



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

December 4, 1986
10:15 - 12:00
300 Morrill Hall

AGENDA

Approx. time INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 10:15 | 1. Report of the Chair.
2. Report of the Finance Committee Chair. |
| 10:20 | 3. External Governance Review: Identification of appropriate persons for external reviewers to meet with and interview. |

DISCUSSION/ACTION

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 10:35 | 4. Approval of November 20 minutes (attached).
5. Special committee on preliminary evaluation of the academic professional classification: Prospective nominees. |
|-------|---|

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 10:45 | 6. Central administration's proposal for an SDI forum (attachment). |
| 11:15 | 7. Provost's Advisory Task Force on Academic Planning: Charge and timetable for identifying members. |
| 11:30 | 8. President's items. |





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612) 626-1850

MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

December 4, 1986
10:25 - 12:10
300 Morrill Hall

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (Chair), Charles Campbell, Mark Brenner, Richard Goldstein, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Phil Shively.

Guests: Roger Benjamin (Vice President and Provost), David Hamilton, (Chair, Senate Committee on Research), Kenneth Keller (President), V. Rama Murthy (Associate Vice President), Mary Jane Plunkett (student organization adviser), Marsha Riebe (of the president's office), Mike Peltier (Minnesota Daily), Maureen Smith (University Relations), and six student SCC members: Patrick Durbin, Brenda Ellingboe, Ron Kubik, Roy St. Laurent, Andy Seitel, and Bruce Vandal.

1. Report of the chair.

- Professor Berscheid invited FCC members to let her know any new ideas about academic planning they would like her to convey to the provost when she met with him the following day.

- There will be no December 18 meeting.

- Legislative liaison. The colleague Professors Berscheid and Shively have most recently discussed the position with is now considering the offer. Expenses would have to include the means to help keep that person's research going.

2. Report of the Finance Committee chair.

Professor Shively said SFC's agenda for 3:15 this afternoon would include an executive session discussion with vice presidents Benjamin and Kegler on how the University's biennial request stands in the state offices, and then in regular session the outlook for the sabbatical proposals, and academic planning.

Consultation with committees. Professor Shively said that in the November SFC meeting, some committee chairs complained that their committees were not being appropriately involved and consulted on major business relevant to their charges. He commented that the Planning Committee and the Finance Committee should both have been in on the evolution of the procedures for academic planning. While each has a good reason for feeling it should be heavily involved with planning for the University's

future, it would be wasteful of the provost's time to meet separately with three committees. Chairs in SFC expressed the view that if a matter is exciting and important the Consultative Committee takes it for its agenda. Some committees feel frustrated that they are not getting some important matters which they should. Professors Berscheid and Brenner noted, though, that as soon as a draft on academic planning reached FCC, the FCC requested that the administration involve the Senate Planning Committee.

FCC members noted that multiple committee interest in an issue has long been a problem, and they discussed assigning (or coordinating) an issue to one committee. In trying to determine optimum governance consideration of an issue, one confronts the conflicting ideals of, on the one hand, encouraging the generation of as many good ideas as possible and, on the other hand, enabling governance to speak with one voice to the administration. Professor Berscheid agreed that the committees have a legitimate interest, and said she would not want them suppressed from giving their opinions.

Professor Shively thought it not the best course of business for the Faculty Affairs Committee currently to be discussing its sabbatical plan with the academic vice president, since SCFA submitted the plan in the spring and the Finance Committee is now dealing with it. However, Professor Campbell argued that SCFA has a very legitimate interest in the fate of that proposal and, because it has studied the question at length, is the best body to discuss the plan with Vice President Benjamin.

Dr. Benjamin as a new vice president wanted that December 3 discussion with SCFA, probed the committee in many ways, and wants to establish closer relations with SCFA.

Professor Berscheid asked if providing for coordination of work is not the reason the Finance Committee includes the chairs of the major committees, but Professor Shively said that while SFC provides for communication, coordination is not part of its charge or role. Professor Campbell said the Faculty Consultative Committee should be in the business of communication to the committees.

Professor Brenner finds the Finance Committee's special role to be setting individual requests and rationales (e.g., child care, sabbatical support) in the context of all the University's needs.

Professor Murphy pointed out that in some instances the different interests of different committees mean their wishes cannot be reconciled.

Professor Shively said an appropriate balance must be struck between providing for extensive interchanges and squandering faculty and central administrators' time; he called those administrators a terribly important resource to the University. He and Professor Brenner recommended the Facilitative Committee as the place to take up issues of multiple committee interest. Professor Berscheid indicated she could, if necessary, call a Facilitative meeting for early in January.

3. Governance: visit of external reviewers.

The chair asked members to submit any suggestions about the visitors' schedule and interviews.

4. FCC minutes of November 20. The chair will submit corrections; she asked other members to call the secretary by December 8 with any others.

