



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING AND  
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

March 1, 1984  
300 Morrill Hall  
10:15 - 12:30

AGENDA

- 10:15 FCC
1. Minutes of February 16 (enclosed).
  2. Report of the Chair.
  3. Set agenda for March 8 meeting with Regents.
  4. Set dates for two additional Faculty Senate meetings.

FCC with the President

- 11:00
1. The International Character of the University.  
(NOTE: Professors Michael Root (SCEP) and Karen Olness (International Education Committee) will join us for this discussion.)
- 11:45
2. The Merwin Report on Faculty Vitality.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MINUTES  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND  
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

APPROVED 3/15/84

March 1, 1984  
300 Morrill Hall  
10:30 - 12:30

Members present: Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe (Chr.), Marvin Mattson, Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, W. Donald Spring, Deon Stuthman, John Turner.

Guests: President Magrath, Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow, Doug Iverson (Minnesota Daily).

1. The minutes of the February 16 meeting were approved.

2. Report of the Chair.

A. Date for SCC dinner at Eastcliff. No Thursdays are available in the late spring, and the President has proposed one of two Wednesdays. FCC members proposed the SCC accept for Wednesday, May 30.

B. Inloading of Summer Session and Continuing Education & Extension credit instruction.

Professor Howe met with the Faculty Affairs Committee at its first major meeting on inloading, a subject Educational Policy asked it to address after SCEP itself looked at the issue and raised several questions. SCFA has now identified what it sees as the major issues and is scheduling a meeting on the question with Vice President Keller.

Professor Rubenstein said the Finance Committee would discuss inloading with Dr. Keller, probably in April. Professor Howe noted that while SCEP and SCFA seem to be concerning themselves with questions on faculty workload and compensation, inloading raises additional questions, such as curriculum, which the SCC and SFC could perhaps attend to.

Professor Spring noted that the Finance Committee has in recent years encouraged the vice president fairly strongly to forward inloading because of the anticipated increase in state support that would result.

FCC members raised other points the committee could discuss with Vice President Keller:

- Professor Turner noted that a great deal of Extension is in CLA. If a consequence of inloading is a net retrenchment for CLA with reallocation of the new stream of state money to other units such as IT, there would be a lot of unhappiness.

- Professor Fredricks said the individual circumstances of units need to be taken into consideration; Theater Arts' faculty and students alike are for the most part away from campus in the summer practicing their craft.

Compensation: Professor Merwin reported that the College of Education has inloaded Extension, but each department pays the evening instructor on an overload basis.

Professor Howe told SCC that new information indicates the legislature funds the state university system and community colleges for summer instruction which is not inloaded.

C. Review of the President's administration.

Professor Howe summed up the FCC meeting with Professor Kauffman as thoughtful and informed. Professor Merwin credited Professor Howe with thorough and excellent preparation.

Confidentiality of letters submitted. Faculty colleagues have been inquiring just what the attribute of confidentiality means in this case. Professor Howe recommended, and the FCC indicated complete agreement, that the names of the signers should be excised before going to the Regents' committee. The unit, as shown on the letterhead, should not be excised. Professor Howe will forward the recommendation to Mr. Wilson.

Professor Howe reported that Professor Kauffman will go to UMD for meetings with administrators and to hold office hours (which Professor Howe had recommended on the basis of conversations with several UMD faculty members). Several persons wondered about the legal implications of Professor Kauffman's visit to a campus where most of the faculty are represented by a collective bargaining unit, and wondered whether the Duluth faculty would have sufficient input through their bargaining unit. Several also were concerned that Professor Kauffman have access to the other coordinate campuses.

D. Consent Decree petitions.

Professor Striebel has proposed to Professor Howe that the EEOWC and FCC proceed jointly this spring to constitute two additional ad hoc committees to address two more of the six petitions filed with the court last June. One alleges discrimination in assigning P/A as opposed to faculty classification; the other alleges discriminatory intent in retrenchment decisions. Professor Howe read the operative language from the petitions.

The University must decide whether or not to respond to each petition submitted. Mr. Dunham recommended last fall that FCC and EEOWC join in the effort to formulate a response to the petition regarding internal tribunals. FCC is uncertain whether central administration intends to respond to each of the others or to let some of them flow to the special masters.

Professor Freier said that determining whether or not discrimination occurred in the petitions now singled out is primarily a matter of data collection followed by a statistical analysis. Professor Stuthman recommended that the people who believe they have witnessed or experienced discrimination should offer testimony but should not be part of the deliberative body.

