



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

Minutes
Faculty Consultative Committee
June 5, 1980

Chairman Richard Purple convened a meeting of the Faculty Consultative Committee at 11:00 a.m. on June 5 in room 404 of Coffman Memorial Union. Other members and members-elect present were Professors Blake, Brasted, Eaton, Hobbie, Melsa, Schletzer, Spring, Verrill and Ward.

1. Minutes. Copies were distributed of requested corrections to the FCC minutes for May 15. Action was postponed on approving or disapproving the minutes and the requested changes on FCC and FCC conversation with the President.

2. Collective bargaining. There was a brief discussion (1) questioning the effect the upcoming run-off election at Duluth will have upon the manner of Senate representation from that campus and (2) expressing a sense that the 1980 legislature disenfranchised the faculties of Morris, Crookston and Waseca by limiting them to a choice of no agent or the agent selected at Duluth. Professor Purple recommended asking the University attorney what the rights of the Senate are with regard to Duluth's representation on it.

3. Grievance and Legal Concerns Subcommittee report. Professor Eaton reported that she and Professors Spring and Purple had met the previous week with Vice President Hasselmo to consider the wisdom of naming a commission to look into the Rajender case, particularly with regard to communications before the announcement of the consent decree and repercussions since the announcement. She said that the Vice President had previously preferred to let the issue rest, but that the continuance of rumors and false information had persuaded him that the controversy is not subsiding. She asked whether the FCC believed there should be a commission of inquiry and, if so, whether it should be composed wholly, partly or not at all of FCC members. Some members indicated a preference for letting the controversy quietly expire. It was Professor Schletzer's opinion that such an inquiry might chiefly produce more recrimination. She also pointed out the difficulties raised because the cast of characters is always changing. Professor Blake said that while the legal repercussions and the significance of the case remain, he believed that prolonging bitterness and recrimination would be counterproductive to the University's mission.

Professor Verrill, however, said he thought it important to attend to principles involved and to help make clear to everyone just what the legal ramifications are of the affair including, for example, situations of oral promises made to non-tenured faculty. He added that many people would also like to know where the money is going to come from for attorneys' fees and possible other costs. Professor Spring said that with the University community all saying, in one way or another, "It's too bad," there is a need to develop an understanding of why and how the Rajender case and settlement happened and what can be done to prevent it from happening again. Professor Eaton added

that it was imperative to lay to rest the view that one must sacrifice excellence in order to hire women. Professor Hobbie said that while reviewing the whole affair would be overwhelming, he continues to have questions regarding the negotiation of the consent decree and how well Chemistry was kept informed, and also regarding the interpretation of the decree. Professor Purple said that the University owes something to the women of the faculty and should aim now to become the best affirmative action employer in the nation.

Professor Blake recommended that if the FCC names a commission, it be composed of persons outside the SCC. Professor Eaton said the subcommittee was suggesting a three-person commission of whom one would be a woman full professor and two would be men widely respected for their ability and fairness. Professor Verrill moved the FCC appoint a three-member commission with the individuals to be named later. He accepted as friendly, Professor Blake's amendment that the number of members and the exact charge be specified at a later date. The motion passed without dissent. Professor Brasted urged the FCC to put together a list of questions to which they would like answers. Professor Purple agreed to inform the Daily of the FCC's vote to create the commission.

4. Search Committee for Faculty Representatives to Athletic Department.

Professor Schletzer reported that the chairperson of the Search Committee for faculty representatives to athletics, Andrea Hinding, has deliberately slowed the process in order that the Twin Cities Campus Assembly could approve a related policy at the June 3, 1980, meeting. Now it is reported that Vice President Hasselmo is pressing to have persons named by July 1. This is impossible if correct procedures are to be followed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Meredith Poppele, Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

SUMMARY

DISCUSSION, FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE - REGENTS MEETING, 6/5/80

The Faculty Consultative Committee held a luncheon meeting with the Regents on June 5, 1980, in the East Wing of the Campus Club, at 11:30 a.m. The two items of business for discussion following lunch were faculty salaries and Senate reorganization. Copies of the SCFA proposal for faculty salary increases in four categories, and copies of the Senate reorganization plan as approved in principle by the Senate in April were distributed to the Regents.

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of UCRRBR, introduced the topic of faculty salaries emphasizing the decline in purchasing power, the steeply widening gap between the progress of faculty salaries in Minnesota and the progress of incomes generally in Minnesota, the competitive disadvantage of many schools and departments to attract first-rate people to their faculties, and suggesting that the relatively slow progress of salaries hits hardest professors in the middle years of their careers. He urged the University to work hard to win in the legislature both a catch-up increase and a floating cost-of-living increase since the rate of inflation in the national economy has been markedly underestimated in the recent past.

Regent Latz, acknowledging that he was speaking in part out of his experience as a former legislator, stated that the legislature would not be in the least impressed with the graph comparing faculty salaries and average incomes in the state as a whole in terms of constant dollars. The legislature would be interested, instead, in peer comparison, data comparing University of Minnesota faculty salaries with salaries of faculty at other Big Ten or similarly comparable universities.

Regent Lebedoff urged the faculty to take a far more active role in promoting the University and their own needs, particularly through contact with their own elected representatives.

Regent Schertler said that during her tenure on the Board, the Regents had taken very seriously the needs of the faculty and had promoted them earnestly.

Faculty Consultative Committee and Regents

6/5/80

p. 2

Professor W. Donald Spring gave a brief overview of the origins, development and present status of the plan for reorganization of the Senate committee structure.