5. Special committee to evaluate the Academic Professional class, as called for by Faculty Senate

The chair submitted a set of names to nominations subcommittee members Brenner and Campbell. Professor Campbell asked that the charge to the special committee require it to get information about all the academic professional ranks, not just what the committee members will know from their own experience. He suggested they might need to devise a survey to go to all members of the class.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

President Keller joined the meeting at 11:15. Several other guests joined the meeting at this point, including the Student SCC (see list at the beginning of these minutes).

6. Administration support for a University forum on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

President Keller told the meeting he and some others in central administration thought the SCC and the Senate acted appropriately regarding a resolution to the Senate (that the Senate urge that there be a forum on SDI with the Regents being invited), which he saw as flawed in two ways: it was not cast in terms of governance, and the "whereas" clauses did not lead logically to the conclusion as regards the regents. On the other hand, he said, there is hardly anyone who does not think the issue is worth discussion. If a forum is wanted, central administration can help in such ways as finding space for the event.

Individuals approached him for support, he said, and he responded that he could approve the holding of a debate.

He distinguished to FCC two questions: (1) Is SDI a policy this country should pursue? (2) Are there questions for which academic freedom should be abridged?

In answer to the second, he noted that two existing University curbs on academic freedom are the proscription of secret research and the controls and limits on research on human subjects and on animals. The question of whether there are other criteria on which we can circumscribe academic freedom can be debated, he said. We put constraints on any number of rights after having thought through some generalizable principles. Perhaps there is a generalizable principle to examine which relates to the SDI research question.

He thought several committees might take an interest in the question, not as a governance issue but as an issue concerning the University. He would endorse a debate being conducted and sees that as not in conflict with the Senate and SCC actions already taken.

Committees may want to be involved, he said, in how the event takes place, if it could lead to an issue of governance which is not the one the Senate has already decided. He did not think the SCC or the Senate objected to the idea of a debate in itself.

Professor Shively regarded the initiative for this debate as coming from the administration. President Keller told FCC that he did not see the larger question as a new one because he had raised it three years ago regarding a particular project at the Duluth campus supported by the Department of Defense. As Academic Vice President he approved it but saw it as something which, although not secret, many people would find acceptable. He recalled that at the time he suggested that the Senate Committee on Research look at it.

He told the FCC he wanted to correct the impression the Daily gave that the Senate and the administration oppose debate.

Professor Campbell remarked that he has been disappointed that the Humphrey Institute has not organized a high-level, informed debate of experts, people who can set forth all the issues relevant to SDI. Professor Hamilton said that only an informed debate can educate the University community; while there may be lack of knowledge concerning SDI, people have very firm opinions. The Research Committee, he said, will want to be involved if there is a campus forum.

Professor Campbell noted that Miguel Carter, the student senator who authored the resolution, wanted prominence for the issue. There have been many SDI forums, but very little attention paid to them by most people. He hoped a forum could be put on something of a par with the Carlson lectures.

Professor Shively recommended it be sponsored at a high level but not in the University governance structure, for that would carry with it an expectation of action which could not actually be predetermined.

He recommended Humphrey Institute sponsorship and added the Institute might very well act in conjunction with either the Institute of Technology or with the Health Sciences.

Vice President Benjamin noted that Dean Harlan Cleveland has, at deans meetings, voiced the broad public affairs issue of high technology's ethical, moral, and social impacts. It is Dr. Benjamin's hope that over the next decade the University will have much discussion of this area.

President Keller said the administration would not initiate an SDI forum, but would provide some support, out of discretionary funds, for a well-planned event. He stated the broad question as: How the University defines the conditions under which research should or should not be done.

7. Academic Planning: details of charge to, and timetable for naming members of, the Provost's Advisory Task Force.

Dr. Benjamin wants the committee named promptly since, because the bulk of the work will be done in Spring Quarter, some adjustments in faculty members' teaching assignments may be required. He reported he has just sent notices to all the deans and vice presidents requesting nominations; someone in his office will forward the names to the Consultative Committee chair. He expects the Consultative Committee to also submit names. We will compare the lists, he said, and put together a final list.

Professor Berscheid noted that given upcoming final exams and the holiday break, it would not seem possible to meet on the names until early January. Too many people are interested in the make-up of this committee to let it be rushed through during the break, and the FCC wants to meet over the names.

Professor Berscheid said the faculty members named will need release time which will be expensive, but Dr. Benjamin said there was no problem with covering that expense.

FCC members agreed to meet the first week in January. Professor Campbell indicated the nominating subcommittee would try to meet as soon as Professor Clark returns (December 15).

Mr. St. Laurent asked if the composition by number had been determined. Dr. Benjamin replied he believed there should be about 15 faculty members, plus graduate and undergraduate student representation, and academic professional and civil service representation. The Council of Graduate Students and undergraduate student government should be centrally involved in identifying the student members, he said.

Professor Berscheid inquired as to the rationale for including civil service representation but added that the decision on whether or not to include civil service and academic professional staff was the administrators'.

