



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
November 5, 1981
MINUTES

Approved 11/19/81

The meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee was convened by Douglas Pratt, Chair, at 12:45 p.m. on November 5, 1981 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall. The other SCC members present were Robert Brasted, Nancy Brecht, Jim Brewer, Marcia Eaton, Virginia Fredricks, John Howe, Keith Jacobson, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marvin Mattson, Paul Quie, Patricia Swan, Richard Purple, Donald Spring, and Kit Wiseman. Guests present included Carol Pazandak, Jim Borgestad, Peter Robinson, and from the press, Maureen Smith and Don Jacobson.

1. Agenda

Addition under new business- special meeting of the Tenure Committee

2. Minutes of October 22 meeting-

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the Chair- distributed

Item 3- The Business and Rules Committee will discuss the request of the Civil Service for a greater involvement in University governance following Assembly approval of the revised TCCA Constitution, By-laws and Rules.

4. Student Chair's Report-

a. The Minnesota Student Association has scheduled a rally for December 1, 1981 to demonstrate student concern about the University budget crisis. Support has already been received from other student organizations. Faculty are encouraged to attend.

Discussion- Professor Purple suggested that the rally emphasize proposed solutions to the overall crisis (such as a tax increase) in order to demonstrate a broadly based concern.

The MSA is also speaking with legislators and the Legislative Relations Committee, and undertaking a letter-writing campaign.

b. Students on the Senate and Assembly Committees are concerned about what the student role in University governance would be if collective bargaining goes through.

5. Committee Reports-

a. Finance Committee- The Committee was to meet November 5, following the SCC meeting, to further discuss the budget principles emerging from the fall meetings with the deans. These discussions are part of continuing planning efforts which will form the basis of the University budget for the next two years.

b. Legislative Relations Committee- The committee is considering whether or not to assemble a Citizen Advisory Board which would lobby for the University and help to educate the public about University concerns.

Discussion- Some concern was raised about whether the actions of such a committee could be integrated with other efforts already being made. A consensus was reached that, keeping in mind this concern, further exploration into the Board's formation should take place.

c. Grievance and Legal Concerns Committee- The committee has not yet met with the Sexual Harassment Board because the Sexual Harassment Board has not yet held a meeting.

Discussion- Professor Swan suggested that the Sexual Harassment Board be encouraged to meet. Professor Pratt stated that he would so encourage them by letter.

6. Old Business-

A motion was made that the Assembly Steering Committee endorse the report of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics which recommends the President enroll the Women's program in the Big Ten. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent. The Assembly steering committee will co-sponsor the motion to the Assembly with ACIA.

7. New Business-

a. Chairman Pratt called for discussion of the proposal to hold a special meeting of the Senate, in conjunction with the November 19 meeting of the TCCA, for the purpose of improving communications between the Faculty and the Administration regarding the budget crisis.

Discussion-

Professor Spring observed that, even though such a meeting would come before very many crucial decisions could be made, personal discussion is always good. Professor Eaton concurred and stated that as many sessions as possible would be good. Ms. Wiseman commented that people who are not involved on a day to day basis with these matters need information and the opportunity to ask "dumb" questions.

Vice President Keller stated that he welcomed any chance to talk with people. President Magrath also indicated he would be open to any such meeting.

Professor Purple wondered if the format for the session would be more like a forum than a meeting. Professor Spring said the difference between a forum and a meeting would be that there is no agenda for a forum and no votes can be taken. A motion was made that the special meeting be held as a forum. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent.

b. Professor Eaton proposed that the Tenure Committee begin looking at the Tenure Code to see if revisions are necessary. After some discussion a motion was made that the Tenure Committee examine the Tenure Code (Section 15, in particular) to see whether revisions are necessary and, if they are, to begin to make them. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned at 1:35 p.m. to provide time for the Conversation with the President. It was again brought to order at 2:40 p.m.

Discussion continued about the expanded role of the Finance Committee. Professor Swan stated that there needed to be regular consultation with the Budget Executive one step before their decisions were presented to the Finance Committee. Professor Fredricks agreed that such an expanded role would be beneficial. Ms. Wiseman expressed her concern that students be adequately represented. Professor Eaton suggested that, since those already serving on the Finance Committee are most knowledgeable, a subcommittee should perhaps consist of an "augmented" Finance Committee. Professor Spring argued that too large a subcommittee would be destructive of the consulting purpose. Ms. Wiseman then suggested the committee consist of someone from the Finance Committee, one other faculty SCC member, a student SCC member, and a member of the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Howe then made a motion that the SCC Chair, the Finance Committee Chair, and the SCC Student Chair serve as a subcommittee to form a subcommittee which would attend meetings of the Budget Executive. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Helmstetter



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

Report of the Chair for November 5.

1. As per SCC's directions at our last meeting, I have written letters to President Magrath and Vice President Keller asserting the SCC's expectation to be consulted throughout the current financial crisis. The letter to V.P. Keller was co-signed by Pat Swan on behalf of the Finance Committee.

