central administration, University faculty. Above all, the committee believes that the work of this commission is of such significance that it should have a full-time professional research-oriented staff providing the groundwork for a carefully-drawn agenda and study program along the lines of national commission with funding from University or Foundation sources. There should be frequent committee meetings with a substantial schedule of public hearings with members of the University community and the community at large. The committee considers that the direction proposed in the Appendix of the Mission Statement of March 7, 1975, is essentially an in-reach proposal concerned very much with the identification of existing course offerings and enrollments, and far too little with the overall metropolitan and statewide outreach needs of the people of Minnesota. The committee is concerned that study of so significant an area should be left to the already over-burdened SCEP/SCRAP mechanism without the provision of special staff and funding resources.

Committee membership, 1974-75

Faculty and Administration

Roland Abraham	Forrest Harris	Fred Lukermann
Frank Benson	Arnold Henjum	Harold Miller
Shirley Clark	James Holte	John Moran
Kenneth Egertson	Sheila Koeppen	Arthur Naftalin,
Betty Girling	Joan Leigh	Chairman
		Anna Lee Stensland

Students

Robert Gensley	Kristin Olson
Stephanie Heid	Daniel Young

ARTHUR NAFTALIN,
Chairman

IX. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SUMMER SESSIONS

Reported for Information

In addition to such regular activities as the review of last year's summer sessions and the plans for next year's sessions, the Committee has been addressing a set of questions growing out of a discussion of legislative funding for Summer Session.

At the present time, Summer Session receives some financial support under a legislative special. The legislative request for 1975-77 contains a request for an increase in this funding. Two strategies for the future, and their implications, are being considered by the Committee.

One strategy involves an extension into the future of the present funding arrangements. Legislative funding would be sought for the purpose of supplementing an essentially self-supporting Summer Session. The legislative funds might be used to cover anticipated deficits in certain programs, to eliminate, over a period of some years, the salary maximums that are presently imposed on summer teaching, and/or to provide appropriate contributions to the University's retirement programs for staff involved in summer teaching.

The other strategy involves a closer link between the regular academic year budget and the summer session budget for each unit in the University contributing to the summer program. While tuition income would remain an important funding source also under this strategy, it is expected that a more substantial legislative appropriation would be required than under the former strategy. Any formula developed for the purpose of establishing summer budgets under this strategy would presumably take into account not only the size of the regular academic year budget of a unit but also its past, and anticipated, participation in the summer program (since this participation is, of course, not necessarily proportionate to the size of the regular academic year budget).

The question of financing has led to a consideration also of questions of programming. To what extent would central control over programming (by Summer Session) be retained under the two strategies, as opposed to programming by the individual units? To what extent should Summer Session strive to become a "fourth quarter," as opposed to a program directed towards special clientele?

The programmatic discussion has in turn raised the question of what clientele are now being served by the summer sessions, and what clientele should be served. The Committee has reviewed the results of a survey of summer clientele carried out at Duluth last year. Some consideration has been

given to similar surveys on other campuses but no decision has been made, since it is possible that such surveys may be carried out by one of the task forces envisioned in drafts of the University's mission statement.

A position paper on these questions is under preparation.

NILS HASSELMO,
Chairman

X. COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

Report of Activities, 1974-75

Reported for Information

The All-University Council on Liberal Education is charged with the responsibility for the formulation of policy subject to Senate ratification, establishing "floor" requirements in liberal studies for all baccalaureate University curricula. Additionally, it strives to determine the effects of the policy in order to recommend to the Senate such changes in the policy as seem appropriate. Further, the Council initiates other actions intended to improve the quality of undergraduate education at the University.

CLE members held nine regular meetings this academic year to carry forward the roles and discharge the functions implicit in the Council's charge. In general, the major activities which required the attention of the Council during 1974-75 are summarized as follows:

1. The Small Grants Program, initiated by CLE in 1967, continues its efforts to provide a rapid response with financial and organizational support to ideas of individual faculty, faculty groups, and faculty-student groups for improving the quality of undergraduate education. In the Fall, 1974 round of applications, forty-four proposals were received, of which seventeen were funded, with average grant support of \$1,027. The Spring, 1975 solicitation of proposals is currently underway, with commitment of funding expected to reach the level of approximately \$60,000 for work to be done after July 1, 1975. We anticipate that legislative funding will permit another \$20,000 to meet developmental needs as they arise during the 1975-76 academic year. Approximately fifty such projects are supported annually. A subcommittee of the Council evaluates proposals while the Center for Educational Development provides staff support and other services for the direct administration of the program.

2. The study of distribution requirements at the University, which CLE had contracted with the Measurement Services Center, was completed early in the Fall Quarter. The purpose of the study was to determine the extent and variability of implementation of the floor requirements in four categories of knowledge in collegiate units with baccalaureate programs. A pilot study and, subsequently, a more comprehensive study of student behavior and attitudes vis a vis the distribution requirements was undertaken. The methodology of the main aspect of the study involved analysis of the transcripts of a random sample of University graduates in nineteen units: colleges, schools, campuses and programs. Although findings were multiple, since a pattern of student behavior could be drawn from data on each unit's sample, one of the most important findings was that some forty-one courses which were selected most frequently by students to fulfill distribution requirements, were identified from the wide range of available offerings in the University.

Complete sets of analyses were distributed to all the units which had participated in the study. Additionally, CLE invited curriculum, instruction and educational policy committee representatives from the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Institute of Technology to meet with the Council to discuss selected aspects of the distribution study: unmet collegiate minimums in distribution requirements category areas, the student clientele in the forty-one high enrollment liberal education courses, the known problems of students in achieving the basis for a liberal education, and the consideration of liberal education concerns in the context of curriculum planning.

3. After lengthy deliberation on the Report of the HECC Statewide Transfer Study Committee (which reported in August, 1974), the Council communicated its special concerns to President Magrath who serves on the Advisory Council of the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission. CLE members were particularly interested in reaffirming the provision of collegiate control over implementation of the various liberal education policy statements proposed by CLE and SCEP and approved by the Senate. CLE advised against blanket acceptance of the HECC Transfer Study recommendation stating "Receiving institutions should be encouraged to accept an Associate in Arts degree as equivalent to their own liberal or general education requirements." There is a great deal of diversity between CLE liberal education requirements as implemented by the various colleges within the University and the various Associate of Arts degrees conferred by the many junior and community colleges in the state. The position taken by CLE was subsequently supported by actions of the Assembly Committee on Academic Standing.

4. For the tenth consecutive year, the Horace T. Morse-AMOCO Foundation Awards for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education will honor faculty members who have been nominated by collegiate faculty-student groups, and selected in an all-University competition by an anonymous committee. This program, for which CLE is responsible, provides awards of \$500 to each of eight faculty members who are selected to receive this tangible recognition of their strong and effective commitment to undergraduate education. With the intent of making the criteria for selection more explicit as a guide to College Nominating Committees and the review committee, specific criteria pertaining to teaching activities, developmental activities, organizational functioning which contributes to the improvement of the undergraduate experience, and an open criterion relating to advising, and exemplary professional practice, were developed and appropriate documentation was suggested. In the Fall of 1974, the Council undertook an exploratory project which involves the interviewing of Horace T. Morse Awardees with the goal of producing a film or videotape which will relate demonstration with explanation and philosophy. This project continues as an activity which, hopefully, will be a resource in the preparation of more effective teachers.

To summarize, 1974-75 has been a year for continued appraisal of the implementation and effects of the liberal education policies on which the Senate has taken action in recent years. The Council continues to be concerned with the provision of genuine liberal education in the University and the nature and quality of opportunities for students in its several areas of study. CLE has also discharged its annual responsibilities in administering the Small Grants Program and the Horace T. Morse-AMOCO Foundation Awards Program for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education.

SHIRLEY M. CLARK,
Chairperson

XI. ANNUAL REPORT UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND MEDIA

Reported for Information

The University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media is charged with the responsibility for formulating plans and policies governing the coordinated development and use of educational equipment, materials, and media. The following paragraphs outline the Committee's response to this charge during the 1974-75 academic year.

The Committee's continuing concern for expansion of the University's FM radio broadcasting activities led to its involvement in the University—Minnesota Public Radio issue. Members participated in a joint meeting with SCEP, the University Committee on All-University Extension and Community Programs, and University administrators to explore the matter. As a result of the joint meeting the Committee has formulated a position statement to be transmitted to SCEP and to the special University task force established by SCEP to review the proposed merger of KUOM with Minnesota Public Radio. A member of the Materials and Media Committee will serve on the special task force.

A resolution from the Committee urging the University to become involved in research and development activities in cable television was approved by SCEP for transmission to the University Senate at the regular spring quarter meeting. The intent of the resolution is to encourage the University to begin planning for appropriate involvement in the delivery of educational programming by cable television and to confront the technological, legal, and educational problems which have impeded progress in utilizing this promising instructional delivery system.

