



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

Senate Consultative Committee  
October 2, 1980  
Regents Room, Morrill Hall  
12:45-1:15

AGENDA (B)

1. Minutes of 9/26/80 (to be distributed at the meeting).
2. Report of the Chair (oral).
3. Report of Student Chair (oral).
4. Committee reports.
5. Arrangements for October 23 SCC meeting at Waseca.
6. Preparations for discussion with President.  
(Copy of letter to President Magrath enclosed.)
7. Old Business.
8. New Business.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/23/80

Senate Consultative Committee

October 2, 1980

The second Senate Consultative Committee meeting of the 1980-81 academic year was called to order by Chairman Marcia Eaton at 12:50 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall. Other members present included Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Russ Hobbie, Paul Quie, Vera Schletzer, Julie Sellgren, Donald Spring, Pat Swan, Bruce Thorpe, John Verrill, and Al Ward. Visitors were Carol Pazandak, Assistant to the President, and Trish Van Pilsum of the Daily.

1. The minutes of September 25 were distributed, to be considered for approval October 23.

2. Report of the Chair.

a. The University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women must be, according to the consent decree, constituted no later than the end of fall quarter. Professors Hobbie, Spring and Eaton, along with John Howe (Committee on Committees) and Connie Sullivan (Business and Rules) will discuss this month how to meet that requirement.

b. SCC Newsletter. A synopsis of the minutes of the September 25 meeting was distributed and elicited the recommendation to headline by topics. It was noted that SCC coverage in Brief and the Daily has been very good this year. Professor Hobbie recommended observing more of that coverage before spending money for advertising space in the Daily. Bruce Thorpe moved to table the newsletter question until next quarter. Motion carried without dissent.

c. Humphrey Institute. Regarding SCC's desire for a meeting with Institute Director Harlan Cleveland, Professor Eaton urged the committee to acquaint itself with the content of the site study reports. The assignment was steered to the Subcommittee on Outreach.

3. There was no Student SCC report.

4. Committee Reports.

a. Grievance and Legal Concerns. Professor Schletzer reported on the workshop being conducted that day by the Office of Equal Opportunity regarding the new forms and procedures which are to go into effect October 3, and are designed to assure affirmative action in academic hiring. Schletzer

said attendance was good and participants demonstrated high interest. The process itself is complicated.

Professor Schletzer told the SCC that the Subcommittee on Sexual Harrassment reportedly has already made at least two revisions in their proposed structure and process for handling complaints. She recommended the SCC refrain from expressing concerns until it sees the revised proposal. Concerned individuals should call Chairman Raskind directly.

b. UCBBRR. Professor Swan reported that within the Planning Council there is an attempt to design a process for arriving at the capital request which integrates capital request planning with unit program planning.

5. New Business. Proposal to hold the October 23 meeting at Waseca. While time is short, that was the only date available in fall, and members had indicated a preference for avoiding winter travel. Ward described the kind of day the Waseca campus community would like the SCC to have--a tour of the campus, lunch, an SCC business meeting, and an open forum. When it became clear that several members would be unable to go on that date, the SCC voted to move the meeting to early spring.

6. Agenda for conversation with the President. Professor Eaton asked if there were any additions to the agenda. Bruce Thorpe said he would like, under the Intercollegiate Athletics item, to ask about the reported moving of the student seating section for Gopher hockey from second balcony center sides to first balcony corners.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 for the conversation with the President.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith B. Poppele*

Meredith B. Poppele,  
Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
383 Ford Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

### CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

October 2, 1980  
1:15-3:00 p.m.

Members of the administration present in addition to President Magrath were Vice President Keller, Assistants to the President Borgestad and Pazandak, and Assistant Vice President for Health Sciences, Cherie Perlmutter. Consultative Committee members present were Orhan Arkan, Julie Bates, Robert Brasted, Russ Hobbie, Bryan Jamison, Doug Pratt, Paul Quie, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Julie Sellgren, Donald Spring, Pat Swan, Bruce Thorpe, John Verrill, and Al Ward. Trish Van Pilsum of the Daily and Maureen Smith of University Relations also attended.

1. President Magrath said that he would announce the new Vice President for Finance the following week.

2. Budget.

a. Size of the problem. The discrepancy between budgeted expenses and receipts from the state will be about \$16 million--the \$14.1 million cut required by the state, plus part of the money to pay the civil service cost-of-living increases voted by the legislature. State money was provided but is insufficient and the University must make up the difference.

b. Meeting the problem.

(1) Expenditure reductions. The University has reduced its expenditures of state money in collegiate units, support services, and every other section of the University, as fairly as possible. The cuts amount to about \$5.8 million.

(2) Surcharge on tuition. The surcharge was determined individually by collegiate units and will generate in winter and pring quarters \$3.2 million.