Professor Howe will talk further with Professor Striebel and Mr. Dunham.

3. Tenure Code development and Regents' concerns.

Professor Rubenstein said the Regents are concerned about keeping informed on the Code's development. Professor Howe reported that Vice President Keller has now sent a new packet to the Regents which compares the December 1983 draft of the code with the 1945 code and the 1973 document. He said he hoped to talk with Vice President Keller about structuring FCC's March 8 meeting in a way to be most useful to the Regents.

Professor Rubenstein voiced the hope that we could anticipate when the Senate-approved code would go to the Regents for information and plan one or two additional Regents-FCC meetings before that.

4. Set dates for two additional Faculty Senate meetings.

Of the remaining Thursdays, Professor Turner must be out of town on March 29 and there is a regular meeting of the University Senate on April 19. The FCC asked Professor Howe to confer with Professor Morrison and then set two more Faculty Senate meeting dates.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

1. Merwin Report on Facilitating the Scholarly Activity of the Faculty.

Professor Howe explained the FCC would like to discuss what implementation all of us have in mind. President Magrath indicated he would like to know whether the Faculty Affairs Committee is expected to respond to the recommendations in a major way.

The President told FCC that he likes the report very much. We have to sort out, he said, the non-controversial and cost-free elements from those with cost implications and/or which require legislative appropriation. He would like to get agreement to accomplish some of the recommendations and enter them in the biennial request. We want to move it, he said. Professor Merwin will meet with Vice President Keller and the deans.

The President asked that FCC give him, in addition to whatever it gets from SCFA, a statement on priorities listing four or five of the main items which have budgetary implications.

Comments on the recommendations.

We should restate the given that an improved faculty salary structure is important above all, he said. Other high priorities are the faculty leave policy for sabbaticals, better funding for quarter leaves. He commented that we need a means to enable very small departments to participate. He acknowledged the concern over the adequacy of SEE moneys.

Professor Howe remarked that faculty complaints probably were not about

short supplies alone, but also of being hampered by the lack of central specialized shops. We need to ask, he said, as we review our planning process, whether we have gone too far in our general effort to lessen cuts to academic units by cutting more deeply in support services. Professor Turner said there may be a need for some reorganization so that the existing specialized shops can serve more widely.

Professor Merwin noted that his committee had observed that there are indirect disincentives for a department to keep up its SEE money because those funds are more vulnerable than payroll lines when facing retrenchment. He added that complaints about support also had to do in a major way with secretarial support, numbers of TA's, and the like.

The President mentioned a possibility he said he would like to present to the Budget Executive regarding presenting the formula SEE budget to the Legislature: to break out at least one component to demonstrate how SEE supports faculty work efforts in generating grants and in teaching, and thereby constitutes an investment.

Regarding the quest for recognition and new awards, the President said he would welcome specific recommendations (other than merit salary increases, which are already being used). Professor Merwin told the meeting that the committee found some units do a better job and that central administration might be able to set a certain tone and encourage such activity. The College of Education, for example, recognizes a Distinguished Teacher each year; that makes us more aware of what each other is doing. He said administrators could meet to share information on what works successfully in their units. Professor Stuthman observed that sometimes people are unaware of what is going on in their own unit and envious of what they see happening in other units.

Professor Howe questioned why it was central administration's job to make sure faculty appreciate each other. The President said it is a presidential and central administrative responsibility to see that faculty have the opportunity to recognize what one another are doing.

To begin implementing the report's recommendations, Professor Rubenstein said we need to:

- (1) select what is to be done right away;
- (2) assign responsibility;
- (3) set deadlines.

It may be unwise, he suggested, to apply a leave policy uniformly across the University. The University should be in a position to maximize the efforts of a really exceptional faculty member.

President Magrath referred to the six NIH Young Investigator Awards recently made to University faculty members and said it is important for the University now to provide additional resources so the recipients can go even further.

The desire and need for "retooling" -- just what is meant by it, and how do we deal with it?

Professor Turner offered as an example of retooling a young faculty colleague shifting emphasis: everyone would stand to benefit if he were able to take some courses now in a particular field.

- Faculty complaints of too much time spent on committees at the same time faculty complain of not being consulted.

Professor Howe said the faculty have to tend to that contradiction.

Professor Merwin pointed out that complaints distinguished between administrative committees and governance committees, with more seeming to come out of administrative committee work. A common complaint was, "If I'm asked to work on a report I'd like to know what happens to it."