2. On Thursday night, October 22, after returning from our meeting at Morris, I received a call from President Magrath informing me of a special meeting on Saturday, October 24, of members of central administration, deans, etc., and selected faculty members to discuss the financial crisis that he had learned of that day. Attending for FCC were Marcia Eaton, Bob Brasted and I. Walter Johnson represented the Finance Committee. At the Saturday meeting President Magrath and Vice President Keller discussed the manner in which they felt the University should deal with the Governor's request for a plan to reduce the state's appropriation to the University by 8%, 10%, or 12%. Central Administration's proposal was widely supported by those present and the details were subsequently made public at the special meeting of the Board of Regents on Monday, October 26.

3. I am pleased to announce that Tom Scott, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, has agreed to serve on the Finance Committee.

4. A meeting has been arranged between Stan Lehmberg (SCEP), Bob Hexter (Research), Carl Adams, Chair of the Committee on Computation, Communications and Information, and myself, for November 6 to exchange points of view and to provide for further Senate committee input into the development of the CCI committee's proposals. I expect to assert the SCC's concern for the primacy of educational policy in the committee's deliberations.

5. By the time of our meeting I expect to have a motion for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly from the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. Because of SCC's actions at the October 8 meeting I assume that we might want to co-sponsor their motion for the November 19 Assembly meeting.

Douglas C. Pratt



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

General College
106 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October 24, 1981

To: Shirley Raynes
Office of the Vice President
for Student Affairs
110 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis Campus

From: David L. Giese
Chair, Assembly Committee on
Business and Rules

The Business and Rules Committee has been working on the Assembly constitution since last winter quarter. The committee became aware of the request for additional civil service representation on the Assembly and committees of the Assembly. We also were aware that the professional staff would also have to be included in the constitution. The committee decided that we would not be able to finish our draft of the constitution by this fall if we attempted to include both civil service and the professional staff in the revision. We therefore agreed to finish the basic documents for fall review and ratification and also agreed to begin the information gathering phase leading to the revisions necessary for appropriate representation from the civil service and professional staff. I will contact you in late fall when the B & R committee considers the requests concerning additional representation

copy: Douglas Pratt, chair, Senate Consultative Committee
Jerome Larson, Civil Service Committee
W. D. Spring, Cunsultative Committee

university
of
minnesota
memo

date 11/3 19 81

to Doug Pratt

from Chuck Walcott *CW*

At Meredith Poppele's request, I have prepared the enclosed motion and comment. As I indicated to her, I'd prefer to have this go in as a motion proposed by both your committee and mine. Thus I hope this will be acceptable to you and the Steering Committee. Since I have never had the privilege of writing one of these before and am unfamiliar with the ways of the Assembly, I won't be ~~suu~~prised should something require changing. If you want to make changes of substantive consequence, I probably won't mind and will be happy to talk about it. I'll be in my office (3-2651) Wednesday 10:15 - 11:30 and 2-4, and Thursday roughly 2-4 or 4:30.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Political Science
1414 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2651

November 2, 1981

MOTION:

That the Assembly advise the President to enroll the University's Women's Intercollegiate Athletic program in the Big Ten Conference.

COMMENT:

The University of Minnesota is a founding member of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives - more commonly known as the Big Ten. Minnesota's Men's athletic teams have participated within the Conference framework since 1896. However, it was not until the summer of 1980 that the Big Ten created a Task Force to develop administrative arrangements for the official inclusion of women's athletic programs in the Conference and sponsorship by the Conference of women's competition. Minnesota's Faculty Representatives for both Women's and Men's Intercollegiate Athletics participated fully in the deliberations of the Task Force.

By the spring of 1981 the Task Force had produced a document detailing the conditions under which women's programs might become part of the Big Ten. This document was approved unanimously by the Council of Ten (University Presidents) and forwarded to the member universities with a request that each member respond by July 15, 1981 with a decision to join, to refuse to join, or to defer a decision pending further consideration.

The Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, which had been monitoring and discussing the matter of women and the Big Ten during the year, formally considered the question at its meeting on June 3, 1981. Significant reservations were expressed by Committee members and by spokespersons for the Department of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics. Basically, these reservations involved two sets of concerns. First, questions were raised as to whether women would be treated equally under the new arrangements. Fears were expressed that women would lose control over their own programs within the confines of a traditionally male organization. Second, concern was voiced over the fate of the national governing organization for women's athletics, the AIAW. Some felt that by joining conferences such as the Big Ten, which have formal relationships with the NCAA, women's programs would be providing de facto assistance or endorsement to the NCAA's attempts to wrest control of women's athletics away from the AIAW. Here again, the central issue was the position of women in traditionally male-dominated organizations.