The Committee is also charged with the responsibility for developing policies regarding the suitability of instructional facilities. At the request of a faculty member the Committee sent a letter to central administrators calling attention to the many sources of noise pollution on the Twin Cities Campus and pointing out its detrimental effects on the teaching environment. Administrators were urged to explore ways in which this problem might be alleviated.

The relationship between the educational resource centers on the various campuses was discussed in the Committee. The place of the resource units within the administrative structure was also reviewed with a view toward making these services available to all members of the University community in spite of different administrative and funding patterns.

The Committee also defined a number of issues related to the efficient delivery of media services and hopes to pursue some of these matters at a later time. A proposal to move in the direction of central support of all media equipment and services (as opposed to a fee-for-service arrangement) received a good deal of acceptance within the Committee. The accomplishment of this goal was set as a long range objective for the Committee.

Media resources and production units were encouraged by the Committee to hold open houses and programs to inform the University community of the diversity of services now available. The several such events which were held during the past year appeared to generate considerable interest and to promote increased use of mediated instruction.

All faculty members are urged to consult the publication *Instructional Resources* distributed by the Center for Educational Development in order to learn of the full range of services offered by the University in support of the instructional program. The Committee feels that these resources are not only abundant but are easily available, and all faculty are invited to explore the possibility of their wider use. Suggestions for expanding or improving the services are welcomed by the Committee.

EUGENE WRIGHT,
Chairman

XII. ANNUAL REPORT UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

Reported for Information

The University Committee on Social Policy has met five times during 1974-75 and a sixth meeting is scheduled.

The committee keeps current regarding the employment and educational status of women and minorities in the University community through Lillian Williams, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and her staff. Ms. Williams is an ex officio member of the committee, greatly facilitating the communication process. Our concern with the relatively slow progress of the University toward meeting its affirmative action goals as revealed by the annual reports of recent years stimulated committee efforts to define the role the committee should play in supporting the Regents' policy. This topic has been one of those discussed in meetings with President Magrath, Vice President for Student Affairs Wilderson, Samuel Lewis, Director of the Student Financial Aids Office, and others.

After several years of work by many persons, students, faculty, and civil service, the Guidelines on Equal Opportunity for Students were presented to the Central Officers Group and the Regents' Committee on Student Affairs in April 1975 as a clarification of existing policy.

The Committee on Social Responsibility in University Investments, an outgrowth of concerns of central administration officers, members of the Social Policy Committee, and others in the University community was established during the summer of 1974. The members of this committee are undertaking the complex task of educating themselves about the University's investment pattern so as to provide faculty, student, and civil service input as appropriate. It has only begun its work. In the future, it will wish to report to the Senate on its activities.

FRANK H. WOOD,
Chairman

XIII. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING AND RELATIONS

Reported for Information

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee met four times to consider issues relating to transfer students, accreditation practices, and the award of credit for military service experiences.

The recommendations of the HECC transfer student study were reviewed. In general, larger numbers of transfer students are now more successful after transfer than they were five years ago. Problems relating to financial aid, clear appeal routes, and improved communications were identified, and appropriate actions were recommended to administrative units.

The decision of the University to withdraw from accreditation of private high schools was reviewed, and no change was recommended. Procedural changes in accepting credit from schools accredited by the American Association of Bible Colleges were approved.

Progress in awarding credit for military experiences is presented in a separate information item for Senate review.

JAMES B. PREUS,
Chairman

XIV. SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING

Reported for Information

The major effort of the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning during the current academic year has been to respond to Draft No. 1 and No. 2 of President Magrath's Mission and Policy Statement. The Committee on Resources and Planning over the past years has frequently urged that a Mission Statement be developed, i.e. a long-lasting "Cornerstone Document" which

would be the basis for future University planning. Our two written responses to Draft No. 1 and No. 2 were a consensus of the comments and suggestions of the full Committee on Resources and Planning. Representatives of the Committee on Resources and Planning—along with representatives of other Senate Committees—also met personally with President Magrath to discuss Draft No. 2 of the Mission and Policy Statement. It appears that a final version of the Mission and Policy Statement will soon be available.

An additional project of the Committee on Resources and Planning has been to interact with the Academic Planning and Policy Group (APPG). In particular, we reviewed the planning documents and review guidelines recently prepared by APPG. Currently, we are collaborating with other Senate Committees in soliciting faculty input for the 1976 decennial accreditation review of the Twin Cities Campus by the North Central Association of Colleges.

MARY E. DEMPSEY,
Chairwoman

XV. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE 1974-75

Reported for Information

This reports on Judicial Committee developments since the report of May 10, 1974.

TENURE CASES

As is generally known, the Judicial Committee operates under the Tenure Code subject to a rule that prohibits disclosure of information about individual cases filed by faculty. The following reports, therefore, will necessarily omit identifying detail, hopefully not at the expense of intelligibility.

During the May 1974-May 1975 period, the Committee had under consideration seven appeals by faculty involving tenure denials or notices of termination of a tenured faculty. Five of those cases had been filed prior to the May 1974 report. (Three faculty grievance cases, which will be separately discussed, were active during the year, two of which had been filed before the annual report of 1973-1974.)

Case 1. A tenured faculty member was notified by President Moos in the Spring of 1974 that his appointment would be terminated for cause. A panel of the Judicial Committee was appointed and hearings were held in the summer and into October 1974. The case was then submitted. To date the panel has not reported findings and conclusions.

Case 2. A faculty member on a probationary appointment was denied tenure and given a terminal appointment. His appeal was assigned to a panel and hearings were held in December and March of the current academic year. The proposed findings of the panel were held in abeyance during a period of negotiations between the faculty member and the University. The negotiations resulted in a settlement of most of the matter before the panel. A remaining issue will be the subject of a hearing early in May. By agreement of the parties, the decision of the panel on this remaining issue will be submitted to the President in a sealed envelope, to be opened only in the event that the faculty member is not granted tenure in his new position.

Case 3. A probationary faculty member was denied tenure and given a terminal appointment for 1974-1975. After an appeal was filed, the faculty member resigned from the University and the appeal was withdrawn.

Case 4. A probationary faculty member was denied tenure and given a terminal appointment. A panel was appointed and held a hearing in November, 1974. The panel found that asserted procedural irregularities had either had not occurred or had not substantially affected the tenure decision process and that the decision to deny tenure had a basis in fact. The recommendation of the panel not to disturb the termination was accepted by President Magrath.

Case 5. A probationary faculty member was denied tenure and given a terminal appointment. Prior to a hearing before the panel, another department of the University gave the faculty member a probationary appointment for 1975-1976 and the appeal was dismissed.

Case 6. A probationary faculty member was denied tenure in the Spring of 1974 and given a terminal appointment. In the Fall of 1974 the faculty group considered a one-year additional appointment, which was denied. An appeal was filed from this decision. The matter has been assigned to a panel and hearings are scheduled.

Case 7. A case has recently been filed challenging a denial of tenure and terminal notice that was given in the Spring of 1975. A panel has not yet been appointed; hearings will likely not be held until the 1975-1976 academic year.

In overview, the Judicial Committee seems to have adapted rather well to the three-member panel system of deciding cases. The caseload remains quite substantial, although the indications to date are that there might be fewer active cases during the coming academic year. The holding of periodic full-membership meetings—more frequently, I would advise my successor, than I scheduled them—serves to give continuity and a broader view to the work of panels. Three aspects of the process bear special mention.

First, an area of strain has been the rule of confidentiality under which the Committee and its panels operate. Particularly in the faculty cases that are given extensive press coverage, the inability of the parties or the Judicial Committee to clarify a situation often perpetuates a false public impression about the matter being considered. On the whole, however, I personally am in favor of retaining the rule in the Tenure Code that requires that Judicial Committee consideration of individual cases not be publicized or commented upon publicly. Given the presence of both parties represented by counsel and the zealous and helpful attention of faculty organization representatives, I doubt whether additional publicity would achieve a more objective and rational decisional process. On the other hand, a public proceeding would likely discourage potential witnesses from coming forward to testify. The only alternatives are to hold hearings without necessary witnesses or to request the conferral of subpoena powers on the Judicial Committee. The absence of witnesses would hardly be supportable. The conferral of subpoena power I would personally oppose as being fraught with potential for abuse by misguided Judicial Committee panels.

