



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-2295

ALL UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
AGENDA

October 23, 1980
626 Coffman Memorial Union, 12:30-3:00

1. Fix Agenda
2. Minutes of 9/25 and 10/2 (please bring)
3. Report of Chair (enclosed)
4. Report of Student Chair
5. Additional SCC committees
 Budget: Faculty: Russell Hobbie, Chair
 Allan Ward
 Student:
6. St. Paul meeting
7. Committee Reports
 - a. UCBRBR (Swan)
 - b. Reorganization (Spring)
 - c. Grievance and Legal Concerns (Schletzer)
 - i. Academic Professional Appointments
8. Report from Regents meetings (Schletzer, Swan)
9. (Approximately 1:00 p.m.) Planning Council report by
 Vice President Hasselmo
10. (Approximately 2:00 p.m.) Report on Humphrey Institute
 site (Brasted). We shall be jointed by
 Professor Harlan Cleveland, Director of the Humphrey
 Institute.
11. Student Fees
12. Old Business
13. New Business
14. Adjourn



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 11/6/80

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
October 23, 1980

The third meeting of the 1980-81 academic year of the Senate Consultative Committee was called to order by Chairman Marcia Eaton at 12:30 p.m. in room #306 of Coffman Memorial Union. Other members present were Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, David Eckman (interim Crookston representative), Russell Hobbie, Bryan Jamison, Judy Nord, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Julie Sellgren, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan, Bruce Thorpe, John Verrill and Allan Ward. Guests were Carol Pazandak, Assistant to the President, and Trish Van Pilsum of the Daily.

1. The agenda was not fixed since much rearrangement was necessary.
2. The minutes of September 25 and October 2 were approved and the record of the Conversation with the President was approved with the addition of one word and one phrase on page 5, as read by the secretary.
3. Report on Humphrey Institute Site. (Professor Brasted) SCC members had received in advance two maps and an evaluation summary which Professor Brasted had extracted from University feasibility studies. Material supplied him had included no discussion of a west bank site.

He summarized the history of the other site proposals. The original conception of the Institute was of a 60,000 square foot unit which would sit atop the Science Building on the north side of Washington Avenue. The physical proposal was later expanded to include a museum and to total 90,000 square feet, too much for that building to accommodate. Site proposal #2 is directly across the street, on what is now a parking lot. Site proposal #3 is for construction on both sides of the street at the bridgehead, with an overpass link. The bridgehead sites would serve to physically complete the riverfront side of the east bank campus. Dividing the building to span Washington Avenue would add \$1.5 to \$2 million to its cost. Site proposal #4 is for the northwest corner of the Washington-Oak intersection. Brasted described the Washington-Oak site as the one which could conceivably offer the greatest payoff, but which was plainly the biggest gamble, and was related to presently unanswered questions about long-range planning, including the future of Memorial Stadium, and whether the conceptually necessary additions of a conference center and/or a hotel would materialize. Physically, the presence of the health sciences complex would be overwhelming if the Institute stood alone. A conference center somewhere is a desperate need for this campus, he said.

SCC discussion focused on academic considerations, legislative/political considerations, and whether the site question actually remains open.

Professor Spring observed that the SCC's concern last year was whether academic issues would predominate in the site selection. The substantial library projected for the Institute, including collections proposed for transfer from Wilson Library, would recommend a location adjacent to Wilson. Brasted and the Student SCC voiced the hope that no site selection would be finally made until west bank sites had received careful consideration.

Professor Swan pointed out that the legislature will probably tie appropriation to the choice of site. Eaton noted the basic conflict between the academic and the memorial aspects of the Institute since accessibility to outside visitors appears clearly best at Oak-Washington. Thorpe and others observed that a conference center and a hotel could be established at the Oak and Washington site regardless of the site of the Institute, and Hobbie noted that there is space to locate the Institute, museum, hotel and conference center all on the west bank.

