



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

TENTATIVE AGENDA

(distributed only to participants and vice presidents)

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
and
CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

Thursday, February 3, 1983
300 Morrill Hall

- 10:00 1. FCC.
- A. Tenure Code revision
 - B. Senate agenda for February 17
 - C. Faculty night out
 - D. Other items.
2. Conversation with the President.
- 10:30 A. University-wide priority setting
- 11:00 B. Inloading - discussion of strategy
- 11:30 C. Legislative strategy (Peter Robinson and Phil Shively, guests)
- 12:20 3. Adjourn.

date January 26 19 83

to Faculty Consultative Committee

from Pat Swan

Re: Open hearing on Tenure Code Revision

Bob Morris has now proposed an open hearing, co-sponsored by the Tenure Committee and FCC, on revisions in the Tenure Code with emphasis on provisions for financial exigency and programmatic change.

After checking various calendars, the likely time looks to be Friday, February 18, 2-4 p.m., in the Regents Room, from where we can have a good phone hook-up with the other campuses.

- Questions:
1. Do you believe FCC should co-sponsor?
 2. If so, how do you believe hearings should be announced and structured?
 - a) Should certain questions be posed beforehand?
 - b) Should special groups be invited to testify?
 - c) How should we notify the faculty?
 - d) Etc.

WE WILL SPEND TIME IN OUR FCC MEETING ON FEB. 3 ON THESE QUESTIONS.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

DRAFT
MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

February 3, 1983
300 Morrill Hall
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Members present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe, W. D. Spring, W. B. Sundquist, P. Swan, J. Turner.

Guest: C. Pazandak.

Proposed hearing on tenure code revision.

Bob Morris is agreeable to holding an open hearing which the Tenure Committee and Faculty Consultative Committee would co-sponsor. FCC agreed enthusiastically to join Tenure in this project. Tentative particulars:

Friday, February 18, 2-4 p.m., Regents Room and annex, with phone hook-up to coordinate campuses.

FCC discussed ways to structure the hearing. Bob Morris has told Swan that the two subjects whose public discussion can most help the committee are (1) the relationship of financial exigency to tenure and (2) the relationship of programmatic planning to tenure.

FCC identified three main purposes for an open hearing:

- (1) to allow the faculty to give vent to their feelings;
- (2) to enable the Tenure Committee to learn faculty views regarding dismissal for programmatic revision; and
- (3) to educate some of the faculty who will not before have heard particular arguments and rationales.

Spring argued against the usefulness of a highly legal discussion since ultimately the courts will permit regents to do whatever they want; the question is thus whether the faculty want in the code procedures and constraints on administrative/board action.

Freier indicated she is worried about the University's internal grievance system that will respond to cases brought under the code.

FCC agreed the Tenure Committee and FCC will pose two or three questions relating to financial exigency and to planning, to promote faculty thinking in anticipation of the hearing, and will have an expert in attendance to respond to legal questions, especially with reference to recent case law. Discussion should not be constrained.

FCC
2/3/83
p. 2

Publicity in the form of a Daily ad and one or two notices in Brief should include a phone number faculty can call for additional information or to reserve speaking time.

FCC agreed it wants to generate testimony from certain thoughtful faculty members representing different viewpoints. The following were immediately suggested: AAUP (check with Paul Murphy), Leo Hurwicz, Phil Tichenor, Rick Purple, Woods Halley, Paul Ellis, Roberta Humphreys, Marcia Eaton, and some former chairs of the Judicial Committee. Invitations to these and/or others should be coordinated through M. Poppele at the SCC office.

FCC members would like to take the occasion of the hearing to speak out too.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Executive Assistant,
Recorder



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

January 26, 1982

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

This letter conveys my understanding of our deliberations and tentative decisions on agenda items for your meeting with the Faculty Consultative Committee on February 3. We have also made tentative plans for the March 3rd meeting. I believe you and I reached a reasonably clear and mutually satisfactory understanding of which items will constitute our combined agenda and the probable best order for their discussion. As we talked on Tuesday, we recognized that the agenda (especially for March 3) will likely change somewhat because of changing circumstances and we agreed that in any case it would be advisable to have time at all of your meetings with the committee for brief extemporaneous discussions of items not placed on the agenda beforehand.

I appreciated the time and thought you gave to the nature of your discussions with the Faculty Consultative Committee. I am confident that your attention, and that of the committee's, to the quality of our consultation will allow us to improve our effectiveness in the communication we all believe to be important.

Concerning our agenda for February 3, I believe we agreed on the following items:

1. Setting overall priorities in planning and budgeting.

Because certain aspects of this question have been discussed previously and because discussion of this topic could easily lead to endless generalities, only certain aspects should receive our attention at this meeting. May I suggest the following:

- a) Briefly, how does one apply the litany of criteria (quality, connectedness, etc.) to whole units such as colleges and campuses?
- b) Are there other criteria (Not now in our litany) that must be considered at the level of whole colleges and campuses?

c) When we consider the question of maintaining (and building) quality in certain programs we say that quality cannot exist in isolation and that to some extent we must consider quality "across the board." How wide is the board?

d) The quality of graduate programs is an issue that should be considered by many different units. But how does one identify the relative priority of types of activities (rather than programs)? For example, we have discussed establishing priorities among programs (and units) such as math and English. However, we have spent little time discussing how to establish priorities among types of activities (research vs. graduate education vs. outreach vs. work with international students, etc., etc.).

2. Further examination of the question of "inloading."

a) Since the original Senate discussions, the collective faculty view on "inloading" is probably somewhat changed due to recent concerns over funding and increased discussions about life-long learning. If this is true, how, within the planning process, might we best proceed with considerations of the most important aspects of "inloading?"

b) What are the aspects most in need of consideration? Do they include the impact of inloading on faculty workload, faculty compensation and the definition of what is to be "inloaded?" What else?

3. Strategy for working with the Legislature during the current session (with Peter Robinson and Phil Shively, guests).

a) What will be emphasized to the Legislature in contacts made on behalf of the University?

b) What groups will be contacting the Legislature on behalf of the University?

c) How will issues related to northeastern Minnesota affect the University within legislative and other political circles?

I am dismayed when I consider the potential length of this meeting. The attached tentative agenda suggests time limits for each discussion. I hope that prior thought will allow us to use our time together efficiently.

C. Peter Magrath
January 26, 1983
page 3

Thank you for the extended conversation on Tuesday. I appreciate how difficult it is for you to give such a block of time from your schedule. Though we have made plans for the agenda for your March 3rd meeting with the Faculty Consultative Committee, I shall spare you, for a few days, reading through that agenda.

Sincerely,

Pat

Patricia B. Swan, Chairman,
Faculty Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp

Enc: Tentative agenda

c with enclosure: Members of FCC
Carol Pazandak



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

January 28, 1983

To: Stacey Milavetz, Daily's University Community Editor
From: Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant
Re: February 3rd meetings

Meredith

The regularly scheduled Faculty Consultative Committee meeting scheduled for February 3rd will be a non-public meeting. The Committee has voted to close the meeting to protect the rights of individuals, as permitted by the Senate Constitution.

The Senate Consultative Committee and conversation with the President scheduled to follow at 12:30 will be a public meeting.