On the other hand, many Committee members, including both Faculty Representatives, spoke in behalf of the Task Force proposal. It was noted that Minnesota's traditional athletic competitors and academic peers comprise the Big Ten, and that to compete regularly with them would enhance the competitive level and visibility of women's athletics. Moreover, it was asserted that the arrangements proposed by the Task Force, while imperfect, were basically equitable and could be improved at Minnesota's insistence should we decide to participate. Finally, it was noted that most Big Ten Schools are members of AIAW and intend to maintain that affiliation. To join the Big Ten would not, it was argued, weaken the University's support for the AIAW.

In light of such arguments, the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics voted 7-3 to advise the President to enroll Minnesota's women's program in the Big Ten. However, the Committee also agreed to review the University's experience with the Big Ten women's program carefully at the end of the first year of membership, and to recommend at that time such action as might seem appropriate.

Prior to action by the President on ACIA's recommendation, the Assembly Steering Committee decided, on June 19, 1981, that the question of women in the Big Ten was of sufficient importance to require action by the Assembly. Accordingly, the Steering Committee recommended that the University take no action regarding the Big Ten until the Assembly could deal with the issue. The President complied with this recommendation.

During the remainder of the summer, several things happened that had bearing on this issue. First, the other nine Universities that comprise the Big Ten elected to affiliate their women's programs with the Conference. Second, the Department of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics at Minnesota produced a statement, dated August 12, that reviewed the Big Ten situation and the objections that had been entered, but concluded that the Department wishes to be included in the Big Ten. Third, the Big Ten set October 15 as the deadline for an affirmative response should Minnesota wish to be eligible for Big Ten women's championship events during the Fall quarter.

In light of these circumstances, the ACIA reviewed the matter at its October 1 meeting, and voted 10-0 to ask the Assembly Steering Committee to act in such a manner as to allow Minnesota to meet this deadline. On October 9, the Steering Committee voted unanimously to advise the President to enroll Minnesota women's teams in the Big Ten on an interim basis, pending final action by the Assembly. On the same day, President Magrath formally communicated to the Big Ten our decision to join. What remains, to complete the process, is Assembly approval.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

General College
106 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October 24, 1981

To: Charles Scott

From: David L. Giese *David L. Giese*
Chair, Business and Rules, Twin Cities Assembly

Thank you for your letter of October 22, 1981 concerning the language proposed by B & R concerning the Assembly Intercollegiate Athletic Committee. For some reason, we already had a copy of your suggested revisions and did incorporate some of your suggestions. We hope to have the final draft finished by October 29.

For your information, we have included the following changes:

1. we essentially adopted your language concerning membership but reordered the sentences.
2. we included the word "direct" in your reference to the faculty representative.
3. we included your statement about the policy documents but changed your last word to approval.

I think only 3. above is a significant change from your version. The B & R Committee feels that all policy documents that result in significant change in University policy must be available for approval by the Assembly. No other committee of the Senate or Assembly has constitutional authority to adopt policy documents without the opportunity for complete review by the Senate or Assembly.

Copy: Charles Walcott, Chair, 1981-1982 ACIA
Douglas Pratt, Chair, Consultative Committee
W. D. Spring, Consultative Committee

- o to devise and implement policies governing the granting of awards for contribution to or participation in the Twin Cities intercollegiate athletics programs.
- o to approve all schedules of ~~freshmen and~~ varsity and junior varsity events from the Twin Cities campus.
- o to determine the eligibility of students for participation in intercollegiate athletics on the Twin Cities campus.
- ✓ o to adopt, from time to time, such policy documents it deems necessary or desirable, and to submit those policies to the Assembly for information.
- o to work with the athletic committees of the other campuses of the University on athletic policies which affect the University as a whole. When such matters exist, the committees shall prepare joint proposals which shall then be brought to the University Senate for debate and action.
- o to consult with the Recreational Sports Committee concerning items of common concern.
- o to submit an annual report to the Assembly.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone: (612)373-3226

November 10, 1981

Professor Stephen Gasiorowicz
Chair, Tenure Committee
424 Physics
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Professor Gasiorowicz:

The Senate Consultative Committee voted at its November 5th meeting to ask the Tenure Committee to examine the Proposed Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, as recommended by the Faculty Senate in May of 1973, to determine whether any changes are needed and, if they are, to begin to make them.

The reason for the request at this time is related to the collective bargaining election which has just commenced. If the faculty elects no agent, the Regents will have a one-year period before an agent can again file for an election during which they can deal with matters affecting the terms and conditions of employment of the faculty. Hence, the faculty members of the Consultative Committee want to seize the opportunity and assure that Senate-approved revised tenure regulations will be ready for the Regents' consideration within the coming year.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

DCP/bd

MEMO

11/5/81

To: All-University Senate Consultative Committee

From: David Lenander, member

I would like to make several observations inspired by some of the discussion at the final '80-81 SCC meeting, particularly that related to the library tuition surcharge. Further discussion of a 2% tuition surcharge may seem a waste of time when we are hearing discussion of new surcharges ranging from 20 to 55 per cent. Furthermore, the overall direction of these reflections is towards support of a course of action that we have already begun following, led by Vice Presidents Keller and French. Yet these remarks, drafted last June when we might have thought that there was time for rumination and discussion of even quibbles, have acquired a certain forlorn pertinence in our present situation.