Second, for years there has been controversy and confusion about the extent to which the contents of a faculty member's file should be available to the faculty member when a dismissal appeal is filed with the Judicial Committee. The controversy has been most acute with regard to letters of recommendation that were solicited by the department with assurances to references that replies would be kept confidential. These replies are, of course, employed in the evaluation process within the department and college. It should be publicized that as a policy matter, decisions of the Judicial Committee have reached the point where the entire contents of faculty files will probably in future cases almost routinely be required to be made available to the petitioning faculty member to assist in the preparation of the case. In no other way can the Judicial Committee panel assure itself or the petitioning faculty member that all relevant material is before the panel. To some extent, this might be considered to violate the terms under which letters of reference are solicited. In order to prevent such problems as this might create from arising in the future, I will recommend to the Judicial Committee at its next membership meeting that it pass a resolution urging the Tenure Committee or the Faculty Affairs Committee, whichever is appropriate, to consider the wider circulation or change of such a policy.

FACULTY GRIEVANCE CASES

The "cease and desist" order of the State Mediation Service prohibits the Board of Regents from considering the proposed revisions to the Tenure Code that the Faculty Senate adopted last year. Thus, the faculty employment grievance procedures and standards that were adopted by the Faculty Senate have not become operative. Established practice, however, had provided ample precedent for the submission of faculty employment grievances to collegiate or other appropriate grievance committees, ordinarily on an ad hoc basis with the rules of procedure being worked out for the individual case. The Judicial Committee reviews the adequacy and fairness of the procedures and assures that any findings and conclusions of the grievance body, and the action of the administrative official in response to the recommendation of the grievance committee, are supported by evidence in the record.

A continuing source of pervasive confusion among faculty concerns the line dividing the jurisdictions of the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility together with the grievance committees that have been established under its aegis and the jurisdiction of the faculty committees whose findings, just mentioned, are reviewable by the Judicial Committee. The matter was attempted to be clarified, with the full agreement of the chairmen of the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Judicial committees by a revision of the Report of the Academic Freedom Committee that was adopted by the University Senate on April 18, 1974. (See the last paragraph of item II(D) in the Report of the Academic Freedom Committee in the Minutes at page 125; see also the Abstract of Discussion of that meeting at page 135.)

Unfortunately, some faculty with Tenure Code grievances (and even some faculty with tenure denial complaints and the like) have attempted to invoke the machinery of the Academic Freedom system, with consequent loss of time and confusion. It would be highly desirable if some way were found to make more widely known which are the appropriate bodies to entertain the various kinds of faculty grievances—employment-related or otherwise—that might arise.

Three active grievance cases were formally dealt with by the Judicial Committee during the current academic year. One was abandoned by the faculty member. Another, involving a salary grievance, was heard last academic year for the first time by a panel of the Judicial Committee. The recommendation to the President was that the academic unit involved afford a new hearing to the faculty member because of serious procedural defects in an earlier hearing in the academic unit. The recommendation was accepted by the then Acting President Ziebarth last summer. Since that time there has been a great deal of pulling and shoving about the procedures that should be followed. The matter has finally been submitted to a hearing committee in the academic unit. It is doubtful that the report of that committee will be available before the summer. In the third case, involving a grievance about non-promotion, a panel of the Judicial Committee has been appointed and is actively conducting proceedings in the case.

My personal impression, from these cases and from a number of others with which I have only had informal contact, is that the present system of faculty employment grievances is not working well in all academic units. The problems are many. There are no standardized procedures (and the University and the Faculty Senate cannot adopt any, it is thought, because of the cease and desist order). Some administrators openly express resentment at the notion of hearings on faculty grievances. Some administrators in my admittedly limited experience, need further encouragement to cooperate, as has traditionally been done, in the process of resolving serious faculty grievances concerning the terms and conditions of employment. Administrators complain that attending to formal faculty grievances, which often are presented rather formally and through attorneys, is extremely burdensome and time-consuming. There is perhaps a need here to consider the provision of additional administrative assistance to affected academic units.

CHARLES W. WOLFRAM,
Chairman

XVI. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TENURE COMMITTEE**Reported for Information**

The University Committee on Tenure held six meetings during this academic year and has scheduled another. In the fall we briefed President Magrath and other new administrators on present tenure policies at this University. We responded on the floor of the Senate to the tenure implications of the reports of the committees on faculty consulting.

We have issued two opinion letters interpreting and clarifying the present Tenure Regulations. One letter attempts to clarify the proper use of non-regular appointments (also known as "T" appointments) and the rights of faculty members holding them. The other deals with the rights of faculty members who are affected by a reorganization of departmental structure.

The "cease and desist order" issued in connection with the several collective bargaining petitions has precluded any further action with regard to implementation of the new Tenure Code which was passed by the Faculty Senate in May 1973. When this order is dissolved, we will resume activity in this regard.

FRED J. MORRISON,
Chairman

XVII. REPORT BY THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**Reported for Information**

Senate legislation (see Excerpt, printed below, from the February 28, 1974, Minutes of the University Senate) created a Task Force on Academic Salaries and requested that Task Force to present its final report to the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and to the University Senate. The Task Force Report has now been delivered to the two Senate Committees named, and this printing of the document fulfills the requirement that the Task Force report to the Senate.

The letter of transmittal, dated April 14, 1975 (also printed below), from the Task Force on Academic Salaries to the Senate Consultative Committee and to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs explains why 1) the Report was not released to the two Senate Committees and to the Senate by September 30, 1975, as the enabling Senate legislation instructed [see D (3) of Excerpt from Senate Minutes, below]; and why 2) the Consultative Committee could not be guided by this Report, as the enabling Senate legislation instructed [see D (4) of Excerpt from Senate Minutes, below], in its advice to the administration on the 1975-77 budget.

LEON REISMAN,
Chairman, Senate Consultative Committee
MAHMOOD ZAIDI,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

EXCERPT FROM THE FEBRUARY 28, 1974, MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE**Proposal to Create a Task Force on Academic Salaries**

A. There shall be established a task force on academic salaries responsible to the Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the University Senate.

B. Charge To Task Force: to develop general principles and guidelines appropriate to establish and maintain an equitable system of academic salaries within a university.

C. Selection of Task Force Membership: The Consultative Committee, after wide consultation, will select the members of the task force upon the basis of their expertise and experience.

D. Task Force Procedures:

(1) to solicit from faculty, students, alumni, emeriti, department heads, deans, and others throughout the University who desire to write to, or converse with, or testify before the task force—statements, opinions, recommendations, or narratives which would in any way assist the task force in fulfilling its charge.

(2) to ascertain the general principles and guidelines employed by comparable institutions in establishing academic salaries.

(3) to begin its task immediately, continue its work through spring and summer 1974, and present its final report and recommendations, in writing, to the Consultative Committee, the Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the University Senate by September 30, 1974.

(4) the Consultative Committee shall be guided by this report in its advice to the administration on the 1975-77 budget.

SAMUEL KRISLOV,
Chairman

A suggestion to make the task force responsible also to the Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Senate was accepted by consent of the committee chairman.

A suggestion to strike "temperament" from section C was accepted by consent of the committee chairman.

A motion to insert "The membership shall include but not be limited to members of the faculty, administration, or student body" in section C was defeated.

The report was approved as amended.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL FROM THE TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC SALARIES

TO: Leon Reisman, Chairman
Senate Consultative Committee
Mahmood Zaidi, Chairman
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

April 14, 1975

I am forwarding copies of the final report of the Task Force on Academic Salaries. The report, completed late in fall quarter, has not been released until now in an effort to avoid possible misunderstanding which could have resulted from premature interpretation of the several recommendations. During the Task Force deliberations, several members expressed concern that persons unfamiliar with University procedures might believe that the recommendations are a statement of policy when in fact, the recommendations are only a committee report for discussion by the University faculty through the Senate structure. Committee members also felt very strongly that the guidelines to colleges and departments for distributing 1975-76 salary adjustment must be consistent with the procedures used by the 1975-76 salary adjustment request. These considerations indicated that an earlier presentation of the report might obfuscate the intent of the Task Force.

In early March, President Magrath presented the first draft of the salary adjustment distribution plan to the University community for reaction. More recently, colleges have been encouraged to develop and present salary equity requests. Now that the various campus groups are actively discussing the distribution plan for 1975-76, it seems appropriate for the Consultative Committee and Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to begin discussing the Task Force recommendations.

In reading the Report, individuals should be aware of certain implicit principles and procedures used in formulating the Task Force recommendations. Each member participated in both the drafting and editing of each and every recommendation. While a more uniform style would have resulted if only one or two members did the writing, the chairperson wanted the report to reflect the feelings of all members. Also, rather than allowing the option of developing separate majority and minority reports, the members tried to draft one set of recommendations acceptable to all members of the committee. It took, in fact, seven major drafts before this principle became a reality. In accomplishing this goal, each member compromised on some issues which he/she felt were important. But each member also felt that the final set of recommendations would not necessarily work to the disadvantage of any unit or division within the University.