Professor Turner said it is true that some faculty get overloaded with administrative work; department heads should be asked to check to see what is the extra workload of their most productive people, and especially their junior faculty.

Professor Turner said we should start at once on those little things which could mean a lot. They could be implemented within a year with very little or no application of resources. Among those recommendations with costs attached, we have to set priorities. He recommended that faculty and administration make proposals soon on how to proceed, and then compare notes.

Retreat. President Magrath proposed that all concerned think about the possibility of a day-long retreat for department heads and chairs, deans, and some faculty, to spend on some of these matters.

Vice President Keller remarked on the significance of group dynamics; it would be useful to know the processes that made changes in departments, and what effects different policies have had.

2. The International Character of the University. Professor Karen Olness, Chairperson of the International Education Committee, and Professor Michael Root, Chairperson of the Educational Policy Committee, joined the meeting for this discussion.

Professor Howe asked what the President would like Senate committees to do to help him move forward in responding to the report, and asked what the other committees were doing. Professor Root said that the Educational Policy Committee would write its own response; Dr. Olness said the International Education Committee had just mailed out to the SCC members its response.

President Magrath noted that international education has diverse aspects and that the task force report is a distillation of a number of earlier reports. He believes the University is already an international institution. He believes it is appropriate for central administration to recognize and promote that fact. He referred to the role of international education in promoting international development.

At the national and state levels, resources are extraordinarily limited, he said. But there are people talking at these levels about such activity. He

described himself as one of the people who believe in the importance of attention to these areas, including the study of foreign languages. He said he thinks funding will be hard to come by. But he thinks we can raise some money for international education, that some will probably come from Congress in the next few years, and some from foundations.

He distributed to the meeting participants bound copies of an outside statement made to Congress entitled, "What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us."

He said he does not believe it is the job of the President or of Academic Affairs to prescribe what the University's international education should contain. But we do need a central officer for international education to see that certain things get done. We need to become more organized centrally and to strengthen and support the opportunities we have for international education. But, we need not to try too many things. Much has to come out of the faculty.

There is a lot of interest and receptivity in a number of units on international education activities. He also wants more possibilities for the four coordinate campuses. He told the meeting he would like to see the University of Minnesota more in a leadership position nationally in international education.

Professor Stuthman offered the observation that part of the problem for funding and for understanding is that we continue to think in terms of "we" and "they" -- national vs. international -- while we should try to think comprehensively of us in the whole. We should stress the commonalities among peoples over the differences.

Dr. Olness said she would like to say "Amen" to a lot of what the President has said. The comments of the International Education Committee on the task force report are quite unanimous, she reported. They favor the integrative approach and view; they favor increasing the visibility of what already happens. Awareness would inevitably help the University. It can do much for business, for example.

Professor Root told the meeting he also thinks the task force has produced a good report. SCEP would like to see a summary of the monetary and other consequences as well as of the anticipated benefits, which are enumerated. SCEP counted five new committees that would ensue. There is a need to flesh out the effects of implementation in terms of the burdens, he said. He said that it should be suggested to future task forces that they include a section in their report on expected costs which give a sense of what we are giving up to get what the report proposes. Vice President Keller said a task force can focus on cost and can estimate something about cost, but cannot assess the likely trade-offs. For that you need the perspective of an overarching committee like the SCC.

Professor Root noted that a fundraising officer is proposed for international education while many major programs do not have their own officer. The President pointed out that a number of development officers have been farmed out to a number of units and that many of those, although not all, have benefitted thereby. We have faced conflicts regarding fundraising before, he continued. Anything we did with fundraising regarding international education would have to fit with our other needs. He believes there are sources that would be specifically responsive to international education needs.

The President said the vice presidents and he had not yet discussed how they would like to proceed. No one has yet agreed to any particular implementation.

Professor Turner said if the University seeks foundation help, at some point it is going to have to report what it is doing. The President said that of course the University would have to show what its base is at the time it requests foundation support.

Professor Turner called for getting the quality criteria in place before proceeding. The "we" and "they" attitude arises, he said, when enormous amounts of faculty time are taken up with those students who shouldn't have been admitted in the first place.

He said it is impossible to become the international university of the United States. He warned that the University's area studies are the most expensive kind of programs because of the library resources each must have. He agreed that we don't send enough students overseas, but added that some of the projects for which University students can get credit overseas are of very low value.

Professor Freier said she thought there would have to be some central support services for international students.