1) Although I personally agree that the library acquisitions budget ought to be fully supported at the level of the University's request to the legislature at a minimum, I am not satisfied with the timing and procedure of the Administration proposal to the Regents. I wish to suggest, further, that Bruce Thorpe's objections were not merely "stupid," and if representative of undergraduate student "special interests," in this they are similar to the special interests of faculty and administrators. As examples of similarly short-sighted faculty positions in the discussion of the library acquisitions budget I refer to two Senate Library Committee discussions during this past winter and spring quarters.

Late in winter quarter, in response to the request of University Librarian Eldred Smith for faculty lobbying of legislators for acquisitions (a cause presumably sacred at a research university), there was faculty resistance to this request. No less a person than Prof. John Turner argued against efforts in this regard, saying that only one priority could be pursued with the legislators this year, and despite a desperate situation for library acquisitions, that priority had to be faculty salaries. The committee finally agreed to send a letter to faculty outlining the serious situation, but not calling for organized lobbying efforts on behalf of acquisitions. It is significant that these faculty members are all especially dedicated to the University Libraries, their service and research missions, and the integrity of their research collections (presumably, the general body of faculty would be even less concerned about declining library acquisitions, at least in the presence of declining salaries). These same faculty members generally agreed with Prof. Smith during fall quarter ('80) discussions in which he argued that the U of M and its libraries ought to be competing with the University of California at Berkeley, and emphasizing research support even at the expense of undergraduate library needs. Contrasting with Prof. Turner's position, the MSA Forum adopted a resolution during its last winter quarter meeting (during the week after the SLC turned Prof. Smith down) in support of the full library request, and setting this portion of the University budget request as "a priority" for its representatives at the Minnesota Legislature. In order to take this action the Forum even overlooked its normal procedure channels to act before spring break.

A second instance of faculty hesitancy came at the final SLC meeting, held in Waseca. As I mentioned at the SCC meeting in June, the SLC adopted a resolution calling for funding of the acquisitions request at a level comparable to the University of Wisconsin's--but this came after lengthy debate, only reluctantly, despite Prof. Smith's insistence that the committee act. This reluctance, in the absence of Prof. Turner (on leave), demonstrated that the Turner position enunciated during winter quarter was not idiosyncratic, but shared by a majority of the faculty membership. The reluctance at this meeting to give Prof. Smith all that he wanted seemed based on two less-than-overt concerns (aside from any possible interpersonal conflicts): one, that if Central Administration was indeed committed to diverting funds to this worthy purpose, as Prof. Smith was assuring

Lenander memo, p.2

the committee, from where were these funds to be diverted? What other programs would be cut back in favor of library acquisitions? Perhaps if we had been informed that these funds would come from additional student tuition our faculty members might have been less reluctant to adopt Prof. Smith's ideas--though I, as a student representative, might have found the final resolution less palatable. Secondly, the committee no longer seemed to agree so enthusiastically with Prof. Smith's intention to compete with Berkeley, and instead moved more towards comparisons with such institutions as the University of Wisconsin at Madison--to Prof. Smith's evident chagrin.¹

2) I would like to restate my concern about the library tuition surcharge. Although not only do I fully agree with Prof. Keller that tuition does and must represent the difference between available money (from other sources) and the actual cost of operating the University, I don't agree with tacking little surcharges onto tuition when it has previously been announced that tuition will be rising 10% (not 13%),*the final meetings of the student government and most other campus governance groups have already occurred (including the SLC). I don't agree with Administrative strategy that allows the legislators to adjourn and go home saying, "Well, except for faculty salaries, we've taken care of the University budget, and tuition will rise just ten percent, a figure comparable to inflation." Those same legislators will now blame the Regents in response to student complaints about tuition. It would be more honest and reasonable to say to the legislative committees dealing with the University budget that the Regents will fund this particular item at this particular level, if it means raising tuition more than 10%, or closing down the Waseca campus, or the College of Nursing, or whatever. I realize that the University fears that setting floors beneath budget requests would incline legislators to cut every request to the minimum, ultimately disastrous to its overall program. An eventual solution to this kind of "planning" problem may emerge from Prof. Keller's proposals for long-range planning, the setting of priorities, and the retention of more funds by the central administration in undedicated or reserve accounts. Nevertheless, it is only appropriate that at the present time student representatives protest the kind of crisis management that leaves the University unprepared for problems that ought to have been foreseen--indeed, were foreseen, at least by Academic Affairs representatives during winter quarter SLC meetings. It is worth noting that the 3% surcharge will not be assessed to Extension students during '81-82, not because Extension students don't use the libraries, but because CEE, having already sent its class schedules (including tuition rates) to the printer, would find it a major hardship to have to once again tack on a surcharge. Had the administration been prepared to raise tuition by 13% a month earlier, this might have been avoided. When the SLC met in Waseca at the end of last May, we knew the final disposition of the budget request. We even knew that the Office of Academic Affairs was committed to restoring the acquisitions budget increase. The University ought to have known by then what sort of "re-allocations" would be proposed by the Regents. Indeed, the Regents ought to have been prepared in April.

