



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
5-255 Millard Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373- 3226

Senate Facilitative Committee  
Thursday, January 10, 1980  
402 Coffman Memorial Union, 9:30-10:45 a.m.

Tentative Agenda

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of November 29th meeting (sent previously).
3. Report of the Chair (enclosed).
4. Committee Reports
  - a. UCBRBR
  - b. Committee on Committees
  - c. SCEP
  - d. SCFA
  - etc.
5. Old Business.
6. New Business.
7. Adjournment.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
5-255 Millard Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373- 3226

Senate Facilitative Committee

January 10, 1980

3.

Report of the Chair

a. Fall Quarter was a very busy one, with a considerable amount of business accomplished, and perhaps even more initiated. The Chair is very grateful for the help and hard work put in by all the Senate committees, and if there are ways that business can be made more efficient via help from the Facilitative Committee, I would welcome suggestions.

b. Two items of new business arising before the Consultative Committee should be discussed. The first concerns regulations and roles of subcommittees; the second is the issue of collective bargaining.

(1) Subcommittees: Recently we have received both queries and complaints about mechanisms of operations of subcommittees. At present the Senate Handbook on Policies and Procedures is silent on the issue. One subcommittee has interpreted its mandate as including the right to forward reports directly to the Regents and the President without consulting its parent committee in advance. This raised rather a storm at the December Regents meeting, as the subcommittee's recommendations were both controversial and rather accusatory of the University Senate's policy on search committees. Roberts Rules of Order (newly revised) has only the following to say about subcommittees (p. 413-414): "A committee (except a Committee of the Whole, 51) can appoint subcommittees which are responsible to and report to the committee and not the assembly. Subcommittees must consist of members of the committees, except when otherwise authorized by the society in cases where the committee is appointed to take action that requires the assistance of others."

The Chair is of the opinion that Senate procedure on subcommittees has complied with the above first sentence on reporting. We have generally allowed subcommittee membership to consist of other than committee members themselves for the purposes of acquiring needed expertise on specific issues. Because Senate committees go through an appointive process that tries very hard to provide them with geographic, demographic and other University-wide conditions of balance, whereas subcommittees are not subjected to such strictures and may be very narrowly based, it would seem wise to restrict the reporting lines of subcommittees to their parent committee. Such efforts should hold down the conflicts of lobbying vs. legislating and also restrict the "end-runs"

Facilitative Committee  
Report of the Chair  
January 10, 1980

deplored in the Watson Report. The question is: Should the Senate write into the Handbook an explicit set of regulations regarding subcommittees? The Senate Consultative Committee will consider this question at its January 17th meeting, and if the answer is "yes", it will forward its suggestions to the Committee on Committees with a request that action on the suggestions be taken at the next Senate meeting (February 14th). The Chair would appreciate comments on this issue by members of the Facilitative Committee.

(2) Collective Bargaining: MEA has filed for an election on the main campus (excluding Law, which just completed voting against collective bargaining, and excluding the Health Sciences). Should the Senate sponsor open forums on the issue of collective bargaining? The SCC has been requested to do so. If the consensus is "yes", suggestions as to how, when and where will also be welcomed.

c. In addition to further discussion on Senate Reorganization and UCRRBR's report (about which the SCC is likely to be preoccupied for much of the quarter), the Chair would appreciate a sketch from each of the committees on progress made, particularly in relation to the deadlines set by the remaining Senate meetings of the year.

Richard L. Purple, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
5-255 Millard Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373- 3226

### Minutes

#### Senate Facilitative Committee

January 10, 1980

A meeting of the Facilitative Committee of the University Senate was called to order at 9:35 a.m. on Thursday, January 10, in room 402 of the Campus Club, Minneapolis, by Richard Purple, chair. Other members present were Josef Altholz, Virginia Fredericks, Paul Grambsch, Isabel Harris, Robert Hexter, Russell Hobbie, Arthur Williams and Frank Wood.

