



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

INDEX BY MEETING OF SUPPORT MATERIALS
INTRODUCED IN OR ARISING FROM
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS
1982-83

- 9/16/82 - Draft summary of discussion held in this closed meeting with President Magrath regarding All University Honors Committee business.
- Memo: All University Honors Committee to SCC, re naming of buildings (6/3/82).
- Corr: Prof. P. Swan, Chr., SCC and FCC, to Hon Wenda Moore, Chr., Board of Regents, regarding business of Regents and of All University Honors Committee (7/27/82).
- Corr: V. P. Keller to Prof. Swan re naming faculty to a task force concerned with developing guidelines for University-industry relations (9/7/82).
- Corr: Request, Prof. Swan to Pres. Magrath, for Chairperson of Senate Tenure Committee to report in September to the Regents Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs (7/12/82).
- Corr: Several pieces: Prof. Bradford to Pres. Magrath (6/4/82), V. P. Keller to Prof. Bradford (6/14/82), V. P. Keller to Editor, Minnesota Daily (4/23/82), Prof. Bradford to the U. of M. community (via the Minnesota Daily) (6/14/82), Humphrey Institute Director Harlan Cleveland to Lawrence Perlman, V. P. and General Counsel for Control Data (4/28/82), Prof. Bradford to Humphrey Institute Faculty (5/13/82).
- 9/30/82 - Doc: FCC resolution regarding faculty salaries and submission to binding arbitration (9/30/82) (re equalization of salary norms between Twin Cities and UMD).
- Memo: FCC to Regents, conveying text of resolution (10/6/82).
- 10/21/82 - Memo: Prof. Swan to chairpersons of Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and on Tenure re proposal to grant new tenure contracts on a 9-month basis.
- Doc: List of chairpersons of St. Paul Campus faculty consultative committees, invited to this meeting.

- 10/21/82 - Memo: Prof. Swan invitation to chairpersons of St. Paul Campus
cont. faculty consultative committees.
- 11/18/82 - Doc: "Percent of FY72 Purchasing Power," showing Senate goals
for long-range faculty salary improvement.
- Corr: V. P. Keller to Prof. George Sell, Chr., SCFA, enclosing
copy of above salary plan (11/18/82).
- Doc: "Occupational Groupings - 1983 Legislature."
- 12/2/82 - Corr: Pres. Magrath to Gov. Quie, Rep. Sieben, and Sen. Nelson
responding to state's request for report on the impact of
hypothetical cuts of various sizes upon the University of Minnesota.
- Doc: Average salaries for faculty members -- clipping from the
Chronicle of Higher Education, showing Minnesota institutions (9/1/82).
- 1/13/83 - Corr: Pres. Magrath to Prof. Swan re future agenda items (1/7/83).
- 2/3/83 - Corr: Prof. Swan to Pres. Magrath setting forth agenda.
- 2/17/83 - Memo: Prof. Swan to V. P. Keller re appointment of Dean David Lilly
as Presidential Consultant on the University and Minnesota's Economy.
- 2/24/83 - Doc: "Academic Salary Request."
- Corr: Christopher Ison, Editor, Minnesota Daily, to Prof. Swan,
protesting the closed FCC meeting of February 3 (2/14/83).
- 4/14/83 - Corr: Pres. Magrath to Prof. Swan (4/11/83).
- Corr: Prof. Swan to Pres. Magrath -- agenda items for 4/14 meeting.
- Memo: Ann Bailly to Prof. Swan regarding errors in mailing list
used for ballots for Twin Cities faculty members of Senate
Consultative Committee.
- Memo: V. P. Bohlen to Prof. Swan regarding mailing list problems.
- Memo: Pres. Magrath to Deans and Selected Others: "A New Dimension
for Private Fund Raising for the University of Minnesota" (4/4/83).
- Corr: Pres. Magrath to the Hon. Eugene T. Waldorf (3/30/83):
sample of letter President sent to several legislative leaders
regarding need for faculty salary improvement.

