



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES
SENATE FACILITATIVE COMMITTEE
October 13, 1980

SCC Chairman Marcia Eaton convened the fall quarter meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee at 3:15 on October 13, in Room 402 of the Campus Club. Also present were committee chairpeople Connie Sullivan (Business and Rules), Stanford Lehmberg (Educational Policy), Thomas Kraabel (Academic Standing and Relations), John Howe (Committee on Committees), Van Mueller (Resources and Planning), Patricia Swan (Biennial Request and Budget Reivew), Charles Wolfram (Tenure), Frank Wood (Social Concerns), Bob Hexter (Research), Hoyt Wheeler (Library), and Donald Spring (SCC Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization).

1. Senate Reorganization. Don Spring described the assignment and progress of the writing committee. There are six interrelated documents to revise: the Senate constitution, by-laws and rules, and the Twin Cities Assembly constitution, by-laws and rules. He invited the personal recommendations of the committee chairmen on membership and on duties and responsibilities, as described in the rough draft of the Senate handbook revision. He expects a much more nearly finished form of both the constitution and the by-laws to be ready in about two weeks for distribution to and consideration by each committee. All re-writing should be completed in time for a forum on the new texts to be held on the Minneapolis campus about mid-January, preparatory for the winter quarter Senate meeting of February 19.

Lehmberg reported that he and Jim Terwilliger, last year's chairman of SCEP, have discussed what that committee actually does and will forward their description in writing to Spring so the handbook section on "duties and responsibilities" will reflect those accurately. Spring said he would welcome precisely such information from all committees.

2. Academic Staff Professional Employment Classification. Eaton reminded the group that when the Senate approved in principle the creation of this classification last fall, it made the Tenure Committee responsible for considering the assignments of various job types into the new class. Wolfram reported that the Tenure Committee had apparently met only once last year and has not met yet this year. Academic Affairs has sent to the members of the Tenure Committee a communication whose import is that unless Tenure dissents, reclassifications can go forward. Tenure will meet, study the current and previous form of the document (for the purpose of gaining a clearer understanding of the prescriptive intent and of discerning what questions to raise), try to determine the implications for tenure of the reclassification, and consider whether the E-designation makes sense in each case.

President Magrath and Vice President Keller told the FCC recently that establishment of the classification would be proposed to the Regents as an information item at their October meeting, and as an action item in November or December. (**Following this meeting, Eaton obtained the following clarification from Vice President Keller: The Regents will be given a short description of the Professional Academic Staff classification, and will be asked to approve it. The details of the classification (grievance procedures, criteria for promotion, definitions of particular class titles, etc.) will be worked out by the administration. Some of the definitions of classes may be matters for the Senate to discuss.)

Hexter remarked on the clarity of the document, particularly the definition of faculty as those who teach. Others present, however, cited remaining instances of ambiguity as to what sort of activity constitutes 'teaching'. Hexter reported that some department heads in IT have requested of Assistant Vice President Robinett the addition of one more gradation in the scale of research positions. Some in IT have also questioned the procedure for assessment for promotion, since according to the document faculty need not be involved other than the one faculty member who may be the employee's supervisor. IT approves the designation of professional research employees as professional academic staff rather than as civil service staff, which many presently are.

Should the new class of employees be represented in the Senate? Eaton suggested addressing that question after it is raised by the new class, when that class is actually established. Wolfram recommended that a change in Senate composition be initiated very soon, by an existing Senate committee or a special Senate committee, and noted that the question relates to reorganization. Sullivan and Swan indicated holding serious reservations about the appropriateness of including this new and very broad group. Sullivan pointed out that the class will include many persons the Senate advises or reports to. Both thought incorporating academic staff would raise fundamental questions about the purpose of the Senate and the nature of its business. Sullivan and Eaton will meet to discuss routing the issue to the Senate.