(3) Borrowing. The University will borrow up to \$5 million at the end of the fiscal year, when it will know exactly how much it must borrow. Collateral will be certain parcels of University-owned land which are not in use for either research or instruction. To repay the debt, the University will consider selling some of the land.

(4) Additional means. The University has put \$1.7 million from its emergency funds into operating expenses, leaving it with only 1 1/2% of its O&M budget for contingencies. The University also benefitted from \$500,000 in excess tuition money because of larger-than-predicted enrollment. Vice President Keller said if the University does not lose all the money it expects to lose, its first effort will be to rebuild the reserve for contingencies.

c. Effects. Some University positions will go unfilled, but no

instructional staff is being let go. The University is proceeding as if the current steps are a one-time adjustment. It could not borrow again in the same way.

Professor Verrill asked how and when the University reverts money to the state. The President replied that no reversion actually takes place. Rather, those appropriations termed "open" are not available to the University to the extent they were budgeted and funded. The money will not be in the state treasury to draw on in May and June, so the University adjusts now.

Professor Eaton observed that within collegiate units there are prohibitions on certain kinds of monetary shifts. Vice President Keller said that the administration has placed no requirements on how units may achieve their reductions. However, all "step savings" (money unspent when a civil service position is temporarily vacant) go to the cost-of-living fund; hence a unit does not gain by leaving a civil service job open.

Professor Swan gave the example of her having to turn back money which would have supported a graduate student's thesis research. The President affirmed that the University wants to document all costs so that it can tell the legislature all that was lost or impaired by these cuts. Vice President Keller said the present means of documentation consists in the reports of deans and the directors of state specials as to what they cannot do. For example, agricultural extension agents will not go out to the communities of the state in December and January as they usually do. He said it had been particularly painful to have to cut seed money which brings in ten times itself in federal grants. The Budget Executive has prepared a report to the Regents on what the effects will be. He reemphasized that a cut of this magnitude effects hurt in every part of the University.

the policy The President and Vice President said the administration has reaffirmed for two more years of returning to the units 80% of unexpended salary money and all unexpended supply money. Until a few years ago, all money left at a year's end reverted to central administration, a system which worked against both good planning and the best use of funds. In some units, that carry-over of unexpended funds may cover the present deficit.

3. Academic Staff Policy and Procedures. Vice President Keller said the new recommendation is tighter but not substantially changed from the document originally considered by Senate committees. The content has been reorganized and seems clearer. It is now clear that no one would be shifted into the academic staff category without agreeing to the change. In many instances, employees see the transfer as working to their advantage by putting them in a position to be judged on their professional merits for the job they do, not for another sort of job. An academic staff advisory panel will provide a governance structure under Academic Affairs. Titles and designations have been renamed according to the advice of the units affected. He thinks the present document meets most of the concerns expressed by the Senate.

Professor Hobbie asked whether research appointments have always been other than faculty. The Vice President explained that the cluster of professional research titles is different from the traditional post-doctoral research fellow type. It represents an attempt to create a research category for full-time researchers who do no teaching.

Professor Eaton asked if V. P. Keller expected the Tenure Committee to become involved in the issue again this year. Keller said he assumed the Tenure Committee would still be involved, as the Senate voted last year, in designating groups of employees into the Academic staff category. The next step toward implementation is to propose to the Regents in October, as an information item, establishment of the classification. The President said the item would appear for action in November or December. Keller said it would then return to the Senate for settling questions on classification. Keller said there is no violation of the "cease and desist" order pertaining to the tenure code since no individual is being moved.

Professor Schletzer questioned the implications for affirmative action of the creation of this classification. The categories of employees being moved (most notably, librarians) have contained a large proportion of women. Hence when they become non-faculty, women will comprise a smaller proportion of the University faculty. Keller observed that another large category is that of agricultural extension agents who are for the most part males. The advantage for employees of the new classification is that they will be appraised for professional promotion by more appropriate standards than they are when designated faculty. The University, for its part, he stressed, must persist in affirmative action.

Schletzer asserted the need for academic staff employees to become part of the University governance system, since they will have the same academic concerns as faculty. The V. P. Keller and President Magrath voiced their agreement and the hope that the Consultative Committee can help phrase proposals to the Senate to bring in the new category.

Professor Spring asked if the administration had yet shown the new version of the proposal to the sensitive groups affected. Keller said they had to date worked considerably with the agricultural extension agents and met their general approval; the head of Continuing Education, who formerly had reservations, has volunteered his approval. He said it would be important to take it soon to the librarians.