(Following an hour's presentation and discussion on Planning Council issues, summarized further below, the SCC continued its consideration of the Humphrey Institute site question.) Members wished for more information, including the description of the Institute which accompanied the original fund-raising drive, and desired to know both Director Cleveland's and President Magrath's preferences. There was considerable sentiment that the SCC was not in a position to make a recommendation on site. The committee rallied in consensus behind Professor Spring's recommendation that it make two points to the President: the SCC is afraid academic considerations are being overridden by other considerations in selecting the site; and the anticipated convention center and hotel need not be on the same site as the institute. Sue Pribyl, speaking for the students, supported those points, but wanted it stated also that the student view on campus, excepting only medical students, is overwhelmingly opposed to the Oak-Washington site. Professor Eaton agreed to write to President Magrath a letter with this message and to request that the item be on the agenda for the November 6 SCC meeting with him.

4. Planning Council Report on Administration-Senate Joint-Mode Experiment.

At 1:00 p.m. Vice President Nils Hasselmo joined the meeting, along with John Wallace, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, and three members of the Planning Council: Richard Caldecott, Dean of the College of Biological Sciences; Richard Heydinger, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and Carl Adams, Professor of Management Science. They described the Planning Council's proposal for a joint administration-Senate undertaking and the Council's process of defining and narrowing the list of possible subjects to address, and they answered questions from SCC members.

Vice President Hasselmo said that while the Senate is free to choose and pursue any issue it wants, and central administration can internally undertake studies, there are certain purposes where the value of a cooperative effort is obvious, when faculty views and expertise and administration views and staff support are the most helpful combination. The Planning Council wanted to select for intensive study a long-range issue which would benefit from the joint mode. He said that while the first topic chosen will be of inherent importance, the study will also serve as an experiment to try out the joint mode. Whatever group undertakes the study will have representation from Senate committees and from central administration. He said that in future cases the Senate committees including the Consultative Committee would probably be deeply involved in exploring the range of possibilities and choosing the topic(s). He hopes for

mutual, joint efforts as the University enters a period of economic and enrollment uncertainties. Dean Caldecott reinforced the expression of need for central administration-faculty solidarity against the difficulties which will inevitably come with contraction in the 1980's. Vice Presidential Assistant Heydinger described how a Planning Council subcommittee had drawn up a list of 40 possible issues, garnered from the Watson Committee report, the Weaver Committee report, and the President's statement on Institutional Goals, Objectives and Priorities, and from inquiries made of faculty colleagues. They consolidated these and finally selected three central and comprehensible topics as being of the greatest value to study. The Council approved the topics and forwarded them to the President, who in turn forwarded them to the Consultative Committee. Caldecott described the "Barriers" topic as the broadest and the one which to some extent includes the other two.

Dean Wallace spoke on Graduate School discussions undertaken to alert itself to the difficulties of this decade. This university enjoyed two decades of rapid expansion. The leveling and anticipated shrinking produces a new environment for most faculty. There is an age-group bulge from the flow of young scholars hired between 1962 and 1975. Now the University faces the problem of whether it will have enough junior faculty positions available to keep the system vital. The lack of junior faculty openings means that there will be fewer graduate students in those fields in which the Ph.D. leads virtually only to college teaching. Hence there will be insufficient T.A.'s to deliver the good, low-cost instruction they have been giving. The implications of this situation for faculty and students "boggle the mind," he said. If the anticipated gap in hiring young faculty does occur, this university will be unhealthy in about 20 years, as will many other colleges and universities, he said. He would like to see a clear picture developed of alternatives and to know what this university intends to do. He would like, for example, to help open up new, non-academic careers for humanities Ph.D's.

Hasselmo focused on other aspects of declining support, such as equipment maintenance. The University should search for ways to begin to deal systematically with the losses, he said, and develop an approach to submit to the legislature and other agencies. Heydinger said administrative losses, the slow nibbling away at budgets, trim support services which are actually crucial to instruction. Relating Wallace's remarks to the "Barriers" issue, in response to a question, Hasselmo said that with existing faculty lacking the natural renewal through young faculty, they will need to be offered other means for development.