3. Outreach. Lehmborg reported that little has happened. SCEP is well aware that the Senate a year ago approved the outreach document in principle, excepting explicitly the "inloading" concept. SCEP suggested to Vice President Hasselmo when he attended its meeting on the Duluth campus that there was no reason the administration could not proceed with implementing the aspects of the proposal other than inloading. SCEP last year developed a questionnaire by which to try to determine effects of inloading, which was to be administered to a sampling of units over the summer, but was not. SCEP has met this fall, but Vice President Keller, who attended the meeting, did not know what the present state of this survey was. SCEP requested of Academic Affairs, but was refused, funding for a half-time research assistant to help conduct the surveys. Central administration said it could do the background work itself, but so far it has not. SCEP has received a report from David BJORQUIST, chairman of the Committee on Summer Session, stating that the CLA experiment on inloading ought not to be repeated without consideration of its broader implications.

4. Planning Council Issues. Eaton reported that the Planning Council (which includes faculty members) decided last year to develop some long-range

studies. The three topics they have proposed this year, from which the President, in consultation with the SCC, will choose one for intensive study, are (1) Barriers to increasing faculty productivity; (2) Enhancing intra-University cooperation; and (3) Curricular duplication and its impact on quality. The President has indicated his preference for the "Barriers" topic. While some faculty see such a study as valuable and positive, others speculate that the wording makes it sound like preparation for collective bargaining or financial emergencies. Lehmborg said that Vice President Keller had described the topics to SCEP in slightly different terms, and said the Council was interested in ways of "measuring faculty productivity." Lehmborg also observed that all three proposed subjects are associated with SCEP's domain. It is not now known who would monitor the study--a task force, a standing Senate committee such as SCEP, an ad hoc SCC expanded subcommittee, or some other group.

Sullivan remarked upon the infelicitousness of the wording of the "Barriers" topic; for instance, "effectiveness" would be at least as good and perhaps more fitting than "productivity;" "increased" carries a suggestion of faculty laziness. The Facilitative Committee urged the SCC to request the administration to define the terms, or to cast the topic in more positive terms. Howe described the "Barriers" topic as the most important and interesting of the three. Kraabel observed that the Senate would like to be able to define the issues which interest it enough for intensive study. Eaton pointed out that the Planning Council's identifying key issues in no way precludes the Senate's bringing forward its own. Mueller observed the Planning Council's advantage in having staff and accessibility to data and key persons. Howe asked if there could not be a limited research budget held by the SCC to be used by various committees as needed. Senate committees sometimes need staff assistance in addition to the limited loan of a secretary. Eaton promised to send members of the Facilitative Committee minutes of the SCC meeting with Hasselmo at which the intensive-study subject will be discussed.

5. Ramifications of the Consent Decree.

a. New Senate committee. Eaton reported on progress towards establishing the University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women which is required by the consent decree to be constituted no later than the end of the first quarter of the current academic year. Josef Altholz has drafted a motion to the Senate for the creation of the new committees. Professors Sullivan and Hobbie (Vice Chairman of the Senate) are rewording that draft with the intention that the definition of the new committee can after committee establishment be changed to conform to and be incorporated into the new constitution and by-laws. The motion will go to the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees for approval, and be checked by University attorneys before being put on the Senate docket.

b. University processing of complaints of women not hired. Eaton read substantial portions of Vice President Hasselmo's letter on the University response to the consent decree and in affirmative action. Sullivan raised several concerns: There seems a circularity in the procedures; the handling is almost entirely administrative in nature; faculty participants are required to do administrative work for no return. She felt it essential that the process not be one which delays and impedes a solution, saying those were problems in the Rajender case itself. There was brief discussion of the numerous problems

Facilitative committee

10/13/80

p. 4

and difficulties emanating from the implementation of the consent decree. There was also concern raised about the nature of the data which will be made available to assist departments in affirmative action.

6. SCFA agenda. Eaton reported for Art Williams that SCFA on October 17 will hear a progress report from the Subcommittee on Sexual Harrassment on their development of grievance procedures; hear a renewal of a proposal for a personal resource service for faculty, similar in nature to one in place for civil service employees; and hear new data on sex differentials in faculty retirement plans.

7. Facilitative Committee Communications. It was agreed that for the fall quarter, initially, the SCC office will copy and distribute to the other committee chairs the minutes of the Senate committees as they come to the SCC.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Secretary