Drs. Keller and Benjamin agreed and said they would discuss and decide that question.

Professor Berscheid requested that the charge letter be as complete as possible and include such information as what staff support the task force can anticipate, the process Academic Affairs anticipates, and who in central administration the task force will interact with. She also said the Consultative Committee would like the task force to report to it as well as to the provost.

Dr. Benjamin said he would like to meet with one or two other people to define the charge letter. The task needs to have some context defined for itself, but also needs some room to maneuver, he said. Professor Shively suggested some kinds of details should be left for the committee to sort out for itself in its organizational meetings.

Dr. Benjamin announced he would draft a charge letter and send it to the Consultative Committee.

Professor Campbell asked whether there was a resolution to the question of how to define "program." President Keller said the administration will allow colleges to propose at the beginning of the process how they intend to define their programs; if central administration cannot accept all of them, it will at that point require a change. Generally "program" will equate either with departments or with aggregations by research topics (including institutes which bridge departments), and relative emphases within a program will be identified.

Professor Shively said that the appearance is that the administration will look more favorably on a plan which emphasizes change and interdisciplinary strength. And yet, he said, a unit may conclude, after assessing itself

carefully, that what made it strong continues to be its strength. President Keller responded that there is no absolute need for a unit to make any significant change. We want to preserve what is good, he said; there is no intrinsic problem in not recommending change. Vice President Benjamin acknowledged that he may have encouraged the perception that change was favored by saying that we want some bold, creative plans to come forward. But change for its own sake is not the proper idea, he said.

8. The journalistic slant on implications of legislative appropriations for the University.

President Keller clarified to FCC his remarks to the Minneapolis Tribune, which it had erroneously rendered into an assumption that the president would leave if the legislative appropriation was short of what Commitment to Focus requires. He told the meeting we do face a serious situation. Revenues, as we know, are down, and legislative intent has already committed many future funds; certain budget increases are either automatic or guaranteed, but higher education gets no automatic increases. This is not a time to panic, he said, but it is a serious time. The state's administration truly wants to help the University, and they want to give us signals to go forward even while they face constraints.

He said we have to get at least those things which will protect the future of Commitment to Focus. He reminded FCC that state budget anxiety is always prevalent at this time of the year, and he asked people not to get alarmed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10.

Meredith Poppele



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

N307 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612) 626-1850

December 1, 1986

President Kenneth H. Keller
202 Morrill Hall

re: FCC's December 4 discussion
with you

Dear Ken:

As we discussed last Monday, the FCC will want to talk with you in its next meeting about the administration's proposal for an SDI forum. We'd then like to address questions concerning the provost's advisory task force on administrative planning; we hope for some elaboration of the charge, having seen so far only an outline, and we would like to gain a good idea of the timetable for identifying the members. There should be ample time for additional items you wish to bring to us.

Sincerely,


Ellen Berscheid
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

EB:mp

Attachment: agenda for FCC and SCC

bc: Shirley Clark

Monday, November 24, 1986

Volume 89, Number 44

Minneapolis-St. Paul

Top U administrators announce support of SDI forum

Michael Peltier
Writer

The possibility of a campus discussion on University space weapons research grew Friday when it was announced the University president's office supported the

Chances for a campus discussion on Strategic Defense Initiative research looked slim nearly three weeks ago, after the University Senate voted 87-66 not to sanction a campus-wide forum on the issue.

But supporters of the SDI discussion told the University Social

Concerns Committee Friday that they had received support from top administrators and planned to petition the University Board of Regents for additional support.

Miguel Carter, a former University Senate student representative, told committee members he had spo-

ken to Richard Heydinger, senior assistant to University President Ken Keller, who said Keller and other top administrators supported a discussion on the University's role in SDI research.

Keller could not be reached for comment Sunday.

Heydinger, contacted by phone Friday, acknowledged administrative support for an SDI forum. He added that the final decision on whether to have a forum rested with University faculty, students and staff.

SDI to 5

"The matters like this (a forum), it's important to the community to determine what it wants to debate and for the community to sponsor those."

Heydinger said the administration's main role in campus discussions is to make sure there aren't any road blocks preventing debate.

Carter, who resigned from the University Senate after it refused to sanction a forum, said he was encouraged by the administration's support.

"There seem to be parties interested within the administration that think this idea, given enough time and work, could be made possible

Committee chairman Timothy Knopp, associate forestry professor, said Vice President for Academic Affairs Roger Benjamin contacted him and voiced the administration's support for an SDI forum.

Heydinger said Benjamin's contact with the committee came after top administrators, including Keller, had agreed a discussion on the University's role in SDI research was warranted.

Knopp's contact with the

"is to encourage discussion on this topic," Heydinger said.

Heydinger echoed both Carter's and Knopp's position that any SDI forum also should address broader issues of academic freedom and the University's research policy. He added, however, that the forum would not be organized by central administrators.

Knopp said the committee will study possible discussion formats and hopes to have gathered background information on SDI research