Caldecott described the plight for the sciences, where he said the productivity of the faculty is closely tied to the number of graduate students. A 10-12 year hiatus in bringing in new young scientists would also cause departments to fall behind the state-of-the-field. He called for imaginative thinking, such as exploring means of bringing in young faculty who will eventually move into tenure track positions upon the retirement of others, and ways to encourage moves to half-time appointments by professors in their fifties, (who would receive the other half salary from grants, contracts and other external sources), thereby freeing salary money for young beginning professors. Professor Adams recommended for consideration exchange programs with the community outside the University, exchanges within the University as unit populations rise and fall, and adding technological aids which might yield an increase in clerical help.

I was the point of view of the Student SCC members that the issue on "Curricular Duplications and its Impact on Quality" would yield more tangible

benefits. Caldecott observed that this topic is somewhat subsumed under "Barriers," and also that numerous studies have disclosed that apparent duplication turns out not to be exact duplication and to exist for sound educational reasons.

Eaton requested a definition of "productivity" for the purposes of the study. Heydinger said it replaced the term "vitality," which was found too loaded. The study could begin, he said, by asking faculty members what stands in their way of doing what they want to accomplish, and cataloging the responses. Eaton reported that some faculty members fear the topic implies the administration wants to find ways to make what it suspects is a lazy faculty work harder. Hasselmo insisted no industrial-type model is intended. What are faculty here to do and how can they do it best are the questions.

Professor Verrill said that the changes anticipated in the '80's might result in a decline in graduate education and in faculty members closeted away with their own research, and an increase in attention to undergraduates, which he thought would have positive value. Caldecott suggested an alternate possibility. Since the University is the only Ph.D.-granting institution in the state, and since other state institutions of higher education face enrollment declines in the 1980's, increasing pressures may come to direct undergraduate students away from the University and to the other institutions. Heydinger noted that the Council's subcommittee had considered the issue of "personalizing the University for undergraduates" as very important but one best addressed on other levels, by unit, by department, by professor.

Professor Swan suggested that studying "Barriers" would produce only a catalog of complaints and that more valuable, deeper thinking would come in response to a study entitled "Maintaining the Quality of Teaching, Research and Service in the 1980's," as the meeting had in fact been talking about. Heydinger expressed agreement but said the subcommittee had from that broad kind of concept plucked out "Barriers" as definable and approachable. The topic can be stretched, he said, to its larger philosophical questions. Spring asked if, in terms of public relations, faculty and students wouldn't find more appeal in the philosophical framing of the question rather than the mechanistic sounding "Barriers." Hasselmo said the terms had deliberately been left undefined so as not to limit the study participants in advance.

Hasselmo explained that the Planning Council was seeking the SCC's renewed endorsement of the joint mode and its endorsement of the "Barriers" issue. He requested also that the SCC or a subgroup meet with members of his office to discuss how to constitute the joint study group. The guests excused themselves at 2:00 p.m.

Following a short break, the SCC reconvened for action. Swan moved the SCC (1) endorse the joint-mode, cooperative effort, (2) endorse the general course of the idea which had been just been discussed, and (3) request a specification of the matters to be studied . The motion carried without dissent. It was agreed that the SCC or a sub-group would meet later with Hasselmo and others to discuss the mechanism.