1. A motion to fix the agenda carried without dissent.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 11/29/79 were accepted.
3. Report of the chair.

a. The chair reiterated his appreciation to committee chairs for their work of the fall quarter.

b. The chair introduced the issue of proper subcommittee procedure, particularly as concerns lines of reporting. He stated that the SCC may forward the question to the Committee on Committees. Frank Wood, who has sent a detailed letter to Richard Purple regarding a recent action by Social Concerns' Subcommittee on Equality of Opportunity for Women, summarized the bases for a misunderstanding there. Josef Altholz stated that any piece of writing sent from a body corporately, which members sign as the subcommittee, does indeed constitute a 'report' (and hence should be routed through the parent committee). Concerned persons could properly sign and send a letter as individuals. If time is indeed critically short, the best thing for a subcommittee to do is to seek authorization from the parent committee to go ahead and send a letter on its own. If a committee or subcommittee is in any way a child of the Senate, its reporting must be through the Senate structure. The chair added that standard procedure is for Senate subcommittee reports to be passed on intact by the parent committee, usually with comments attached. When there is any question about the propriety of a subcommittee writing independently, the subcommittee is advised to check with the parent committee.

Josef Altholz recommended considering that a clarification on subcommittee reporting be included in the general Handbook revision scheduled for next year. He also recommended that there be written into the Handbook the license for liberal interpretation of Roberts Rules regarding composition of subcommittees.

c. Collective Bargaining. The chair, noting that the Minnesota Education Association has filed for an election on campus for a collective bargaining agent, asked whether it was the opinion of the committee chairs that the Senate or the committees collectively should sponsor forums on the question. The Faculty Governance Caucus has requested Senate-sponsored forums. Altholz saw the Faculty Consultative Committee, being the present de facto bargaining agent, as the logical sponsor. Several committee chairs stated that they could not alone say their committees would wish to be co-sponsors. Hobbie noted that students are pressing to sit in on collective bargaining sessions.

Williams proposed that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs co-sponsor the forum(s) with the FCC. These are the two bodies that would presumably cease to exist were the faculty to adopt a collective bargaining agent. Hobbie remarked that since it is a faculty affair, SCFA could well be the sole sponsor. Purple summarized the discussion and stated that he would transmit the views expressed to the SCC with a recommendation that the SCC and SCFA or the FCC and SCFA consider joint sponsorship.

#### 4. Committee Reports.

- a. UCBBR--the written report was distributed.
- b. Committee on Committees-- (Fredericks): The committee will start meeting early in February to prepare committee membership slates.
- c. SCEP-- (Purple for Terwilliger): (1) SCEP is considering the recommendation from the Report of the University Committee on the Handicapped. (2) SCEP has approved the SCIP proposal for \$25,000 for a three-year extension. Altholz asked whether SCIP results can be used in questions of promotion and tenure and Purple stated that the current legislation requires collegiate faculty approval for such use.
- d. SCFA -- (Williams): (1) There will be a report in the Daily next week clarifying and explaining the logic behind the Regents vote on University contributions to retirement benefits. (2) Regarding the supplemental life insurance available to University "management employees", Williams met with Vice Pres. Stein to discuss the issue and decided to let this one go. (3) SCFA has looked at the

Task Force Report on retirement plans. (4) The Subcommittee on Sexual Harrassment, chaired by Leo Raskind of the Law School, is still waiting for members to be named from two of four Senate committees to be represented. (5) SCFA is preparing a recommendation on the salary increase component of the 1981-83 biennial budget request. (6) SCFA discussed the 'E' track employment issue, which SCC subsequently sent to Tenure. (7) SCFA endorsed the report of the Giese task force on faculty salaries with its stand on merit increases (submitted to Senate May 22, 1975).

e. Research-- (Hexter): The committee is interested in disseminating information. Last year the committee was instrumental in getting the Office of Research Administration to issue the booklet, "Indirect Costs of Sponsored Research", which answers many questions about charges and about cost-recoveries distribution.

