



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

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

#### TENTATIVE AGENDA

Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, April 17, 1980 10:00 - 10:30  
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

1. Fix Agenda.
2. Minutes of March 20 meetings (sent previously; amended draft of the memo of the FCC conversation with the President is enclosed).
3. Report of the Chair (below).
4. Items for discussion with the President.
5. Adjournment.

#### Report of the Chair.

Regential action on the conflict-of-interest policy may be completed by the time of our meeting, and I will be prepared to report on this. Regent Latz's letter of response to our letter came in the day before the April Regents meeting, and I will utilize the opportunity of their meeting to speak to the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee.

No one has to date submitted items they wish discussed with the President (10:30-11:30 immediately following our meeting). I will have to notify the President's office of intended topics by next Tuesday or Wednesday at the latest. Please call in your concerns.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

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

DRAFT

Minutes

Faculty Consultative Committee  
April 17, 1980

FCC Chair Richard Purple convened a meeting of the Faculty Consultative Committee at 10:10 a.m. on Thursday, April 17 in Room 300 of Morrill Hall. Also present were members Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton, Wendell Glick, Russell Hobbie, Cleon Melsa, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Don Spring, and Assistant to the President Carol Pazandak.

1. The agenda was fixed.
2. The minutes of the FCC's meeting of March 20 and the amended draft memo of the FCC conversation with the President on that date were approved.
3. Professor Hobbie reported on the item on policy on business enterprises at the Regents Physical Plant and Investments Committee meeting of April 10. At issue was a proposed amendment to the Regents' policy on student businesses which apparently removed appellate authority from the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs and delegated final authority to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Professor Hobbie appeared on behalf of the Consultative Committee to request that any change in constitutional status of an Assembly committee go through the normal Assembly consultative procedure before action by the Board of Regents. There was apparently some confusion about the proposed wording, as it had been drafted to clear up an inconsistency regarding the roles of the vice presidents for Finance and for Student Affairs. In the rewriting the appeal procedure naming ACSA had been left off since the Board of Regents does not ordinarily specify an appeals process in policy statements. However, there had been no intention of removing ACSA from the process and, due in part to Regent Unger's advocacy, the substitute paragraph was removed for further consideration.

Because important Assembly business is arising, the Chair announced that he is calling a meeting of the Assembly steering committee for April 24 (2:00-3:00 p.m., Campus Club room 608). He remarked that it is the understanding of the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs that it stands between the Regents and the Board of Student Publications in matters concerning that board. Carol Pazandak said the ACSA hopes to have an information item on the Board of Student Publications at the April 24 TCCA meeting.

4. Professor Purple reported on the Regents' consideration of Regent Latz's post-employment policy proposal and on the unfounded verbal abuse he and the FCC were subjected to in the April 10 meeting of the Regents Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs. Professor Latz stated in committee that he did not understand why faculty should be interested in the question since it was strictly between the Regents and the administrators. That point seemed to impress the Regents, who voted in committee in favor of the policy with Regent Unger

abstaining, and then voted as a whole Board, 11-1 (Peterson dissenting) to adopt the policy.

There appeared to be unanimous disapproval in the FCC both for the Regent committee chairperson's erroneous criticism of Professor Purple and the FCC and for the Regents' implication that faculty had no business concerning themselves with issues primarily involving people who happen at a given time to be serving as administrators. Professors Spring and Eaton specifically expressed their distress at the treatment accorded the FCC and its chair. Professor Spring suggested the FCC discuss the problems in its relations with the Regents prior to the scheduled June 5 luncheon with them, and Professor Eaton recommended the problem be put on the agenda for discussion with them. Professor Hobbie expressed the view that the difficulties arise because of the personalities of individual Regents. He sees little opportunity for gain other than by educational work to effect the choice of some better Regents in the future. He pointed out that the Consultative Committee may be on a collision course with the Regents over the ACSA, the Board of Student Publications and the Daily, and he recommended this latter as a much better issue to collide on. The other members acknowledged the wisdom of his point.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 for the FCC to begin its conversation with President Magrath.