I wish to reiterate that I agree that all operations of the University benefit even undergraduate education, however indirectly. I even agree that it is appropriate to set tuition at whatever increase is necessary², even to increase faculty salaries, or to keep Morrill Hall heated in January. It would be a good idea to furthermore announce as soon as possible that tuition will rise 13%, or 24%, or 37% as a consequence of underfunding the libraries' acquisitions budget, or faculty salary increases, or whatever. Despite agreement about the 2% surcharge, I object to its announcement in July, even though I, as an Extension Graduate student, do not expect to pay it.

3) Prof. Keller referred indirectly to a concern expressed most fully by Prof. Woods Halley at several spring quarter SLC meetings: the obligation of the University to maintain its research collections, including "exotic" journal subscriptions. Concerned over the list of cancellations made by the IT libraries, Prof. Halley argued that Federal grant support of research at the U of M was in part granted on the condition that the U of M libraries were capable of fully supporting said research--including maintenance of the research collection and its journal subscriptions at comparable levels for the duration of grant support. Furthermore, contended Prof. Halley, certain Federal funds were in fact dedicated to supporting acquisitions and journal subscriptions. He argued that inasmuch as Federal grant support of research was greater in most of the departments supported by the IT libraries than in many Liberal Arts (for example) departments, the IT libraries should be especially protected from cutbacks in acquisitions. Prof. Halley asked for an accounting of how these "dedicated" Federal funds were being divided between the various library collections. Prof. Smith was unable to respond. Peter Roll, the representative of the Office of Academic Affairs, responded tentatively and obscurely--basically he conceded that such accounting was impossible, that such records were not kept, and that (in fact) little, if any, attempt was made to distribute a portion of such Federal grant support to specific acquisitions budgets, or even to overall acquisitions. Although agreeing in principle with some of Prof. Halley's contentions, he seemed unwilling to concede that some of the latter's applications of principle necessarily followed from existing law. In particular, he rejected any suggestion that current U of M practice was in violation of such law.

Although this summary of Prof. Halley's concerns may be unclear, I think this partly reflects a situation that is itself unclear, not only (perhaps) in the understanding of such SLC members as Halley, Smith and Roll (not to mention my own), but perhaps also in Federal law and practice. It seemed worth sharing with the SCC as a footnote to Prof. Keller's remarks, and also for another reason. Prof. Halley's special interest in the IT libraries' collections may be like faculty special interest in salary increases, and student "special interest" in minimizing tuition costs--not selfish in a negative sense at all. (This was Prof. Magrath's defense of faculty salary increases last spring, to both the Senate and the legislature).

4) There was some discussion of "undergraduate" versus "graduate" and "faculty" library collections at the June SCC meeting. Such descriptions must ultimately break down, as must any generalized descriptions of U of M programs as purely "instructional-" or "research-" oriented. Two further discussions:

A) It is worth noting that the University Libraries have, as a matter of policy, cut back in serving undergraduate needs. As examples, consider the policy established by Prof. Smith, and defended by faculty members of the SLC at a fall meeting to eliminate, wherever possible, acquisition of duplicate copies of monographs and serials. Obviously, this was done to allow purchase of more exotic materials that would otherwise be beyond the limited budget³. Consider also the long standing policies whereby faculty misuse of their borrowing privileges has been funded (as far as library staff time spent on keeping track of overdue faculty loans, attempts to recover recalled materials, and finally on replacing "lost" materials) out of student overdue fines which support the staff time spent on faculty overdues as well as that spent on student overdues. Last year a tentative first step was taken to address the problem of faculty who fail to respond to recall notices by the Senate. It is to be hoped that in the future the Senate will concur with its Library Committee on a new lending code which adds sanctions for flagrant and repeated refusal to pay bills for lost books and processing fees.

B) Even "exotic" journals are not used purely by faculty and graduate students.

Other users include University staff, as well as undergraduates and alumni, and many members of the non-University community which the libraries serve as a part of the University outreach and service mission. The University libraries are particularly important in this regard in Minnesota, which lacks a state library like those maintained in some other states, as Prof. Smith has noted. As a personal note, I recall wishing as an undergraduate that certain exotic journals were possessed by the University libraries for some personal research projects not directly related to any particular course requirements. These were not even available to me through inter-library loan (as they now would be, since my admission to the Graduate School). I cannot help but think that even undergraduates ought to be encouraged to pursue non-class related research, to develop research interests that might continue in later life to keep them using our library collections as a part of our alumni and outreach community. (We might then, as a consequence, wish to present such outreach needs even more forcefully to the legislature, if such usage were to grow--not that we ignore our present service in this regard when we present our budget requests).