The President asked that the discussion be continued. (He had to depart from the meeting at this point.) Professor Howe said SCC looks to its colleagues on Educational Policy and International Education to sort out this agenda.

Structure. Vice President Keller reminded the meeting that a decision regarding the head officer for international education needs to be made at once because the term of OIP's interim director expires on June 30. He said he could extract a proposal on structure and put it before the concerned committees for their response.

Professor Spring spoke to the need to assess the relative values the University ought to be giving. There is significance in assigning to international education its own assistant vice president while not assigning an officer of that rank to so many other areas which conceivably could merit the same.

Professor Turner recalled that under President Wilson the University set up a Dean of International Studies. Gradually the position diminished in its role. Then the position was reconstituted as a directorship. He commented that there is a lot of logistical work regarding international activities with which the head officer should not have to be bothered. Vice President Keller described that fact as part of the reason for recommending that the Office of International Student Advising be shifted into the new structure where it would be given a lot of the practical responsibilities.

Vice President Keller reminded the meeting that under a grant from Exxon central administration is holding meetings with various University units to talk about how they can internationalized their curricula.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30.

Meredith Poppele,  
Recorder





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

February 24, 1984

President C. Peter Magrath  
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

The members of FCC look forward to our meeting with you on March first. As you will recall from our meeting of February 2, the SCC has talked at some length and fairly seriously about the implications of the Task Force Report on "The International Character of the University." At their February 16 meeting, SCC members reemphasized some of these points and raised some other considerations as well. We know that some of the recommendations are already being implemented, at least in part. We're persuaded that other proposals can be initiated quickly. But we're concerned that some need to be carefully thought through before we plunge in.

We shall come with some specific thoughts about the "Merwin Report" as well. Encased in its data and findings, we think, are some sobering as well as encouraging implications.

We look forward to hearing your thoughts and questions about both of these important sets of issues. We have invited Professors Michael Root and Karen Olness to join us for the first part of the agenda.

Cordially,

John Howe, Chairperson,  
Faculty Consultative Committee

JH:mp

Enc: SCC minutes of 2/2, 2/16



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office File  
3-1-84

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

March 8, 1984

Vice President Kenneth Keller  
Office of Academic Affairs  
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

Just a note to follow up the Faculty Consultative Committee's conversation with you and the President last week. You indicated toward the end of that meeting that the two of you would develop a proposal concerning administrative leadership arrangements for international education at the University. Everyone seems agreed that decisions of that sort are preliminary to decisions of programmatic and other sorts. We look forward to receiving and discussing your proposal.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'John Howe'.

John Howe, Chairperson,  
Faculty Consultative Committee

JH:mp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

cc: FCC 3-15

March 2, 1984

Mr. Duane Wilson, Secretary  
The Board of Regents  
220 Morrill Hall

Dear Duane:

At our meeting yesterday, the Faculty Consultative Committee discussed the matter of confidentiality of faculty letters to the Regents' Presidential Review Committee. A number of faculty have asked us what "confidentiality" means in this instance. We propose the following conditions:

- that Professor Kauffman have full access to them,
- that I, as chairperson of FCC, have full access to them, and
- that if copies of the letters are forwarded to the Regents' special review committee, the authors' names first be removed. We think that is important. The authors' departmental affiliations, as indicated by the letterhead, should be retained since that would be useful information for people to have available.

We hope these understandings are agreeable to Professor Kauffman and the Regents' committee.

Sincerely yours,

John Howe, Chairperson  
Faculty Consultative Committee

JH/mp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
March 15, 1984  
12:30 - 3:00  
626 Campus Club

AGENDA

1. Minutes of March 1 (enclosed).
2. Reports:
  - A. Report of the Chair
  - B. Report of Finance Committee
  - C. Reports from Regents meetings.
3. Additional ad hoc committees re Rajender Decree:
  - A. Use of the Professional Academic Classification
  - B. Retrenchment and Female Faculty.

Note: J.H. will report on his March 12 meeting with Charlotte Striebel and Steve Dunham.
4. Arrangements for making our Senate and Assembly committee appointments early in the Spring Quarter.

Note: We will bring a list of the appointments we are called upon to make.
5. Development of Recommendations to the President Concerning the Findings of the Merwin Report.

Note: Please come prepared to make and discuss specific proposals. I hope to prepare our statement over the quarter break.
6. Discussion of Various Salary Procedures Involving Departmental Merit, Market Impact, and Our Usual Spring Allocations.