- 4/28/83 - Corr: Prof. Swan to V. P. Vanselow re search committee for Dean of the Medical School (4/21/83).
- Doc: Re above search, a list of proposed search committee members as telephoned from V. P. Vanselow to Prof. Swan (4/19/83).
- Corr: Prof. Swan to V. P. Bohlen (4/29/83).
- Corr: Prof. Swan to Pres. Magrath regarding search for replacement for V. P. Bohlen.
- Corr: Pres. Magrath to Prof. Swan regarding search process (4/24/83).
- Doc: "Search Committee Guidelines" from Senate minutes of 4/17/80.
- 5/19/83 - Memo: Prof. Swan to FCC re salary appropriation pending at Legislature.
- Doc: "Biennial Request/Recommendations" 5/11/83).
- Doc: "Discussion Outline for Grievance Procedures" (5/19/83).
- 5/26/83 - Corr: Prof. Swan to V. P. Kegler re legislative riders (6/22/83).
- Memo: V. P. Kegler to Regents, President, et al, "New Riders, 1983 Appropriations Bills."
- Corr. and doc: Survey on faculty morale from University of Washington, and accompanying corr.
- Doc: "University of Minnesota, Comparison of Average Salaries and Fringe Benefits..." for years 1979-1983.
- 6/16/83 - Corr: Prof. Swan to Pres. Magrath re University participation in National Council on International Manpower and Research (6/16/83).
- Doc: "Conference on The Development and Utilization of International Skills," including "Proposal for the Establishment of a National Council on International Research and Manpower" (conference date 4/28/83).
- Corr: Pres. Magrath to Prof. Turner re National Council (6/28/83).
- Corr: Prof. Turner to Pres. Magrath (7/5/83).
- Corr: Prof. Swan to V. P. Hasselmo (6/17/83).
- Doc: University of Minnesota Faculty Retirements (1982-2000) (by college and by blocks of years).
- Corr: Draft text and cover memo to FCC of letter to Pres. Magrath regarding Regents' action in supporting F.I.R.E. Center funding over alternative budget item.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

UNIVERSITY SENATE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1982-83

INDEX OF TOPICS BY MEETING

Sept. 16, 1982

- FCC
1. Report from Regents Educational Policy Committee
 - a. University-industry relationships (establishing principles for)
 - b. University contract with Genetics International.
 2. Legislative Relations: report from Peter Robinson, faculty legislative liaison.
 3. Tenure Code review.

FCC meeting
with the
President
and others

Closed meeting.

1. Honors Committee and Regential action.
2. University's collective bargaining negotiations with the UEA.

Sept. 30, 1982

- FCC
1. Nomination to Senate Planning Committee.
 2. Naming faculty to task force on faculty workload.
 3. Committee on Charitable Giving (re Cooperating Fund Drive request to come on campus).
 4. Resolution regarding the principles of excellence, merit, and equity in reference to methods of determining faculty salaries (in response to equalization demand by UMEA).

Oct. 21, 1982

- FCC
1. Setting agenda for quarterly meetings with Regents.
 2. FCC responsibility in naming board members to bodies outside the governance structure.
 3. Senate and Assembly agenda.
 4. University grievance procedures (a subcommittee is to begin review and revision).

Oct. 21, 1982cont.

- FCC meeting with the President and others
1. University-UEA bargaining sessions to resume (announcement).
 2. Faculty workload, productivity measures, and uses of the data.
 3. Mode of faculty appointments: 'A' vs. 'B', particularly regarding new hiring.
 4. Professional/Administrative appointments: criteria to be applied regarding converting certain faculty positions.
 5. Mandatory retirement age: President's concern over Congressional move to lift.

Nov. 18, 1982

- FCC
1. Faculty grievance procedures study and proposal.

- FCC meeting with the President and others
1. Regents' faculty salary request for 1983-85 biennium.
 2. The state financial situation.

Dec. 2, 1982

- FCC
1. The desirability of closed meetings for consultation with the President on some subjects.
 2. Reputational rankings of departments.
 3. FCC communication with University faculty as a whole.

Dec. 9, 1982

- FCC
1. Professor Calvin Bradford and the Humphrey Institute.
 2. Honors Committee and the Regents.
 3. Open and closed FCC meetings.
 4. The state fiscal crisis: impact on the University, how to absorb cuts.

Dec. 16, 1982

- FCC
1. Nominating committee for Assembly Committee on Committees.
 2. Faculty representation on committee for developing University-industry relationships policy.