Committee members also tried to balance their personal interest (as faculty members) in a salary plan with their responsibility as citizens to provide a quality university at a reasonable cost. It would have been easy to recommend a set of salary principles that would provide maximum salary benefits to all University faculty members with the same number of years of service to the University. Instead, the Task Force tried to derive a set of salary principles that would allow the University to become one of the best educational centers in the world, and yet remain an institution that the students could afford to attend and that the citizens of the state would be willing (able) to support. While some faculty will not be happy with the Task Force decision to consider cost to students and the state as a relevant criterion in developing salary principles, Task Force members felt that a set of principles which reflect the interest of taxpayers would be better accepted and funded by citizens of the state than a set of principles which were developed without regard to cost.

Early in the Task Force deliberations, committee members expressed concern over the lack of faculty involvement in developing salary requests. Historically, University faculty members have been involved in developing requests and setting priorities for promotion, new positions, and improved physical facilities. However, until recently the task of developing a salary request procedure has been left almost entirely to Central Administration. In developing this set of recommendations, Task Force members deliberately proposed that faculty members become involved in the request development process as well as the final salary delivery process.

By the end of their discussion, committee members agreed that decisions to readjust the salary of an individual faculty member are best made by the individual's colleagues within the department operating under general guidelines rather than by a more remote administrative officer following a set of fixed rules. Undoubtedly, University departments with diverse needs will choose different plans for distributing salary increases or adjustments among their members. Thus, the Task Force felt that departments should remain free to work out the details of salary distribution procedures with deans and University administration. This procedure necessarily assumes that departments will employ a method for distributing salary increases or adjustments that will be consistent with their salary request procedures. Due in part to these considerations, the final Task Force report contains no recommendations concerning distribution of salary adjustment monies.

The Task Force reached its decision to omit a salary distribution recommendation from the report only after investigating and discussing salary plans based on a step system. During their survey of salary plans utilized by other colleges and universities, the Task Force noted that all of the institutions employing a step system also included in their salary plan, procedures which allow administrative modification based on marketplace considerations. Usually, deans, vice-presidents, and presidents are allowed to hire an individual faculty member at a competitive level, not necessarily at the first step. In order to retain faculty, administrative officers are also allowed to advance individuals more than one step in a year or to consider additional experience for an advancement in level or category. These findings further convinced Task Force members that individual departments should be allowed great latitude in administering salary distribution plans.

Readers should also be aware that cost of living was the most difficult issue for Task Force members to resolve and include in the recommendations in an acceptable way. The attitude of Task Force members toward cost of living contracts ranged from complete support to complete rejection. It was probably true that most faculty members who testified before the Task Force asked that cost of living be included in the recommendations as a major, if not the primary, salary increase principle. Earlier drafts of the recommendations included more explicit statements on the importance of the cost of living as a salary principle. Other drafts failed to mention cost of living at all. The final set of recommendations does not mention cost of living directly, but changes in cost of living are reflected in both recommendation one and recommendation two.

Finally, the Task Force members had to decide which of two plans should be recommended to the University of Minnesota.

1. Should the University Administration set a percent salary adjustment figure that would be uniformly applied across colleges except as individual departments and colleges could make extraordinary requests for an additional allotment; or
2. Should individual departments determine as nearly as possible what their salary needs will be in order to maintain their quality after which the central administration would collate and adjust each request into the total University salary request?

It will be obvious to the reader that the Task Force chose the second alternative. But in choosing that basic alternative, the Task Force tried to provide protection for departments that might be harshly penalized by a market oriented salary plan.

I and members of the Task Force will be happy to meet with either or both committees to discuss the report.

David L. Giese, Chairperson
Virginia Gray
John H. Kareken
Robert F. Lambert
Ronald L. Phillips
Frederick E. Shideman
Barbara J. Stuhler
Larry C. Thompson

**REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC SALARIES,
March 31, 1975**

As the University Senate Consultative Committee responded to its charge to assist central administrative officers in developing guidelines for preparing the 1974-75 budget, the need for an intensive study of the academic salary system became apparent. In recent years faculty morale has been adversely affected by so-called merit increases which have been far below increases in the cost of living. Recent decisions concerning equalization requests submitted by various groups have been questioned by some members of the faculty. Other faculty members asserted that legislative intent was being subverted by the Regents in distributing merit salary money which the faculty thought had been appropriated for across-the-board increases. As an outgrowth of these concerns, the Consultative Committee recommended formation of a Task Force on Academic Salaries. The Task Force was asked to

...develop general principles and guidelines appropriate to establish and maintain an equitable system of academic salaries within a university.

Through the spring and summer of 1974, the Task Force worked at its assignment, holding open hearings, interviewing faculty members and University officials, and discussing issues. This report constitutes the Task Force's analysis of the salary structure issue and its recommendations. Not every Task Force member agrees with everything that is said in this report; nor do all members support each recommendation. But all members share the hope that the report, and the several recommendations contained in it, will provide the Senate with a basis for constructive discussion of the issue of academic salaries.

The Task Force's recommended budget procedure was not used in determining the salary request for the 1975-77 biennium. Nevertheless, the Task Force supports and endorses the administration's decision to emphasize salary increases needed to cover past and prospective increases in the cost of living. With the serious inflation that has been experienced, it is reasonable to argue that salaries at other universities and in industry have increased sharply or will soon and that therefore, to maintain their quality, all departments of the University need large salary budget increases.

The Task Force recommendations below are explained in detail in the next section of the report. Several appendices dealing with related issues, responding to faculty suggestions, analyzing the present system, reviewing the Task Force activity, and listing material requested by and submitted to the Task Force complete the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The head of each University department, in consultation with the department faculty, shall prepare an efficient* planning budget based on marketplace principles by

- a. identifying a peer group;
- b. surveying the peer group to determine its reward system;
- c. determining the minimum budgetary requirements necessary to maintain a reward system comparable to that of the peer groups.

2. The department head, the dean of the college, and the appropriate vice president shall examine the efficient budget to determine whether the proposed department budget based on the peer group reward system is appropriate for the department. The department head, dean and vice president may adjust the efficient budget to obtain a more equitable budget.

*Not every collegiate unit throughout the University system is made up of departments. In this report, "units" and "departments" are used interchangeably to describe groups of individual faculty members with a common subject matter, discipline or assigned task.

**Any reasonable faculty salary schedule must strike a balance between the salary needs perceived by faculty members and the University's responsibility to the state to achieve maximum benefit from student tuition and legislative appropriation. The Task Force used the term "efficient budget" to refer to a budget that maintained this balance.

3. The President, through the appropriate vice president and dean, should provide a reasonable salary increase for each faculty member promoted to a higher rank by estimating the amount of money necessary for the promotion fund and integrating this amount as part of the legislative salary request.

4. The appropriate vice presidents and the deans should maintain a small contingency fund to assist departments in meeting unanticipated salary demands arising from retention cases.

5. Decisions concerning salary increases for individual faculty members should continue to be made primarily at the departmental level. Department heads and department faculty should consult to determine expectations of performance and rewards for performance.

6. To the extent that proportional allocation is consistent with legislative intent, the President and vice presidents should allocate actual salary monies to collegiate units according to each unit's proportion of the total budget request.

In order to implement the above recommendations it is essential that the President and the appropriate vice presidents use the information provided by the departments and colleges when formulating the legislative salary request and allocating the appropriations.

EXPLANATION

Traditionally the mission of the University faculty has been described as teaching, research, and service. As this report is being prepared, a combined faculty-administration-Regents group is preparing a new mission statement for the University. Each college has a stated mission in its constitution and every department or comparable unit has a mission explicitly or implicitly defined. These missions will, of course, vary. For some units, teaching may be of the highest priority; for others the highest priority will be research and for still others; service will be the primary mission. Similarly, individual faculty missions will differ, reflecting unit missions and accommodating individual talents and interests.

While the ultimate responsibility for approving the educational role or mission of the University lies with the legislative representatives of the citizens of the state, the Regents have a constitutional obligation to relay to the legislature a statement of what they regard as the proper mission of the University and its constituent units. In their presentations to the legislature, the Regents emphasize the mission that in their collective judgment is best for the University as a whole, yet in the give and take of the democratic process, alternative roles are advanced and examined by both parties.

Through shared responsibility, the Regents and the legislature shape the University mission by their response to central questions. What types of teaching programs are to be offered at the University? For how many students? What will be the quality of each of the programs? How much research will be done at the University? In what subject matters? What will be the quality of each of the research programs? What type of outreach programs are to be available to the people of the state? How extensive should they be? What will be the quality of these outreach programs? Answers to these questions decide the mission; appropriations by the legislature affect the quality of that mission. It was with these questions in mind that the Task Force addressed the issue of how legislative salary appropriations should be allocated to the various units and to individual faculty members.