Meredith Poppele



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

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

DRAFT MEMORANDUM

FCC Conversation with President Magrath  
Thursday, Apr. 17, 1980

1. The President joined the faculty and Dr. Pazandak at 10:25 a.m. and entered into the discussion of the issues of post-employment ("conflict-of-interest") policy and relations generally with the Regents. It was his opinion that this policy is not going to amount to much, that it will be a rather meaningless gesture. He also thinks no one will ever attempt to extend it to the faculty. Professor Purple stated his resentment of the Regents' implication that the faculty had no business looking into this matter at all. The President agreed that the implication was wrong. He pointed out that Regent Schertler on April 11 did make a clear public apology for the scolding she had served up the previous day. Professor Purple commented that all her public scoldings, which are directed at the administration far more than at the faculty, are inappropriate.

In response to Professor Hobbie's inquiring as to whether the conflict-of-interest discussion represented an isolated instance or whether the Regents generally do not take faculty views seriously, the President replied that the Regents generally, and as a whole, do not discount faculty views.

Professor Glick asked the President how the present Board of Regents differs from other board he has observed. The President replied that (1) open meeting laws have affected the posture people take in meetings; (2) boards now are much more interventionist than one and two decades ago; and (3) board membership is considerably different now from 20 years ago when a member typically was an affluent, successful male WASP. Among other implications is that some people who serve now have no other role to fill which is as important as being a Regent.

2. The consent decree for the Rajender case was discussed next. Professor Purple speculated that the faculty, lacking prior acquaintance and conditioning, will react to it with anger. President Magrath replied that he appreciated that response but that the University did not have any choices. He fears faculty reaction would ultimately have been worse had the hearings drawn on and on with legal costs escalating, on a case the University would anyway have lost in the end. Professor Hobbie inquired to what extent the faculty can be given information to help them understand what the alternatives were. The President responded that while there cannot be public briefing sessions on the details of this case, he would recommend additional information sessions between attorneys and representative faculty members, probably department chairs, to help spread an understanding of the alternatives and the settlement, and he directed Dr. Pazandak to begin setting up such meetings.

Professor Glick stated his concern as a faculty member about the assignment of a "Master" in hiring disputes. The President replied that the master comes in, if at all, only at the end of a long stage of grievance procedures. Professor Purple said he was concerned that the new Senate committee on equal

opportunity for women, required to be formed as part of the settlement, might tie up Lillian Willians' equal opportunity office and the collegiate deans. President Magrath stated his hope that the committee would be composed of mature faculty whose sense of responsibility was to the good of the University. The committee is supposed to come into being by January 1, 1981. Professor Purple said it was his guess there will be wide interest in what this case has cost the University.

3. Vice President for Academic Affairs Search. President Magrath thanked the faculty for the dialogues the SCC had had with the four vice presidential candidates. He thought those interviews had helped the candidates orient themselves for the remainder of their discussions on the campus. He also spoke of the SCC's "very judicious assessment" of the four candidates, conveyed to him by telephone and then by letter. He said that Ken Keller will officially take office on June 15 and that in the meantime he is being carboned on all correspondence which goes to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, is invited to briefing meetings, and is starting to make rounds, as time permits, to talk with the deans. The President stated his support for the reorganization of the Office of Academic Affairs and to funding, within reason, some additional staff.

4. Professor Glick asked the status of the search for a Vice President for Finance. Dr. Pazandak reported that the search committee plans a screening session at April 25 to arrive at a slate of six to eight candidates for interviewing. She asked for reactions to the search committee's plan to bring in a total of up to eight candidates who would meet with the University community at that first visit, along with the search committee. Because of the more specialized requirements of the position, the search committee wishes to involve more people at an earlier stage of the review process.

Professor Hobbie asked whether it was likely that people who saw themselves as semi-finalists, not finalists, would wish to put themselves through all those meetings. He also wondered whether confidentiality would be a problem with broader participation at an earlier stage. Dr. Pazandak replied on the confidentiality question that this search committee had not been refused in its request of all those under consideration for permission to call their campuses and make inquiries.

5. State legislation. The President said the so-called "garbage bill" includes revisions to the Public Employees Relations Act. If the governor signs that bill, the University will have to ask questions and examine the implications for University employees. An important question, he said, will be whether, if the bill becomes law, the University will have a grace period of six to nine months in which to move certain relevant items through the Board of Regents, unencumbered by the "cease and desist" order.

The meeting concluded at 11:40 a.m.

Meredith Poppele