4. Business Enterprises Policy Revision. The President said the revised report going to the Regents contains an affirmative statement on the value of extracurricular student business enterprises. Under the former policy, when the Vice President for Finance or for Student Affairs saw something amiss in a business operation, the concern would go to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs whose decision would be final, except for the possibility of a veto by the President. A significant change in the proposed new version is that if a vice president deems the committee position to be mistaken, the officer can appeal to the President for corrective action. President Magrath said there is no intention by this change to torpedo a student enterprise. In response to a question from Bruce Thorpe, the President said the document does not address the issue of excess funds. He volunteered that private businesses occasionally question competition from University enterprises, such as livestock sales by the agricultural extension agents.

5. Student Fees Policy. The President said it is appropriate for the relevant committees to study and make recommendations on the fees structure, including the fee for the Daily. Every fee, he said, is negotiated annually. He cannot now address questions on the refundable Daily fee because of the suit brought against the University on that matter. Professor Hobbie observed that the Consultative Committee could take it upon itself to see that a

review mechanism is instituted on the Daily fee question.

Arkan raised a general question about the annual spring procedure on fees recommendations. The Regents receive three sets of recommendations, which may differ or be the same: that of the Student Fees Committee, that of student government on each campus, and that of the administration. The President said it is valuable for the record to have each recommendation presented, but that they can be presented jointly whenever they agree, and separately only when they disagree. Arkan and the President agreed that usually the recommendation of the fees committee and that of the student governments could be merged into one.

6. Intercollegiate Athletics. Professor Schletzer had understood that there was to be more discussion on this campus prior to women's intercollegiate athletics being moved into the Big 10, which she described as a branch of the NCAA. President Magrath clarified the relationships and the changes in process. The women are not presently in the Big 10. The University of Minnesota is a member of the Big 10 which, as a conference, is within the NCAA. Each has a bearing on the others. The Big 10 is governed ultimately by the faculties and presidents of the member institutions. Minnesota women belong to the AIAW. Hence the University of Minnesota is a member of two organizations (NCAA and AIAW) which are bitter opponents of each other. For five or six years the Big 10's Council of Presidents has argued the question of whether to bring their women's intercollegiate athletics into the Big 10. Magrath and President Boyd of Iowa have consistently spoken against that move. In the latest vote on the subject, this summer, President Magrath felt that, as one of a minority of only two opposing the move for women, he must vote in favor of the study on creation of a plan for women joining the Big 10. However, he said, he will not at all compel University women's joining this conference. It is his assessment that in terms of prestige it will probably turn out to be advantageous to the University women to join. Professor Schletzer expressed pessimism about the security and self-direction of women's intercollegiate athletics when it comes under the NCAA blanket.

Bruce Thorpe informed the President that the section of hockey seats newly reserved this year for students are the worst possible. The President said he would get his specialist vice president to look into that situation.

7. Council on Undergraduate Education. Professor Brasted, who had placed the item on the agenda, had had to leave the meeting early. Professor Spring summarized the history of the proposal for such a council. He said that the Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization had believed that incorporating such a council into the Senate structure would be divisive and that therefore the proposal should not be handled as part of Senate reorganization but administratively. Reorganization forwarded the proposal to SCEP, asking that it offer its advice to the administration. If SCEP thought such a council belonged in the Senate apparatus, it would report so back to the Senate. Brasted is wondering how central administration views the council proposal.

The President said he did not think such a council would be meaningful. A council would be redundant and not imply improvement in undergraduate education. There are better ways to achieve the desired ends. In defense of the proposal, Professor Eaton said there are questions which arise which cannot be dealt with at the collegiate level. She thinks many undergraduates

face real problems with which no one is explicitly assigned to deal. Professor Schletzer remarked that in most units the undergraduates feel they are treated as second rate, with their situations always regarded as a little less important than those of graduate students; other students serve as their advisors; they rarely have the chance to talk with a professor.

The President observed that deans are responsible for both undergraduate and graduate education, and that ideally there would not be the bifurcation which exists between the two. Professor Swan asked precisely where it is that the students do not get what they need, and the President also asked to have the problem focused. Professor Hobbie noted that in Physics, graduate students complain more than undergraduates.

8. President Magrath described the Planning Council paper on issues proposed for consideration for intense study, with the choice to be made from among three: Barriers to Increasing Faculty Productivity; Enhancing Intra-University Cooperation; Curricular Duplication and its Impact on Quality. The "Barriers" issue is the one President Magrath would most like to see addressed.

The President remarked that he has enjoyed the association with the All University Senate Consultative Committee and finds it constructive.

Professor Swan expressed her disappointment at her very first SCC meeting with the President this summer (the August 26 briefing on the budget cuts) because it was a joint meeting including all deans and unit heads and so because of the large numbers, it was impossible for her to offer much faculty perspective. The President said the necessity to explain the crisis immediately to a large part of the community had regrettably required that that particular meeting be a joint one. Normally, the budgetary consulting sessions are held appropriately in small groups, including UCBRRR.

The conversation concluded at 3:00 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,  
Secretary, SCC