5) Several other matters discussed by the SLC are worth noting here, though even less related to the June SCC discussion:

A) Prof. Smith was fond of noting that since his tenure began with the U Libraries his biennial budget requests have included increases only for acquisitions budgets. This is not to ignore regular salary increases for library faculty, professional and para-professional staff, but there have been no increases in services or miscellaneous programs support. During those years a number of services have been cut back (especially reference services) although certain other limited services have been increased or extended (Wilson circulation hours and Walter study space are examples). In some cases, fees for services must increasingly be charged, or increased, or services must be further pared.

B) Money for part-time student salaries has not been increased in accord with raises in student salaries (tied to civil service salaries). This will have an increasingly drastic effect on such support services as reshelving, searching, stack reading, circulation hours. Already (last year) Wilson Library discontinued reading the stacks for mis-shelving when student hours were cut by one fourth. Other cuts that may be coming include the elimination of recalls, or searching, or the sending of overdue notices.

C) Major capital improvements, particularly for Walter and the IT libraries, will cost a great deal in the next few years. Telecommunications and computing technology advances may also have unforeseen costs--especially judging on the basis of the University Libraries' past management of its programs in this area.

¹The SLC chose to name some of the "Madison rank" institutions in its resolution not entirely out of disagreement with Prof. Smith, but out of concern with the real politics of lobbying the Regents and legislature. We chose to name several institutions judged comparable to the specifically excluded Harvard and Berkeley as representing our ideal aspirations, but more emphasized "Madison rank" institutions as peers with which we might more realistically expect to be compared.

As a further footnote to Prof. Turner's arguments at the winter quarter meeting it is worth noting that the '80-81 SLC chair left the U of M for greener pastures, and a much higher salary.

²I realize that it may be politically dangerous to assert Regental authority to legislators re-considering University autonomy--nevertheless, the Regents' authority to govern the University is gone if they cannot exercise it out of fear as certainly as if the legislature was to take it away. The Regents cannot tax, as does the legislature, but they can and do decide how to spend University funds, and how to assess tuition.

Lenander memo, p.5.

³The SLC resisted student suggestions that whereas the size of the University Libraries was possible in part because Minnesota has largely concentrated its resources on one campus--with the largest single campus population in the country--in contrast to such state systems as those in California or Indiana or even Wisconsin, it bears not only a responsibility to support the research mission of a major University, but also the educational mission of a largely undergraduate campus. Not that the two are necessarily mutually exclusive, but the Berkeley campus population, although smaller than that of the Twin Cities, includes more graduate students. I am not sure that a desire to "compete" with the Berkeley campus and its libraries is well-advised. Our libraries should be serving the the research and instructional programs that we have and decide to maintain, however this compares with other institutions' libraries programs.

⁴Faculty immunity to payment for lost materials--and even to assessment for overdue fines--is by no means universal at other universities. Even at our own Waseca campus both faculty and staff must pay lost book bills--in contrast to the Twin Cities campus situation. This is not to assert that Twin Cities faculty never pay their bills, by any means. However, many feel comfortable ignoring what is no more than a moral obligation. (Incidentally, I was told this summer, when I visited the Berkeley campus graduate library that even there bills for lost materials are deducted from faculty and staff paychecks).

⁵Prof. Smith assured the SLC that this service would be re-instituted in '81-82, and that the cut was only for one year as part of the U Libraries' portion of the one-year retrenchment caused by the budget shortfall. He had neglected to so inform the Wilson Circulation Department, where I had been told that recalls might be discontinued in '81-82 as well.

ddl

cc: Prof. Ken Keller, Eldred Smith, Wayland Noland, Woods Halley, and Mr. Bruce Thorpe



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT
November 5, 1981

Approved 11/19/81

SCC members present were Robert Brasted, Nancy Brecht, Jim Brewer, Marcia Eaton, Virginia Fredricks, John Howe, Keith Jacobson, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marvin Mattson, Douglas Pratt, Paul Quie, Patricia Swan, Richard Purple, Donald Spring, and Kit Wiseman. Finance Committee members present were Stanford Lehmborg, Walter Johnson, and Irwin Rubenstein. Vice Presidents Keller and French also attended.

President Magrath opened the meeting by stating that it was his objective to keep the University of Minnesota intact and to improve it even in these times of fiscal peril. As yet the University's budget has not been cut but everyone within the University system must work together to prevent cuts from being made. Uncertainty is likely for another several months. In the meantime the Administration would like to intensify the consultative system already in place by suggesting that the Senate Finance Committee meet with the Budget Executive on a regular basis. President Magrath stated that he would be visiting with deans and program leaders to remind them of the importance of following good consultative procedures.

Discussion-

Professor Howe encouraged President Magrath to express the concerns of the SCC to the deans. Ms. Wiseman commented that often, deans do not consult with students.

