



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
151F Chemical Engineering
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-2295

SENATE FACILITATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 21, 1980
9:30 - 10:30 a.m., Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club

Tentative Agenda

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of meeting of January 10, 1980.
3. Report of the Chair.
4. Committee Reports.
5. Old Business.
6. New Business.
7. Adjournment.

Report of the Chair

With the distribution of the budget, the Senate Consultative Committee's workload now will be shifted essentially to that topic, with a heavy reliance on UCBRR. Other items presently in front of the SCC include another review of the Senate policy on search committee guidelines for major administrative positions (with only minor revisions expected), and monitoring of ongoing business before the Senate. I would appreciate progress reports from the various Senate committees, particularly on those items that had tentative deadlines set on them.

One question which has come up recently concerns distribution of materials out of the SCC office. Ordinarily, I attempt to read all the material that comes in, and those items which appear relevant to matters to be discussed by the SCC or which contain updating information for SCC members regarding progress, or lack of it, towards resolving one or another problem which we have steered to other committees, etc., are copied and distributed to all SCC members in the "meeting agenda packets" sent out prior to each SCC meeting. Items that are essentially in the terrain of the administration are copied and sent forward, sometimes with covering letters pointing out Senate interest. These latter items are reported to the full SCC in the Report of the Chair. The SCC packets (which also contain the Report of the Chair) are also distributed to the President's office, to the University Press, and to the Minnesota Daily, in accordance with our open meeting policy. Unless an item is either marked "confidential," or is obviously sensitive enough to require a prior check with its originator, the material may be subject to the scrutiny of the press. It would be of help to me if you would mark "confidential" any materials you do not wish copied. I apologize if the above policy has caused you inconvenience.

A substantive draft of the Senate Reorganization Plan is now anticipated to be ready for circulation well in advance of the March 13th meeting of the Facilitative Committee. The topic will be on the agenda for that meeting.

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

DRAFT OF MINUTES
Facilitative Committee Meeting
February 21, 1980

Senate Consultative Committee Chairman Richard Purple convened a meeting of the Facilitative Committee of the Senate at 10:40 a.m. on Thursday, February 21, 1980 in room 626 of Coffman Memorial Union. Other members in attendance were Josef Altholz, Paul Grambsch, Robert Hexter, Richard Kottke, James Terwilliger, C. Arthur Williams and Frank Wood.

There was brief discussion of the frustrations which continue because of the long-standing cease and desist court order regarding negotiations.

Report of the Chair. (a) Budget. Professor Hexter asked Professor Purple to expand on President Magrath's statement that the University had gone about as far as it could go in centrally-mandated retrenchment/reallocation. Professor Purple cited the inelasticity of budgets. The number of tenured faculty and level of enrollment are the biggest budget determinants. The President, he said, is effectively asking the deans of the collegiate units to take responsibility for intra-unit fund transfers. Professor Altholz observed that the President can pre-determine where changes are to be made by designating which colleges must reallocate funds.

There was some discussion of the trend of tenure track appointments within the Office of Student Affairs. Usually these appointments are made jointly with a department which stands, in the short run, to gain a pre-paid shared faculty member. Professor Purple stated that the President had agreed in his February 14 meeting with the SCC that Student Affairs is not to make any more tenure track appointments without the approval of Academic Affairs and that he would write a letter to that effect to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Are "state specials" tenurable employees? Professor Altholz offered as a plausible example the appointment of a professor for "Minnesota History" in the History department. That could well be an appointment attractive to the legislature, and the individual would be regular faculty. Professor Grambsch said that when the legislature funds a "special", monies move around inside a

department. The "special" money is used to pay existing faculty and the department uses its saved money for other purposes.

Could the University persuade the legislature to invest now in outstanding young faculty? Professor Purple cited the dearth of employment opportunities now for promising young Ph.D's. He believes the state could reap a windfall of talent by reinvesting inflationary surplus during the period of the "buyer's market." Professor Grambsch recommended the alternative of trying to get the legislature to set up now a special endowment fund to provide for that hiring in the future. The legislators know, he said, that the University has exhibited a short memory in the past regarding such promises as not to ask for more later. Hence, they would be skeptical that the University, when large numbers of retirements occur around the year 2000, would not seek to re-fill all those vacated positions despite promises 20 years earlier that they would not.

Professor Purple stated, again from the SCC meeting with the President, that the President was amenable to consider having UCBRBR write into the blue budget-biennial request book some academic planning proposal to temporarily swell the faculty ranks. Although the idea might get nowhere this year, the legislature will have been made aware of the idea. The suggestion is for 40 to 50 positions per biennium. Professor Hexter suggested the proposal might be appealing to foundations, which might offer funding for positions to be later picked up by the legislature. Professor Altholz suggested considering endowing positions for senior professors, thus removing them from the regular budget and freeing up monies for other hiring.

(b) Regents' conflict-of-interest proposal. Professor Purple announced that Regent Latz will introduce to the Regents Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs at its March 13 meeting, a conflict-of-interest regulation for departing University administrators and decision-makers. He described the FCC's opposition to the proposal in its present form and the FCC's intention, approved by the President, to send to Regent Latz a letter stating their several concerns.

(c) The Chair's policy on distribution of letters and memoranda received in the SCC office. Professor Altholz asked that that policy be made clear to next year's group of committee chairpersons as well, since the policy of open meetings and open conduct of business is not commonly taken to mean outright, broadscale distribution of relevant materials.

Committee Reports.(a) SCEP. (James Terwilliger)

(i) Report on the Handicapped. Professor Terwilliger reported briefly on SCEP's item for information at the February 14 Senate meeting regarding implementation of recommendations for handicapped students. SCEP's concerns are with how the changes will be funded and how the costs will affect monies available for other educational needs.