Testimony taken by the Task Force during open hearings centered primarily on faculty concerns about increases in the cost of living, the management of the "equity" fund, the proportionate allocation of funds to collegiate units, and the necessity for improved methods for explaining individual merit decisions. The Task Force heard that "merit" adjustments were meaningless when the monies available for salaries were not sufficient to provide each faculty member with a salary adjustment commensurate with the cost of living increases. Testimony revealed that some faculty members feel that all major units of the University should have approximately equal mean salaries by rank while other faculty members allowed for different beginning salaries but asked that dollar value increases be similar among faculty of equal rank. Almost every faculty member suggested that his unit was being disadvantaged by the present system of salary improvement allocation and pointed to the consequent deterioration in faculty morale.

After listening to the faculty at the open hearings and discussing the present system of salary adjustment with various central officers and deans, the Task Force concluded that the present system of salary adjustment needs revision. The following recommendations reflect the Task Force's effort to be responsive to the concerns of the faculty and to be realistic in light of competing demands on the resources of the state.

1. The head of each University department in consultation with the department faculty shall prepare an efficient planning budget based on marketplace principles by

- a. identifying a peer group;

As a public institution the University of Minnesota has an obligation to act in the public interest by submitting to the legislature an efficient budget, a budget which makes it possible for the University to achieve its mission at the least cost to the taxpayers. A budget built on a market-determined faculty salary structure will provide the optimal low cost budget for the citizens of Minnesota. A market-oriented faculty salary structure accepts the reality that faculty members in some fields command salaries higher than faculty members in other fields because of differences in the supply and demand for academics. However, both academic and non-academic employment opportunities and consequently salaries must be expected to fluctuate over time and in response to changing national priorities. Another reality is that most faculty members in demand by non-academic employers are paid higher salaries than their counterparts whose disciplines are limited essentially to the academic market.

To achieve the level of quality required in the mission of each college and each department, it is necessary that "peer groups" be identified for each particular department or unit within the University. Such "peer groups" in other institutions can best be identified by each of the departments or comparable units throughout the University of Minnesota system. In certain instances, it may be necessary to include non-academic competitors (industry, government).

- b. surveying the peer group to determine its reward system;

Each unit or department head, in consultation with department faculty members, shall establish mechanisms or guidelines whereby units/departments may accurately determine competitive marketplace salaries in their particular areas of expertise. The mission of a particular unit includes some judgment as to anticipated or desired quality. To the extent that the marketplace reflects quality, an assessment of quality is imperative to determine the unit's desired position in the marketplace. Therefore, each unit will need to develop proper measurements of quality at the same time as it develops marketplace information. The burden will fall on individual departments to determine the most suitable method of quality evaluation, but the collegiate deans and central administration will share in the responsibility of assessing the appropriateness and accuracy of the measurements.

- c. determining the minimum budgetary requirements necessary to maintain a reward system comparable to that of the peer groups.

Once the Regents, through University central administrative officers, have approved appropriate peer groups for the departments and colleges, the unit administrator may then simply calculate the salary adjustment needed for that department. The Task Force believes that this procedure would result in an annual accumulation of salary data which could be meaningfully employed in projecting academic salaries and justifying requests for salary increases.

Even though the initial burden of identifying marketplace "peers" falls on individual departments, University and collegiate administrators must

also share responsibility in this kind of process for salary adjustment. The administrative heads of collegiate units in particular must be well-informed with respect to data employed by the units in arriving at projected salary requests and, in order to achieve the department's mission, be prepared to exercise the control necessary to maintain balance and adjust inadequacies or exaggerations in requests. Such controls on collegiate units would be the responsibility of the University administration. If it is to meet with any success, this process would also require that the University central administration present a detailed outline of the salary portion of its budgetary request to the legislature.

Obviously, this kind of approach to budget planning will place an additional burden on units and departments and require a great deal of cooperative effort on the part of administrators and faculty members. Operationally, this recommended budget process may be initially difficult to implement until each department and unit has identified its peer groups and formulated its mission. The fact that some units are now indirectly employing salient features of the proposed plan suggests that this recommended process is both feasible and manageable.

To summarize: Associated with the given University mission, there are individual missions and departmental missions, hence, for each department there exists a peer group, or a group of comparable competing departments. What the Regents determine, with the help of deans and department heads, is the total salary required for accomplishment of the given mission. In this way the legislature is aware of the specific University mission it is buying when salary money is appropriated.

2. The department head, the dean of the college, and the appropriate vice president shall examine the efficient budget to determine whether the proposed department budget based on the peer group reward system is appropriate for the department. The department head, dean and vice president may adjust the efficient budget to obtain a more equitable budget.

Because the application of the marketplace principle may not fully reflect the important contributions of certain units or particular individuals and because it will not in every instance or discipline reflect the magnitude of the current inflation, the Task Force recommends equity adjustments in the efficient planning budget.

Cost of Living Adjustment: The marketplace principle presumes that inflation will drive up the salaries of peer groups. It precludes an across-the-board salary index that is based on some cost-of-living index. The efficient planning budget will result in cost-of-living increases, although of differing magnitudes. What the Task Force proposes, given the severity of current inflationary pressures, is the establishment by central administration of a cost-of-living percentage figure which units and department, if they choose, may utilize in developing budgets instead of market determined average salaries. This will serve to provide a base which may be employed in budget planning when the marketplace may reflect both inflation and demand for some but not for all. Departments may use either the cost-of-living percentage figure or the marketplace determined figure in calculating salary increases. They may not use both.

In formulating its recommendations, the Task Force has rejected a salary structure tied primarily to a cost-of-living index because it believes that over the long-run and in different economic circumstances, the full implementation of the marketplace principle will ensure competitive compensation and guarantee fulfillment of the University's mission.

Other Alternatives: National and state legislation places limits on a "pure" marketplace salary structure. The federal government has already regulated the operation of the marketplace in regard to age, race, and sex, and the University is required to have affirmative action programs. The concept of salaries based on the marketplace carries with it an assumption that individuals will be free to relocate geographically to take advantage of market conditions. Therefore, a system of salaries based on a strict marketplace principle will tend to penalize less mobile individuals: married women, individuals who are predominantly teachers, and individuals whose research may be essentially non-portable. For good reasons, whether inflation continues to soar or not, the Regents may choose to present to the legislature a case for an equity-based salary structure for units which can demonstrate that a salary structure based on marketplace principles will not be a fair measure of their needs. This equity-based structure will always result in a budget that is larger than an efficient budget; the level of the salary adjustment under an equity-based structure will depend on the importance of equity to the University, the legislature and, ultimately, to the citizens of the state.

A variety of techniques are available, other than use of some "average" salary, to calculate equity-based salaries. One technique might be to calculate the substitution cost, that is, the cost of replacing an individual with someone of equal qualifications. The substitution cost for a senior professor who is an outstanding teacher and is experienced in University affairs might be a higher figure than his or her market-determined salary because he or she has skills specifically needed by and developed for this university. The marketplace evaluation being conducted by the unit administrator should provide a basis for an accurate assessment of the substitution cost for this senior professor.

Another technique which may be used to calculate equity-based salaries, in the absence of a perfectly competitive outside marketplace, is to estimate the amount of money required to keep a professor at full productivity after tenure. Sufficient rewards for teaching, research, and service are needed to sustain morale and stimulate high-quality performance to the degree required to maintain the quality of productivity defined in the mission statements. For instance, a promotion raise, in constant dollar amounts across the University, would fulfill this need, as it rewards equally those who presumably have contributed equally to the University. Among the other internal factors influencing people to stay at this university (even though subjectively they say they are underpaid) are the working environment, the amount of democracy in departmental affairs, the openness of administrative decisions, the opportunity to choose preferred activities in consultation with unit administrators, and rate of promotion. While all of these conditions might be encouraged because they contribute to productivity, they are not to be substituted for money.

3. The President, through the appropriate vice president and dean, should provide a reasonable salary increase for each faculty member promoted to a higher rank by estimating the amount of money necessary for the promotion fund and including this amount in the legislative salary request.

There is a great inconsistency in promotion practices throughout the University. Some promotions are rewarded by appropriate salary increments; others are not. Because of limited salary adjustment funds, many departments have been unable to reward promotion with appropriate salary increments. If they did so, other faculty members in those units would suffer disproportionately. The Task Force believes that a uniform policy should be established, that a separate fund should be held by central administration to assure uniformity, and that minimum promotion increments should be made available in a fixed dollar sum varying only according to rank. This minimum is not intended to limit the size of the increment but to establish a base figure.

4. The appropriate vice presidents and the deans should maintain a small contingency fund to assist departments in meeting unanticipated salary demands arising from retention cases.

A department, if it did not receive the same salary increase as its peer group, would not be able to maintain the quality of its staff for any period. What will happen in any particular year in regard to salaries is not, however, entirely predictable. The need for contingency reserve dollars at University-wide and collegiate levels is due to the inability of individual departments to predict with any certainty in any given year how many faculty may receive valid offers from competing employers. One collegiate unit may find itself confronted with an unusually large number of retention cases while another is confronted with a small number. Hence, a small centralized fund, administered by the academic vice president, would be very useful. In addition to a centralized fund, deans

should hold small portions of their respective allocations for departmental cases. A contingency reserve fund is a necessary instrument for the retention of high quality faculty members if departments are to maintain quality.