Professor Swan suggested that a small representative subcommittee would perhaps be best. Professor Stanford Lehmborg, Chair of Educational Policy, stated that the Educational Policy Committee would like to be involved. It was decided to further discuss President Magrath's suggestion before the close of the meeting.

President Magrath then responded to several written questions.-

1. Should budget cutting occur, does the Administration plan to discuss those cuts with the SCC?

President Magrath replied that any cuts will be discussed with the SCC. Professor Purple then asked what had transpired during the meeting with Governor Quie. President Magrath replied that the meeting had been open and cordial. No specific figures relevant to possible budget cuts were discussed.

2. Does the University have a cash-flow problem?

No. It is not likely that such a problem will arise but if it does, the Administration will consult with the SCC.

3. Can the University survive this financial crisis?

Yes, if everyone works together. The University of Minnesota is a "superb" university and potential students would be making a mistake not to consider attending here. The history of Minnesota government indicates a strong tradition of support for education.

4. What lobbying efforts are being undertaken to advance the University's position?

The Administration is in contact with many support groups. A two-page fact sheet is in preparation which will outline the consequences of budget cuts and highlight the unique ways in which the University of Minnesota contributes to the state of Minnesota. Vice President Kegler is meeting with state legislative committees.

Vice President Keller added that he is taking advantage of every opportunity to talk to people about these matters. He observed that many people are under the illusion that the U. is an affluent institution and that it is necessary for those knowledgeable about the University's situation to patiently answer all questions so that the correct information is disseminated.

Discussion-

Professor Swan commented that the public sometimes thinks the University has a number of strange, exotic departments which could easily be dissolved. Professor Mattson observed that even if there are some exotic programs, they are often self-sustaining and would not affect, to a large degree, the University budget.

Professor Spring stated that there is a "vulgarization" problem which occurs when simplified information, however accurate, is broadcast or published. Professor Keller said that it is difficult to make abstractions (such as 8-12% cuts) "concrete" without running the risk that the information will subsequently be oversimplified or exaggerated.

Dave Lenander asked whether the recent accusation that the Administration would cut an inordinate number of women's programs in the event of drastic budget cuts had any basis in fact. President Magrath replied that there was absolutely no basis for the accusation and that there were over 30 other items on the list in question which were not at all related specifically to women. Vice President Keller added that, according to a recent analysis, any substantial cut in programs would weigh even more heavily on male students. Professor Rubinstein expressed his opinion that publishing a list of possible program cuts was a mistake because if some programs on the list are indeed cut, people involved in other programs on the list will become very nervous. Vice President Keller replied that it should be understood that programs not listed would also necessarily run the risk of reviewal and possible cuts. Professor Howe said that any decisions must be preceded by consultation that is systematic, clear, and consistent. Professor Spring added that, in the end, one must have confidence in people and those procedures which have been found to be effective. President Magrath agreed that "there is no confidence without consultation."



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

NOV 2 1981

November 2, 1981

Professor Douglas C. Pratt
Chair, All-University Senate
Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
St. Paul Campus

Dear Doug:

Thank you for your October 28 letter. It is timely since this Thursday FCC and SCC will be meeting with me and with Vice President Keller. I want to respond to your comments and to also signal a number of items that we must discuss as part of our agenda this Thursday.

First, as you know, I personally and all of my associates in the Central Administration of the University are totally dedicated to the most effective consultation and use of the University Senate procedures that is possible. We intend to continue this consultation in any form and as actively as you and your Senate colleagues wish, for that matches completely our desires. As you know, Vice President Keller has been meeting on a regular basis with the Senate Finance Committee on budgetary and retrenchment and reallocation issues, seeking advice and judgment as he proceeds on his difficult responsibilities as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chair of the Budget Executive.

Turning specifically now to the potential State-wide retrenchment that may seriously damage the University of Minnesota a few comments are in order. We should all note that at this point nothing is certain or settled, and the issue that the University has helped to raise and explain with regard to the devastating impact of cuts in the 8 to 12 percent range is, we believe, contributing to a reexamination within the State and our State government as to the desirability of cutting essential programs so drastically.

There are, as I am sure you can appreciate, no plans whatsoever that have yet been developed regarding the Regents' indication that, with grave difficulty, the University might be able to accommodate a \$10 million reduction in the current biennium -- even though this would impair our programs. Personally, I hope that we do not have to forgo up to \$10 million of urgently needed State appropriations, but we are all caught in a very terrible situation that is not of our making. In any event, I would like to request that as the first agenda item, SCC give us advice as to how we might carefully, in a consultative mode, examine ways in which to accommodate a potential \$10 million reduction or any other reduction (greater or lesser) that might be ultimately forced upon us by circumstances. I would appreciate specific advice and guidance as to procedures and ways in which we might consult and work together, assuming of course that the consultation that Vice President Keller has had under way with SCC and the Senate Finance Committee would be a major part of this consultative process.