FCC meeting with the President and others

Closed meeting.

1. University's budget cut for FY 1982-83
 - base cut; how to take it;
 - cuts in state contributions to employees' retirement funds;
 - effect on salaries.

Dec. 16, 1982 2. UEA: negotiated settlement close.
cont.

3. Consent decree
 - legal fees;
 - Schick and Platt case.
4. Professor Calvin Bradford and the Humphrey Institute.

Jan. 13, 1983

FCC

Closed meeting.

1. Faculty night out (Campus Club dinner, women's basketball game).
2. Planning/Consulting.
3. Faculty newsletter for Winter Quarter.
4. Tenure Code revision.
5. Legislative prospects.
6. University Relations.
7. Nominating committee for Committee on Committees.
8. University-Industry Relations Committee.
9. President Magrath's speech to NCAA on higher academic standards for athletes.

Feb. 3, 1983

FCC

1. Proposed hearing on Tenure Code revision.

FCC meeting
with the
President
and others.

Closed meeting.

1. Setting overall priorities in planning and budgeting.
2. "Inloading" credit instruction.
3. Strategy for working with the Legislature during the current session.

Feb. 17, 1983

FCC

1. Hearing on Tenure Code revision.
2. Faculty night out.
3. Second cycle planning
 - SCC and the planning theme task forces;
 - Theme task force on University and the Economy of the State.
4. Planning SCC's meeting with Vice President Bohen.
5. Open or closed FCC meeting with the President on March 3?

Feb. 24, 1983

- FCC
1. University-ROTC Relations Committee and the University's contracts with the services. Requesting review of the ROTC programs.
 2. Permitting the closing of some FCC meetings; FCC subcommittee to draft an amendment to Senate bylaws.
 3. Setting the agenda for SCC's March 3 discussion with the President.

Mar. 31, 1983

- FCC
1. Report on disposition of request made to All University Honors Committee for interim action.
 2. Committee memberships: preliminary discussion of FCC nominations to Business and Rules, Planning, Finance, and the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.
 3. SCC newsletter; comments upon the draft text.
 4. Flaws discovered in University's faculty mailing list. Some members did not receive their ballot for Assembly Steering Committee election.

Apr. 14, 1983

- FCC
1. Faculty legislative liaison: Peter Robinson reporting to FCC. Discussion of the future of the position.
 2. FCC votes to invalidate the election of new members to the Assembly Steering Committee because of errors in the mailing list used for the ballots, and to give directions for holding a new election.
 3. Nominations for vice chairperson of the Senate and Assembly.

- FCC meeting with the President and others.
1. Intended reallocation of funds retrenched from the colleges in 1983-85. Extended discussion.
 2. The place of the arts and sciences in the University's mission and in its current activities. Extended discussion.

Apr. 21, 1983

- FCC
1. Nominations for Senate and Assembly committees.

Apr. 28, 1983

- FCC
1. Discussion of the planning process and of the response SCC should make to the Budget Executive's request that the Consultative Committee make a statement to the Regents about the validity of the planning and of its results.

- Apr. 28, 1983
cont.
2. Nominating a vice chairperson for the Senate and Assembly.
 3. Advising President Magrath on the search process for a replacement for Finance and Operations Vice President Bohlen.
 4. Proposed amendment to Senate bylaws to permit closing some FCC meetings.

May 19, 1983

FCC

1. Cooperating Fund Drive. Special Senate subcommittee not ready with a recommendation to the Senate. FCC considers CFD's request it be allowed to continue the pilot project for a second year.
2. Grievance Subcommittee: distribution of preliminary recommendations. Extended discussion on the draft report.

FCC meeting
with the
President
and others

1. Reports on and discussion of the status of the University's appropriations bills within the Legislature.

May 26, 1983

FCC

1. University of Washington's survey on faculty morale.
2. Faculty salary rankings (comparisons within the Big Ten plus California).
3. Report on filling committee memberships.
4. Future of faculty legislative liaison position.
5. University-Industry Relations Committee.

June 2, 1983

FCC

1. Committee appointments.
2. Election of SCC chairperson and associate chairperson for 1983-84.
3. Mechanism for faculty lobbying in the next legislative session. With Peter Robinson.