5. Decisions concerning salary increases for individual faculty members should continue to be made primarily at the departmental level. Department heads and department faculty should consult to determine expectations of performance and rewards for performance.

A common criticism emerging from the hearings was that department administrators did not clearly outline their expectations in terms of individual faculty members' duties, prior to annual salary adjustments. The need for faculty members to clearly understand what is expected of them is obviously an essential component in the proposed system of developing efficient and equitable budgets. Consultation between department head and faculty members, although there may be various ways in which it may actually be implemented, should be the standard practice and should make clear what the expectations are and how the evaluation of an individual's performance will be made.

Preparation of the efficient and equitable planning budget by department heads will generate an aggregate salary request for the department. However, except in unusual situations, the procedure will not necessarily result in mandated allocation to individuals in a department. Instead each department head in consultation with department faculty must estimate the minimally acceptable salary for each faculty member—his or her market value and/or his or her value (the quality of their contributions) to the institution. In the case of an entry level position, that estimate would be relatively simple: the market price for beginners is ordinarily a well-established monetary figure which will, however, vary widely from discipline to discipline.

After the entry level, the estimate becomes more difficult because performance evaluation begins. Performance evaluation involves (1) determining the function(s) to be performed by the faculty member and (2) establishing procedures to evaluate the level of the performance. For step (1) it is important that individual faculty, particularly new ones, fully understand their responsibilities. Each faculty member should have an annual review of his/her individual mission with the unit administrator and, where appropriate, a department/college committee. The outline of individual responsibilities within departments would consist of expected teaching load, expected service contributions, degree of involvement in research and amount of time to be devoted to each. Departments without faculty review committees should seriously consider developing appropriate groups. For step (2) annual assessments of faculty contributions to the stated mission should be undertaken by department heads or committees, where appropriate. Each faculty member will be judged by standards unique to his or her mission, and consideration will be given to the proportion of time devoted to each function as outlined during his/her annual review.

A number of mechanisms are available for systematic evaluation of faculty performance. At present, probably only research has an easily determined market value so that if salary is strictly market-determined, the effect will be to reward research and not to reward other activities. In the face of an imperfectly competitive market, the University will have to devise systems to reward those other activities which it values as instrumental to its mission. Toward this end a new teaching evaluation policy was approved by the University in the spring of 1974. Evidence can be obtained of service to the University community through membership on departmental, collegiate, University-wide, and external committees. Units primarily concerned with outreach to the people of the state have or should develop standards for measurement suited to their programs.

6. To the extent that proportional allocation is consistent with legislative intent, the President and vice presidents should allocate actual salary monies to collegiate units according to each unit's proportion of the total budget request.

It is likely that legislatively appropriated funds for salaries in any budget period may not be equal to those requested. In such an event, it is proposed that allocation of such funds as are available be made on a proportionate base. The proportion allocated to each college and presumably to each department or equivalent unit would be based upon the proportion of the total approved request made by the collegiate unit. In this respect, allocations will be pre-determined and will not be based on *ex post facto* decisions. Prior agreement among deans, department heads, and faculty members with respect to expectation of faculty performance and the subsequent evaluation will provide a framework for individual salary allocation.

APPENDIX A

Four issues that relate indirectly to the salary improvement question were also considered by the Task Force. In an effort not to dilute the issues set forth in the text of this report, the Task Force decided to include these related issues as Appendix A.

1. The University Senate should consider organizing a lobbying effort at the legislature.
2. The Consultative Committee should review questions posed by faculty members regarding academic year (B) and twelve-month (A) appointments.
3. Departments and colleges should establish grievance procedures to handle disputes with respect to individual salary adjustments.
4. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee should consider:
 - a. a fringe benefit system permitting appropriate individual adaptation.
 - b. an extended system of rewards and recognition for high-quality academic performance.

1. The University Senate should consider organizing a lobbying effort at the legislature.

The Task Force is unsure how to respond to this suggestion. If the University adopts a system of collective bargaining, direct faculty representation at the legislature will come into effect. The recommended policy for requesting and allocating salary adjustment monies should considerably improve the position of University spokesmen in the legislature. If neither of these is effected, then the University Senate and interested faculty members may wish to implement this proposal.

2. The Consultative Committee should review questions posed by faculty members regarding academic year (B) and twelve-month (A) appointments.

The differences between academic year (B) and twelve-month (A) appointments were raised by several faculty. Among the advantages and disadvantages mentioned, depending on the point of view, are the following: faculty members who support themselves during the summer months on research grants tend to gravitate toward areas where funds are available, irrespective of their own interests or the importance of the undertaking; the additional two or three month salary guaranteed for the A appointees must be weighed against the opportunity for summer session teaching, securing a research grant, outside employment, and increased vacation time if elected; and in many fields it is perceived that there is on the average an unjustified difference in the monthly salary of those on A and B appointments.

Any wholesale shift either from academic year to twelve-month appointments or vice versa would have significant implications for the mission of the University and the quality of that mission. The Task Force feels that while these questions are important and complicated enough to be the subject of a study by the Consultative Committee, they are outside the charge of this Task Force.

3. Departments and colleges should establish grievance procedures to handle disputes with respect to individual salary adjustments.

At the time of this writing, a salary grievance procedure is being established by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Administration. In cases where the department head has misestimated an acceptable compensation, a procedure system which accommodates individual grievances and affords due process must be available so that faculty members may contest the sufficiency of their proposed level of compensation. The Task Force anticipates that this

procedure will be only occasionally employed. Indeed, the prior consultation between department administrators and faculty members with regard to departmental expectations of faculty performance should be helpful in eliminating or reducing the need for invoking a salary grievance procedure.

4. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee should consider:

a. *a fringe benefit system permitting appropriate individual adaptation.*
There are a number of factors which affect a faculty member's decision to remain at the University of Minnesota. One is total compensation: salaries plus fringe benefits. Because the fringe benefits are such a significant part of the total compensation (10-20%) the Task Force recommends that a "cafeteria" approach be given serious consideration by the Faculty Affairs Committee as it continues its deliberations on a range of issues constituting the total compensation package. The "cafeteria" design would provide a variety of optional (up to a limit) fringe benefit programs in which a faculty member might enroll, tailored to individual need and accommodating faculty members on a full- or part-time basis.

b. *an extended system of rewards and recognition for high-quality academic performance.*
There are, of course, some special rewards and recognitions already in existence. The Regents Professorship is the most prestigious of these and, in addition to the name, carries with it an annual stipend of \$5,000. Excellence in teaching is recognized with Horace T. Morse-Standard Oil awards, and many collegiate units have similar recognitions for faculty members judged to have been outstanding teachers in a given year. These awards, usually funded by private contributions such as the Minnesota Foundation or the Century Fund, carry modest, non-renewable remunerations. The average award falls somewhere around \$500. Yet, less than two dozen faculty members out of a total faculty of nearly 3,000 receive these annual recognitions. Using the Task Force recommendation that individual missions be formulated in consultation with unit administrators and that salary improvements be based on the individual faculty member's performance of those missions, the procedure for assessing special merit of excellence will have been established. In order not to deplete the resources for salaries, the University should obtain monies for this purpose from outside funding sources. An extended system of rewards and recognitions may serve to stimulate creative productivity and a greater measure of accountability.

APPENDIX B

Suggestions expressed in testimony to the Task Force and the responses of the Task Force are summarized here for faculty information and reference.

Salary Adjustment Issues

1. Salary adjustment funds should be allocated on the same proportional basis among the several collegiate units/divisions and, within each collegiate unit/division, among its several departments.
2. Salary adjustment funds should be allocated on a per capita basis among the several collegiate units/divisions, and within each collegiate unit/division, among its several departments.
3. Salary adjustments should be made within the framework of a step system.
4. Faculty salary maximums (ceilings) should be established by rank.
5. Faculty salary minimums (floors) should be established by rank.

1. Salary adjustment funds should be allocated on the same proportional basis among the several collegiate units/divisions, and within each collegiate unit/division, among its several departments.

This suggestion approximates the present system and, in the opinion of the Task Force, would not produce a satisfactory salary distribution except by fortuitous accident. Any such simple rule misallocates the legislative appropriation, giving too much to some departments and too little to others. In so doing, it may distort missions—those units/divisions with modest salary improvements will be hard pressed to fulfill their missions; those with an inflated salary improvement will pursue missions different from those initially agreed upon. Paradoxically, a strict percentage allocation does not easily accommodate a change in mission; with such a system, some kind of separate funding must be maintained to achieve that end.