Professor Douglas C. Pratt
November 2, 1981
Page Two

Second, I would like our agenda this coming Thursday also to include our desire -- as has always been customary in the years I have been here -- for recommendations on the question of faculty salary distribution. Again, I must emphasize that nothing is clear or certain, but the negotiators for the faculty unions in the Community College System and the State University System have reached tentative agreements. It is possible that we may receive our share of the salary money currently held in escrow by the State before the end of this calendar year, though I must note that the current interpretations of the 1981 law pertaining to salaries for public employees held by the Commissioner of Finance indicate that salary money cannot be released until all bargaining units have worked out settlements. Naturally, we here at the University are anxious to obtain our part of the salary money (both for faculty and Civil Service salaries) as quickly as possible, and will continue to work on interpretations that release this money to us.

Assuming, for the moment, that we will soon receive our faculty salary money, I would value the judgment of the Consultative Committee, and particularly its FCC component, on a number of questions. One of these has to do with the question of retroactive salary payments. If we have the money in hand prior to the end of the calendar year, would your Committee recommend that the retroactive payments be made on or after January 1, 1982? As you can appreciate, with lower tax rates scheduled to go into effect in 1982 on the federal level, there would probably be income advantages to hard-pressed faculty if the payments of retroactive sums came in 1982. On the other hand, there might also be disadvantages to persons in having a considerable lump sum payment occur after the first of the new year. It may not be an easy choice, and, indeed, if the salary money is not available until after the first of the year there is no choice, but we would urgently request your Committee's advice on this matter.

Relatedly, as has been the customary practice which we wish to continue, we would appreciate your Committee's judgment as to how we should distribute the faculty salary money. Again, as is customary with past practice, I would assume that SCC would also wish to elicit the views of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs on this important matter.

I must emphasize that, unfortunately, we do not know the precise sum that will be available to us for salary distribution. There are as yet unanswerable questions from the State on this matter pertaining to certain intricate calculations, fringe benefit payments, and the like. For the sake of discussion, however, let us assume that the actual salary increase (exclusive of fringe benefits) will be in the 8 to 10 percent range. My personal hope is that it will be much closer to 10 percent than 8 percent, and this of course includes the 2 percent that we have internally reallocated and reserved for faculty salary (and Civil Service salary) increases. I would appreciate your Committee's comments on this matter and advice as to how we might engage in the most effective consultation on this matter.

Professor Douglas C. Pratt
November 2, 1981
Page Three

On another matter, I believe recalling in reading the minutes of your Committee's Morris meeting questions as to how we can all best consult and inform ourselves with regard to the discussion currently under way on the subject of changes and improvements in the University's computer and communication information systems. As Vice President Hasselmo made clear in his presentation to SCC, we have deliberately surfaced this issue both because it is important and because we are anxious to receive faculty and Senate advice, opinion, and guidance on this important long-range matter. I would appreciate, if possible, knowing which Committee SCC believes that Vice President Hasselmo should address on these matters -- consistent with his presentation to you some weeks ago.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:kb

cc: University Vice Presidents
Members of the All-University Senate Consultative Committee

October 28, 1981

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

I appreciate your briefing me immediately on the magnitude of the University's share in a statewide financial retrenchment and on the University's intended response.

I have been directed by the Senate Consultative Committee to inform you that, as representatives of the faculty and student body, we expect to be given the opportunity to participate as consultants and advisors in the continuing decision-making process regarding the grave financial crisis now facing the University.

Sincerely,

Douglas C. Pratt,
Chair

DCP:mbp

October 23, 1977

President C. Peter Wagner
208 Morrill Hall

Dear Sir:

I appreciate your invitation to participate in the study of the University's financial situation and to provide financial recommendations and advice. I will be pleased to accept your invitation.

I have been directed by the Senate Committee on the University's financial situation to participate in the study. I will be pleased to accept your invitation to participate in the study. I will be pleased to accept your invitation.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Wagner
Chair

CC: Mr. [Name]



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

October 30, 1981

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

Consultative Committee members have submitted the following questions which they would like to discuss with you in our meeting at 1:15 on November 5:

1. If and when central administration must develop a list of specific programs, units, or parts of units to be cut, will you discuss the specific options for that list with the SCC?

2. Could there be a cash flow problem for the University, especially now in the light of the at least temporary cut-offs to the cities? If there were a cut-off, what input could SCC have on how the University deals with it?

3. How may the current news coverage affect the outlook of students, especially those away from the Twin Cities area, who have been considering entering the University next year? Are some of the messages likely to prompt them to choose another school? How can we get the word out that we are still going to be a university?

4. An exchange of information about lobbying efforts. What is the President and what are others in central administration doing, what are faculty and students doing, and what else should we be doing? We hope Peter Robinson will be able to attend.

The members of the Finance Committee, which is scheduled to meet at 3:00 on the same date, are being invited to come earlier and join the SCC's discussions with you if they can.

We will welcome any additional questions and information you may want to put to the committee. Thank you for your attention to the concerns listed above.

Sincerely,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

DCP:mbp
cc: Senate Consultative
Committee members