5. Report of the Chair.

a. Senate Committee staffing need. Eaton reported from the Facilitative Committee that some Senate committee chairmen feel hampered by lack of funds for support staff. Hobbie observed that the new chairmen did not receive a

notice to submit a budget, since budgeting was asked of the experienced, incumbent chairmen of last spring. The Senate has some unallocated funds and chairmen should feel free to apply to the budget committee, which Hobbie chairs, for funds. Eaton will so inform the Facilitative Committee.

b. ACIA. Vivian Barfield has requested that the Assembly Consultative Committee consider asking the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to study its constitution and by-laws to see whether they reflect the changed circumstances of the enormous increases in women's athletics.

c. Parking Committee. The Chairman of this committee agrees that it does serve, as the Facilitative Committee assessed last year, as a rubber stamp for administration requests so far as fees are concerned. Transportation Services informs the committee how much fees will have to rise to cover cost increases, and Parking ratifies the fee increase. The committee agreed to issue only one sticker per parking permit this year instead of two, because of abuse.

d. Professional Academic Staff classification. The Senate Committee on Research has requested officially receiving the P.A. document for consideration. The Regents had the item for information at their September and October meetings and will vote on creation of the class in November or December. Professor Schletzer voiced her long-standing concerns that faculty employees may be unfairly persuaded to accept transfer into the new class. For example, she said, there are units which since 1973 have been unable to hire anyone on other than a 'T' appointment. The SCC instructed Eaton to forward the document to Research and direct that committee to sent its report directly to Academic Affairs.

6. Report of the Student Chair. Pribyl reported that the Student SCC held a meeting preceeding the SCC meeting and discussed a wide range of topics. They nominated Bryan Jamison to the Budget Committee.

7. Additional SCC Committee.

The Senate Budget Committee.

Faculty: Russell Hobbie, Vice-Chairman of Senate, Chair.
Allan Ward

Student: Bryan Jamison. Committee approved by SCC.

8. SCC spring meeting on the St. Paul campus. There was brief discussion as to whether to invite administrators of St. Paul campus units to make presentations. The consensus was to not treat St. Paul as a separate campus (i.e., St. Paul / Minneapolis are the Twin Cities Campus), and hence to not invite special Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics presentations.

9. Committee Reports.

a. UCBRBR. (Swan) UCBRBR will meet October 30. Agenda: How to bridge the gap between budget planning for the coming academic year and the legislative appropriations which do not occur until late in the operating academic year.

b. Reorganization. (Spring) The full subcommittee met October 13. The writing subcommittee meets again on October 23.

c. Grievance and Legal Concerns. (Schletzer) The fourth draft of the proposal from the Subcommittee on Sexual Harrassment will be discussed at a Grievance workshop on October 28, which Schletzer will attend. The new version, she said, includes stiffer sanctions, up to loss of job, for repeat offenders.

10. Report from October Regents meeting. Schletzer reported from the Faculty Affairs committee meeting, on the topic of the Outreach proposal. Vice President Keller said quality control in outreach is the administration's main concern, and that even though deans and department heads have that responsibility now, they are not aware that they have it. Spring relayed Carol Pazandak's statement of central administration concern about involving faculty and students in the Outreach discussion. The SCC will ask Keller to report at its November 6 meeting the present status of the Outreach proposal.

11. Student Fees. Judy Nord reported that the Student Forum's Fees Committee will monitor the Daily refundable fee experiment and also consider the appropriateness of other fees and questions of equitability. Sue Pribyl urged that the concepts of how fees are paid need discussion, as well as the dollars and cents merits of individual requests. People were reminded that keeping fees separate from tuition has been a way of maintaining student control over the fees and their uses. Pribyl moved the SCC refer the issue of the Daily refundable fee to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs, with the request that they also address the whole concept of mandatory fees. Spring offered as a friendly amendment the substitution of "Assembly Consultative Committee" for "SCC." The amendment was accepted and the motion carried without dissent by the Twin Cities Assembly Consultative Committee component of the SCC.

12. Old Business. Motion on University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women. The SCC members received copies of Hobbie's and Business and Rules Chairman Sullivan's revision of the Altholz motion, which they propose for the Senate docket for December 4. Their motion contains a preamble which they hope will not be required. A University attorney will determine whether the preamble is necessary and whether its contents must be in the body of the motion itself. The Committee on Committees will report its recommendation to the SCC prior to November 20. Eaton invited SCC members to consider the motion and make comments at the November meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele,
Secretary, SCC