The Task Force agreed with several groups and individuals who suggested that the percentage allocation now in use works to the disadvantage of individuals, departments, and colleges that are currently below University averages. The usual argument involves the increasing dollar discrepancy between salaries. Consider two equally productive faculty members with different initial salaries (presumably) because of market considerations. If both receive a 5% increase per year on initial salaries of \$14,000 and \$12,000, respectively, at the end of three years the original \$2,000 difference will have increased to \$2,315 although the ratio of the two salaries remains the same. This difference will continue to increase as long as both remain at the University.

The second argument advanced is that percent increases permit high-salaried departments to transfer salary improvement funds from the higher salaried individuals to lower salaried faculty members within the department with the result that the higher salaried individuals receive "large" dollar improvements but small percentage improvements while the lower salaried individuals receive both a "large" dollar improvement and a large percentage improvement.

A third argument concerns the inability of the lower salaried department to fund changes in the base rate for instructors and assistant professors except at the expense of the other faculty members. A related problem is the inability of these departments to fund promotions adequately.

2. Salary adjustment funds should be allocated on a per capita basis among the several collegiate units/divisions, and within each collegiate unit/division, among its several departments.

In response to the criticisms of the current percentage allocation system, a number of faculty members advanced the idea of allocating the salary improvement funds to the several units on a per capita basis. Under this system each unit would receive a fixed number of dollars for each of the faculty members in that unit. This could be a different value for each of the faculty ranks. Such a system of allocation is the opposite extreme of the percentage system and errs in the other direction. The amount allocated must be sufficient to ensure that the higher priced faculty members are receiving an appropriate salary improvement. If not, this procedure could result in a loss of quality in some departments relatively quickly and a gain in quality in other departments being more of a wish for the future than a certainty.

In brief, the Task Force feels that any benefits gained by adopting a per capita system would result in more problems than it would solve.

3. Salary adjustments should be made within the framework of a step system.

Surprisingly few members of the faculty who appeared at the open hearings advocated adoption of a step system for the determination of salaries. The Task Force examined several examples and felt that they posed a new set of problems. If the steps are automatic, the system at best becomes cost of living and at worst rewards the least competent individuals as well as the most competent individuals. If not automatic, the system effectively expands the number of ranks which in turn requires an increased number of documented promotion decisions. A step system must also address the problems associated with the cost of attracting and maintaining faculty members in fields having widely different marketability. The most common approach is the application of a weighting factor for each subject-matter area or department. Floors and ceilings are built into step systems but it is possible to have one or both without the intermediate gradations within rank.

4. Faculty salary maximums (ceilings) should be established by rank.

The imposition of ceilings is the least desirable feature of the step system and is meaningless because of the employment of weighting factors for subject

areas and the ever-present special contracts for particularly distinguished individuals. Depending upon the manner in which the ceilings are established, there could be a marked influence on promotion considerations since to raise individuals above the ceiling would require that they be promoted.

5. Faculty salary minimums (floors) should be established by rank.

The Task Force considered extending the system of salary floors for the Instructor and Assistant Professor ranks to the Associate Professor and Professor ranks. A University-wide floor must encompass all subject-matter areas. As such it would be essentially meaningless since faculty members in many areas would automatically be beyond the floor. If the floor is set too high, an inordinately large amount of the salary adjustment monies would be needed just to fund the floor, resulting in a smaller amount that could be allocated among the remaining faculty members. The present floors already result in this problem in some departments. Extension of the floors would tend to compress the salary structure and could result in lessening the quality of the department/college and arbitrary changes in department/college missions.

APPENDIX C

REVIEW OF PRESENT SYSTEM OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

The current salary adjustment system includes three stages—a planning stage, an appropriation stage, and an allocation stage. In the planning stage, the central officers of the University recommend a salary improvement percentage to the Regents. Some Senate committees are consulted at this point. Administrators at the collegiate level are minimally involved, and there is essentially no formal input from departments.

Negotiations between the University, the legislature, and the governor comprise the appropriation stage. Near the end of the legislative session, the three parties agree on a sum of money to be used for faculty salary improvement. This sum is usually announced publicly as a percentage of the salary base budget. Preliminary publication of this percent figure has often led faculty members to expect that particular amount of increase in their own individual salaries; an expectation which, for a variety of reasons, is seldom realized.

The central administration, with suggestions from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Consultative Committee, and the Council on Academic Officers, then allocates the salary improvement money for the following purposes.

1. Improvement in fixed rates for graduate student ranks.

The usual graduate ranks—including the teaching assistant, the teaching associate and the research assistant—are paid on what are called "fixed rates." That is, all graduate students in one classification, regardless of the department employing the graduate student, are paid at one rate set by the University. In recent years the increases in salaries at these ranks have been as high as, or higher than, the percent of salary improvement money received by the University from the legislature.

2. Change in fringe benefit costs.

In 1963, the University administration began to subtract the substantial costs of an expanded faculty fringe benefit plan from the salary appropriation. Once these improvements were instituted, only the fringe benefit associated with the salary improvement had to be subtracted from the salary fund (University's increased contribution to retirement, social security, etc.). In 1973, for the first time, the legislature provided a separate appropriation to cover the cost of fringe benefits on improved salaries.

3. Assistance to retired faculty.

Faculty members who retired before 1963 when major improvements were made in the faculty retirement plan could not benefit from these changes. Consequently, a relatively small sum (approximately \$30,000) has been used each year to provide increased benefits for these former faculty members.

4. Special collegiate problems.

University administrators have found it necessary and advantageous to retain a small fund to assist colleges and departments with extraordinary costs in any particular year. Since retention and promotion problems occur in all colleges and departments, the distribution of these funds over several years approximates the usual distribution of improvement funds.

5. Special equity (equalization) considerations.

Within the last ten years, various colleges, departments and groups of faculty have presented requests to deans and central administration for additional funds to be used to redress inequities that had affected them. In the past the special requests were largely unpublicized within the University community, but more recently they have become more widely known. Now, because of the size of the equity fund, which, since 1966 has accounted for at least eight per cent of the salary improvement funds, it has become an important determinant in salary adjustments. Consequently, every unit must make a request if it wishes to use equity funds to maintain its position within the salary structure.

6. "Merit" increases for individual faculty members.

Any salary improvement monies remaining from the legislative appropriation are allocated to the various colleges as a percentage of the collegiate salary budget with each college receiving the same percent.

Following Regents' approval of the budget plan, the President informs the various unit administrators of the allocation of resources and the procedures to be followed by them in preparing the new budget. The plan usually does not presume across-the-board adjustments but does allow individual college discretion in distributing merit funds. The general practice seems to be for a dean to retain a small percentage of the collegiate allocation to help departments with equity, promotion, and retention. The deans then distribute the remaining collegiate share to departments either in proportion to the department's share of collegiate resources or on a per capita basis.

Departmental practices in determining individual salary adjustments vary widely. Some units schedule open meetings at which faculty members discuss the contribution of the various departmental faculty members; other departments limit attendance at similar meetings to faculty members of higher rank. Many departments have informal procedures for ranking a faculty member's contribution. Still other departments give the department head almost complete freedom to distribute the salary improvement funds.

APPENDIX D

WORK AND PROCEDURES OF THE TASK FORCE

Once the Task Force in preliminary meetings decided that the first order of business was to invite testimony from faculty in open hearings, several notices to that effect were issued.

A memorandum announcing the hearings, date, time and place was sent to all faculty members on the Twin Cities and coordinate campuses. Advertisements appeared in the *Minnesota Daily* on May 8 and May 15, 1974.

In each of these communications, it was announced that "additional hearings will be held if necessary."

The Task Force held the following schedule of meetings, including open hearings, Task Force discussions, and report preparation.