(ii) Outreach. The first meeting between SCEP and administration representatives is scheduled for the afternoon of 2/21/80 to begin the process of determining the impact of implementation of the Outreach proposal. There has been little progress toward a pilot study. SCEP itself does not have the resources to design the pilot study required by the Senate. Professor Altholz recommended that, regardless of general approbation of the plan educationally, SCEP can insist that certain kinds of questions be answered; e.g., "How does the plan work at the individual and the department level?", and, "Do we want those results?" Professor Terwilliger said the first issue is how to define a reasonable sampling plan. Altholz recommended surveying the six departments, including Geography, which are currently experimenting with inloading. Professor Grambsch exclaimed that "this University has been getting by with murder for 50 years" in extension education. Extension students plainly are victims of discrimination, paying 85% of their instruction cost. Evening students in the MBA program pay twice what day students pay. He also pointed out that the President's goals and planning statement includes the aim of implementing the Outreach Report. The members of SCRAP are asking how the administration can consider implementation when the Senate-mandated pilot study hasn't even been undertaken. Grambsch described T.A.'s and R.A.'s as the last great pool of exploitable labor; Altholz said they are also the last great pool of cuttable teaching staff; and Purple expressed his view that in the CLA summer school experiment it is mostly T.A.'s and R.A.'s who will get bumped.

(b) Social Concerns. (Frank Wood)

(i) Subcommittee on Social Responsibility in Investments. Professor Wood announced that Social Concerns will meet on the afternoon of 2/21 to receive the first report of this subcommittee. There are five companies in the University's portfolio with shareholder resolutions this year. The subcommittee will ask Social Concerns to take a position on those. He anticipates some motion again on wholesale divestment. He cited the difficulty of time strictures in moving on

resolutions. The President wants the resolutions for a week to decide whether to send them to the Regents, and Regents meeting materials are to go to them ten days before their meetings, which in this case are March 13 and 14. Professor Wood also noted that the committee and subcommittee could not do nearly as much in this area without the assistance of Ann Rutledge, Assistant to the Vice President for Finance, who is their liaison with that office.

(ii) Minority student representation in the Senate. Professor Wood said that the University has not accepted the findings of the letter from the Chicago branch office of HEW, and that presumably that letter will be revised. In answer to the question of whether anyone is working on recruitment of minority student senators, he replied, "Not really." Mr. Kottke said student government people are pre-occupied with the Cooke-Carlson trial. And he commented that the two student senators newly named from IT are both white males.

(c) SCRAP. (Paul Grambsch)

Regarding the 1980-81 budget proposal and the 1981-83 biennial request proposal, Grambsch said all the questions SCRAP has raised have also been publicized by others. SCRAP's work for the spring is to react to the planning, goals and budgeting documents. SCRAP is suggesting an ongoing review of the organizational structure of the University, a practice which exists in most large organizations. The basic structure of this University, having been in place for a century, may no longer be the soundest possible arrangement.

(d) Business and Rules. (Josef Altholz)

The committee awaits the final form of the proposal on Senate reorganization. Purple noted that Senate consideration and adoption may have to be postponed to 1980-81

(e) Research. (Robert Hexter)

The Research Committee continues to work on developing a Handbook. Professor Hexter carried with him a draft of a handbook prepared by the University for principal investigators. The document is 1 1/2 inches thick. Hexter said he would be agreeable to the Chair's request that he attend one of the SCC meetings with the President to discuss the problems generated by such cumbersome procedures.

(f) SCFA. (Arthur Williams)

(i) Sex differentials in periodic retirement benefits. SCFA is recommending that the University plan for retirement benefits and contributions be changed as of July 1 to eliminate sex differentials with respect to future contributions. The recommendation will be on the Senate agenda for April 17. The committee has decided that it should not defer action on this issue until the faculty has taken a position on the report of the Task Force on the Faculty Retirement Plan. Professor Williams observed that the Task Force Report may be controversial. (The report runs 40 pages, single-spaced.) The proposal is for a complete change with no increase in cost. Thus, some people will benefit by it and some will be hurt.

(ii) The subcommittee on sexual harrasment (Chair, Leo Raskind) is about to begin meeting.

(iii) The Tenure Committee (Chair, John Cound) has apparently not yet met. The importance of this body getting to work on particulars of implementation of the 'E' (academic staff) proposal was emphasized. (SCC Chair Purple noted that a change in the nepotism rule, referred last month to the Tenure Committee, should not be rushed. Since existing nepotism rules are included in standing contracts between the University and various federal agencies, substantial revision could impinge seriously on the status of those contracts. Probably sufficient change for the present might consist of language change to further eliminate sexism.)

(iv) 1980-81 faculty salary proposal. SCFA recommends asking the legislature for a 13% increase instead of 7% as requested in the administration's proposed budget. SCFA voted, by a narrow majority, that if a 7% increase were awarded, they recommended 5% distribution across the board and a 2% distribution for merit. SCFA also approves requiring departmental faculty to approve departmental allocation.

Old Business. Collective Bargaining Forums. The Chair reported that the SCC and the competing aspiring collective bargaining agents are agreeable to sponsoring and participating in forums but are in no hurry to name a date. Professor Altholz discussed the attempt at new enforcement of an obsolete consultation policy which, he said, constitutes a change in working conditions.

New Business. The next regularly scheduled TCCA meeting is to be April 24. Professor Altholz suggested the Chair consider advancing the regular TCCA meeting so that the Cooke-Carlson trial outcome may be resolved as soon as possible, along with all other regular TCCA business.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Meredith Poppele, SCC Secretary