June 16, 1983

FCC

1. Proposal for the University of Minnesota to join the National Council on International Research and Manpower. Affirmative vote taken.
2. Committee appointments.
3. Tenure Code revision-- making the process very open.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
909 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2653

May 13, 1982

To: Humphrey Institute Faculty.
From: Calvin Bradford *Calvin Bradford*
Re: Control Data - Hubert Humphrey Institute Issue

I have enclosed several letters and memos which provide a background for our discussion of the Control Data issue. These materials are assembled in two packages. The first package includes letters and memos which are all related to contacts outside the University. The second package includes internal memos.

The key external items are the letter of January 6, 1981, from Larry Perlman of Control Data to me, the March 10, 1982, letter from Larry Perlman to Harlan Cleveland, the April 28, 1982, letter from Harlan Cleveland to Larry Perlman, and the May 4, 1982, letter from James Hogg of Control Data to Harlan Cleveland. The key internal memos are Harlan's memo and attachment to President Magrath on March 19, 1982, and my April 2, 1982, memo to Harlan.

I am sure that Harlan had the best of intentions in what he has done. I do not believe anyone in the University approached the issue with any malice. Nonetheless, through errors in process and what I believe are misplaced priorities and too much concern about how we appear to outside private interests, I think we have negotiated and entered into an agreement with Control Data which compromises both the integrity of the Institute and the principles of academic freedom. Clearly, I view the problem as being much more serious than does Harlan.

Since we are going to have a chance to discuss the issue in detail, I will simply try to offer a summary of my position.

Since last May (1981), when Control Data discovered that we were investigating the operations of City Venture Corporation, they have tried to influence our work by applying pressure to people outside of the project or to our superiors. When we planned a June, 1981, meeting of community people (some from City Venture cities and more from economic development efforts in other places), they had an old friend of Harlan's who is their Washington lobbyist, contact Harlan. In addition, someone contacted Magrath's office, and the director of the City Venture project in Toledo, contacted Art Naftalin, an old friend. All the contacts were to see what was going on and to express a concern that Control Data had not been invited to this meeting of community people. Finally, an employee of City Venture tried to hire one of the Humphrey

Institute students to collect information about what we were doing and pass it on to Control Data, according to the report of the student to me.

Harlan thought we should meet personally with the President of City Venture and a Vice President of Control Data to respond to their concerns. This was this first point where Harlan and I disagreed about the nature of the project. Harlan thought that any such project which looked at the work of City Venture should have as one of its goals the desire to help City Venture work better. I felt, and still feel, that this would make us one of their agents, and that any benefits which they might receive should come from the indirect impacts of the work. I stated that the point of the work was to develop within the community sector a more enlightened and detailed discussion of what it means to have private sector partnerships and that I presumed that as a public product, this would also be of interest to the private sector and government people involved. While it was clearly gracious to meet with them, I have always been concerned that this appears to be asking permission to talk about them - and we never meet with citizens before we do research about them.

At this meeting, these two men protested that if anyone was going to come to talk about City Venture, they should be allowed to pick all the critics. We politely turned down this request.

By January, Larry Perlman escalated the pressure by sending a letter to me stating that they were concerned about our biases, and claiming that articles which he cited were inaccurate and inflammatory. (My response is in the March 8, 1982, letter from me to Larry Perlman.) On March 10, 1982, Perlman sent a letter to Harlan trying to discredit my staff and our reputations and asking Harlan to disassociate himself and the Institute from our work. I think it improper to respond to challenges filed on the grounds of anyone's political views, and the claims of interference and the comments about the position of the World Council of Churches are categorically false.

Harlan responded by setting up a meeting between himself and Perlman. I agreed with Harlan that it could be helpful to have a committee help him decide how to respond, although I would not have even responded with a special meeting had I been in his shoes. I also indicated that because of the importance and sensitivity of the issue, I had already planned to ask Control Data to write their own response to our work, to be published with our work.

What I now object to is that Harlan revised the offer I made in the meeting so that Control Data was told that they could submit an article which we would publish (with no mention of review or critique), and that a special review panel was established to decide about publishing my work, AND, Control data would be asked to submit a private critique to be considered prior to Harlan's decision about publishing my work. I feel that Control Data was given an opportunity to write whatever they wanted with no review and I am now, essentially, subjected to two potential veto operations.