- April 22 Organizational meeting with Leon Reisman, chairman of the Consultative Committee subcommittee on salaries
- April 29 Task Force discussion
- May 6 Task Force discussion
- May 8 Open Hearings in Duluth
 - Thomas Boman, past president of AAUP and past chairman, AAUP salary committee
 - Dean Hendrickson, past chairman, AAUP salary committee
 - Robert Evans, past president, AAUP and chairman of the Faculty Council
 - Thomas Bacig, past president of the Faculty Council
 - Boyd Christensen, Assistant Professor of Art

Klaus Jankofsky, Associate Professor of English
Judith Wahl, Graduate Teaching Assistant

- May 14 Open Hearings in Morris
Gordon Bopp, Academic Dean
Andy Lopez, Director of Computer Sciences
Wilbert Ahern, Associate Professor of History
Nathaniel Hart, Professor of English Literature
- May 16 Open Hearings in Minneapolis
John Wertz, Professor of Chemistry
John Masters, Associate Professor, Institute of Child Development
Malcolm Purvis, Chairman of the Economic Status Committee, AAUP
Curtis Hoard, Associate Professor of Studio Arts
Clarke Chambers, Chairman, Department of History
Stuart Schwartz, Associate Professor, Department of History
Carla Phillips, Assistant Professor, Department of History
- May 20 Open Hearings in St. Paul
William F. Hueg, Jr., Director of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, speaking for the Executive Council of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics
Eville Gorham, Professor of Botany
Donald Rasmusson, Chairman and six members of the Salary Committee for the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics
Herma Schlenk, Assistant Director of the Hormel Institute
- May 29 Ellen Eagon, Associate Professor, School of Nursing
Sharon Wilford, Instructor, School of Nursing
Audry Grosch, Assistant Professor, Libraries
Candido Zanon, Associate Professor, General College
Robert Rathburn, Professor, General College
William Hathaway, Associate Professor, General College
- May 30 Harold Miller, Dean, Continuing Education and Extension
K. N. Gelatt, Associate Professor, College of Veterinary Medicine
Claire Woodward, UMFT
- June 6 Task Force discussion
- June 20 Persons invited to appear by Task Force
Stanley Kegler, Vice President and Special Assistant to the President
Harold Chase, Acting Academic Vice President and Budget Assistant Neil McCracken
William Shepherd, former Academic Vice President
Roy Richardson, Director of Personnel
- June 21 Persons invited to appear by Task Force
Harold Bernard, Director of Insurance and Retirement
Allan Spear, State Legislator and Associate Professor of History
- June 28 Persons invited to appear by Task Force
Alfred Aeppli, UMFT
Task Force discussion
- July 2 Persons invited to appear by Task Force
Richard Swalin, Dean, Institute of Technology
Task Force discussion
- July 3 Persons invited to appear by Task Force
David Berg, Director, Management Planning and Information Service
Neil Gault, Dean of the Medical School
- July 8-10 Task Force discussion and report drafting
- July 15-17 Task Force discussion and report drafting
- Sept. 18 Task Force discussion and report drafting
- Sept. 25 Task Force discussion and report drafting
- Oct. 1 Task Force discussion and report drafting
- Oct. 15 Task Force discussion and report drafting

A conservative estimate of the total time devoted to this undertaking by each member of the Task Force is 200 hours. This includes the time in meetings and hearings, in reading documents and other relevant materials that came to the personal attention of the members, and in the preparation of the report.

**APPENDIX E
DOCUMENTS REQUESTED BY OR SUBMITTED TO THE
TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC SALARIES**

- GENERAL MATERIALS—UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
- University of Minnesota Budget, 1973-74.
- Summary of Academic and Promotion Increases, 1973-74 Budget, University of Minnesota (undated).
- University of Minnesota Academic Salary Analysis, Class Within College, All Funds—1973-74, September 27, 1973.
- Stanley B. Kegler to Vice Presidents, Deans, Provosts, Directors, Department Heads, and Student Government Heads, 1973-74 Academic Salary Data, February 14, 1974.
- Malcolm Moos to Provosts, Deans and Directors, Preparation of the 1974-75 General University Budget, March 18, 1974.
- Malcolm Moos to Faculty Consultative Committee, Salary Equity Recommendations for 1974-75, April 4, 1974.
- Fall, 1973 Faculty Activity Analysis Brief Summary, March 12, 1974.
- Harold W. Chase to Provosts, Deans and Directors, Policy on Evaluation of Teaching, Adopted by the University Senate, May 30, 1974.
- Malcolm Moos to Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Directors, Guidelines, 1975-77 University Legislative Request, January 17, 1974.
- Academic Planning Principles and Priorities for 1975-77 Legislative Requests, May 14, 1974.
- Faculty and Civil Service Salaries (draft of 1975-77 legislative requests).
- Comparisons of Increase in Wage Rate with Cost of Living by Academic Level (submitted by Roy Richardson), undated.
- Roy Richardson, Faculty Compensation Principles (draft, mimeo), June 19, 1974.
- William G. Shepherd, Departmental Procedures in Making Recommendations Affecting the Status of Individual Faculty Members, January 28, 1971.
- Summary of Equity and Merit Salary Items, University of Minnesota 1965-74.
- MATERIALS FROM THE COORDINATE CAMPUSES
- Report of the UMD Faculty Council Salary Review Task Force for 1973-74.
- University of Minnesota Proposed Budget, 1973-74, Allocation of Equity Funds 1972-73 and 1973-74 (submitted by UMD).
- Female Employee Salary Increments, 1969-74, University of Minnesota, Duluth.

University of Minnesota, Distribution of Equalization Reserve, 1968-72 (submitted by UMD).

- University of Minnesota, Duluth Faculty Association (untitled and undated document analyzing comparative salary data).
- Robert H. Evans to President Malcolm Moos, Statement of University of Minnesota, Duluth's Faculty Council in re UMD salaries, August 2, 1973.
- Judith Wahl to Task Force on Academic Salaries (on behalf of the teaching assistants in the UMD Department of English), May 8, 1974.
- Gordon R. Bopp to David Giese, Chairman, Senate Task Force on Academic Salaries, Statement on distribution of equalization funds on the Morris campus, May 20, 1974.

MATERIALS FROM THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS—MINNEAPOLIS

- C. Arthur Williams to Professor David L. Giese, Chairman, Task Force on Academic Salaries, Statement from the College of Business Administration, May 29, 1974.
- Testimony presented to the Senate Task Force on Academic Salaries by the Committee on Faculty Personnel of the University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus, May 29, 1974.
- Harold A. Miller to Members of the Task Force on Academic Salaries, "Salary Equity—Continuing Education and Extension," May 30, 1974.
- Harold A. Miller to Vice President Harold W. Chase, Statement of CEE salary position, March 14, 1974.
- Clarke A. Chambers to Professor David L. Giese, Chairman, Task Force on Academic Salaries, Statement and data from the Department of History, May 10, 1974.
- Willard W. Hartup to Associate Dean Darrell Lewis in re "Equalization of Salaries in Institute of Child Development," March 4, 1974.
- Frank J. Sorauf to Vice President Harold Chase, A Proposal for Salary Equity Funds for CLA, February 22, 1974.
- Statements from the Department of Studio Arts (various materials from 1972-73 and 1973-74).
- Comparative Salary Information for General College Faculty, 1959-73.
- Report of the Subcommittee of the General College Faculty Committee on Faculty Salaries, January 6, 1971.
- 1971-72 Salary Report (of the General College).

MATERIALS FROM THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS—ST. PAUL

- Statement to the Task Force on Academic Salaries, University of Minnesota, Monday, May 20, 1974 by the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics Executive Council.
- Salary Discussion with Task Force on Academic Salaries, Salary Committee for Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics (undated).
- Dr. K. N. Gelatt to Task Force on Academic Salaries, "Report on Academic Salaries, College of Veterinary Medicine: Summary," May 29, 1974.

MATERIALS FROM SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

- Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, May 13, 1974.
- SCFA Reports (Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs), Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1974.

MATERIALS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- Orientation Packet, Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 (15 separate materials variously dated).
- Higher Education Contract Clause Finder (excerpts from Second Issue), Industrial Relations Center, College of Business Administration, University of Hawaii, January 1974.

MATERIALS FROM AAUP AND UMFT

- Report of the Economic Status Committee, University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Chapter AAUP, 1973-74.
- AAUP Report, American Association of University Professors, University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Chapter, May 1974.
- Outline of statement by Clare Woodward for the UMFT, May 30, 1974.
- UMFT News, February 25, 1974, April 23, 1974 and May 10, 1974.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS

- Archie S. Wilson, Department of Chemistry to David L. Giese, Chairman, Task Force on Academic Salaries recommending "a cost-of-living factor as an integral part of an academic salary structure," May 14, 1974.
- Dan Pedro to Professor Giese in re "Hearings on Academic Salaries," (undated).

COMPENSATION PLANS FOR MEDICAL FACULTY

- Private Consultation Practice in the College of Medical Sciences, Statement of Policy and Implementing Resolution, adopted June 15, 1963, amended September 20, 1963 and March 11, 1966.
- Robert C. Hardin, M.D. to Board of Regents in re "Medical Service Plan," The University of Iowa, June 3, 1971.

MISCELLANEOUS

- Statements submitted to the Task Force on Academic Salaries by Dr. H. Schlenk, Associate Director, The Hormel Institute, Graduate School, University of Minnesota, Austin, Minnesota, May 20, 1974.
- Faculty Salary Policy, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada (excerpts), April 25, 1974.

XVIII. QUESTIONS TO ADMINISTRATORS

XIX. OLD BUSINESS

XX. NEW BUSINESS

XXI. DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

- RAYMOND MONDLOH**
1921-1975
- GILFORD W. REMINGTON**
1901-1974
- CAROLINE B. ROSE**
1913-1975
- CECIL WOOD**
1916-1974