The committee wants to see faculty informed, especially new and young faculty, on the existence and particulars of research facilities in the Twin Cities area. The committee is working with Dr. Verbrugge to develop a new rate structure which, it is hoped, will be fair to all users, particularly in the light of the steady decrease in legislative funding for the Computer Center.

f. SCRAP-- (Grambsch): Later this day, January 10, SCRAP was scheduled to meet to begin considering and responding to the President's draft document on goals, objectives and planning. SCRAP has received the timetables suggested by the SCC and they feel they can work within the proposed schedule. They will deal first with the assumptions, both explicit and implicit, contained in the statement. SCRAP will also consider and comment upon the drafts of the Regents' revision of the mission statement.

SCRAP has abandoned the idea of becoming a policy study group, since members do not have the necessary time. Grambsch thinks the University needs a futures study group which would produce study papers addressing long-range issues in education. Students and faculty are sufficiently busy that they cannot ordinarily afford to invest the time demanded.

g. Social Concerns-- (Wood): The committee has spent time clarifying the procedures for the Subcommittee on Social Responsibility in Investments. Wood is working with students who are concerned about the lack of minority student representation in the Senate. He noted that there are a number of students who believe the letter from the HEW branch office to the University means that the University must name more minority students to the Senate or lose all federal funds. He observed that students are not getting to matters they should be attending to and

sees student activism as in bad shape this year because of the trial of two TCSA members. He sees good students trying to be helpful and becoming very discouraged.

Social Concerns is also addressing the Nestle boycott issue. Wood stated that Professor Blackshear is attempting to initiate seminars on campus using especially the "Columbia Seminars" model.

h. Judicial-- (Purple for Park): Purple reported that a Judicial Committee panel has recommended an addendum to the nepotism rules at the University which would preclude ex-spouses from participating in promotion and tenure discussions. He expects the SCC to refer the question to SCFA and to Tenure.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Meredith Poppele, SCC secretary

M E M O R A D N U M

TO: Senate Facilitative Committee  
FROM: Fred Morrison, Chairman, UCBRR  
DATE: January 9, 1980  
SUBJECT: Budget business, January and February

I am sorry that I will be unable to attend the Facilitative Committee meeting Thursday. There is a meeting of the Regents' Budget Committee at the same time.

The following items will be arising in January and February, which will require coordination between UCBRR and other committees.

Six-year capital request. The President has distributed the six year capital request. UCBRR will meet on Thursday, January 17, to make its report. We hope to have input from all relevant Senate committees by that time.

Copies of the item have been sent to all members of SCRAP, and to the chairs of the committees on educational policy, research and faculty affairs. If your committees have input, please direct it to us in a timely manner.

Budget allocations. (Items for units). We should receive budget allocation items on January 28. Copies (or summaries) will be sent to all members of SCEP, SCRAP, Research, and Faculty Affairs (if the reports are exceedingly long, a full copy will be sent to the chairman of each committee, and summaries to the members.

An UCBRR meeting will be held on Thursday, February 7 at 12:00, 606 Campus Club to provide orientation on these items. A public hearing will be held in conjunction with the Senate meeting on Thursday, February 14. Your committee recommendations must be received by Tuesday, February 19, in order to be taken into account in the materials which go forward to the President. UCBRR will meet on Thursday, February 21, to prepare its report on this matter.

FLM:nmv

Points relevant to "merit" increases in the Report of the Task Force on Academic Salaries, completed March 31, 1975, submitted to the SCC April 14, 1975 and to the Senate on May 22, 1975.

Task Force chair: David Giese  
SCC chair: Leon Reisman

#### Appendix A. 4.b.

....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.

#### Report, Explanations, 5.

...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... 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.

March 3, 1977, Senate Meeting

Recommendation: That the Senate approve transmission of the draft document "A Philosophy for Faculty Compensation" to the President and his staff for reaction.

Approved.

From SCFA minutes of 11/30/79: "It would be useful to remind the University community of the existence of the statements made in those minutes (5/22/75); the Academic Vice President will be asked to send them to deans, department heads, and other appropriate persons.