It is one thing to be gracious, it is another to subject a faculty member to what I feel is a kind of punitive review in response to outside pressures which were clearly designed to intimidate the Institute and do damage to the professional reputations of Institute faculty and staff.

In my April 2, 1982, memo, I expressed my concern about the effect of any such agreement, particularly any discussion which Harlan had had with Perlman about "turning down the burner" on our work, as Harlan said he characterized it to Perlman.

I saw the April 28, 1982, letter of understanding before Harlan sent it. I told him that I thought it was not acceptable, particularly point #2 which allowed for their review of my work. I do not have any problem with academic review processes or the Institute developing one for their publications. I do object to imposing one ad hoc as a result of pressures and then defining as the only outside reviewer, a company which has made clear its desire to suppress and terminate the work in question.

The May 4, 1982 letter from James Hogg (the same man quoted in the Daily on April 21, 1982, noting in a letter to a stockholder that Control Data takes account of the politics of faculty members when granting money to a university) states clearly on page 3 that Control Data's understanding of Harlan's agreement is that we cannot speak about our work, write anything, or discuss our work until it is complete and Control Data has had full rights of review and critique. This is precisely the interpretation I feared. It is, in my opinion, a gag order.

I am sorry that we have come to this point. Many times along the way, the process could have avoided this present state. I requested that the matter be discussed before the faculty and that the university attorney be consulted, but both requests were resisted, the first on the grounds that nothing would be granted to Control Data. Once the review committee met without my being there, and as you can see from the memos between me and Bob Einsweiler, I feel that the review process became involved in inappropriate issues.

I am pleased to discuss the issue, the facts, the allegations, and anything else which you are interested in on this matter. I am indeed sorry for the present state of affairs, but I feel that I must protect the integrity of the research, the university, and the Institute as my conscience dictates.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612) 373-3226

Cuc FCC
7-28

July 27, 1982

Honorable Wenda W. Moore
2727 Dean Parkway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

Dear Wenda:

As the Faculty Consultative Committee looks forward to the 1982-83 academic year, we anticipate another year of good working relationships with the Regents. Good communication is essential to the best interests of the University; thus we value the opportunities for frank, informal discussions at our quarterly meetings with the Regents. Because we value this relationship, I am writing to suggest that we, the Board and the Committee, work together for continued improvement in our communication. Specifically, I wish to urge that the Regents request the President to inform our committee whenever they have questions or experience a sense of frustration about matters that have been delegated to the University Senate and its committees.

Recently, the policy regarding the process whereby an individual is nominated for a University honor was apparently of concern to the Regents. We are now aware that there was a series of contacts between the Regents or the President and the Honors Committee regarding an appropriate recognition for former President Moos. It may have been due in part to a sense of frustration about the faculty's role in the nomination process, that the Regents finally used a procedure outside of established policy to name a building for Moos. The Faculty Consultative Committee, which is also the faculty portion of the Senate Steering Committee, was not made aware of the problem until after the fact. We have no desire to question the action itself, but we are concerned about the fact that the faculty and the Honors Committee were by-passed. We are aware that the Honors Committee could also have told us about the problem before the Regents took action, yet in the interest of confidentiality they chose not to do so.

May I suggest that in the future, the Faculty Consultative Committee is the group most likely to be in a position to help with University Senate matters of concern to the Regents and that

Hon. Wenda Moore
July 27, 1982
page 2

when such matters arise, the Regents inquire of the President whether the Consultative Committee has been made aware of the situation. We are somewhat uncertain as to whether the Regents have changed policy with regard to the process for originating and screening nominations for naming University buildings or if the previously established policy remains in effect. May we hear from you whether your recent action was intended as a precedent, or whether it was considered to be an exception?

For our part, we realize that we have not made sufficient efforts to communicate with the Board of Regents about matters of mutual concern. We pledge to improve our communication efforts this year, because we believe that good communication will continue to build trust in our working relationships. We value mutual trust and believe the Regents do also. We look forward to an interesting, challenging, and mutually satisfying year in our work together.

Sincerely yours,



Patricia B. Swan, Chair,
Faculty Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp

cc: C. Peter Magrath
Duane Wilson

bcc: Caroline Beaudet & d. d.