



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

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

MINUTES
SENATE FACILITATIVE COMMITTEE
April 7, 1981

Marcia Eaton convened a meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee at 2:10 p.m. in Room 625 of Coffman Memorial Union. Present were Robert Hexter, John Howe, Russell Hobbie, Thomas Kraabel, Stanford Lehmborg, Edward Rippie, Connie Sullivan, and Charles Wolfram.

Three documents were distributed: (1) Academic Affairs' rough estimates by unit of the number of P.A. staff for the coming year; (2) The President's Institutional Planning Statement; (3) the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilitating Individual Faculty Activities.

1. Annual reports are due at the Senate office April 30 to make the docket for the May 14 Senate meeting.

2. The Sexual Harrassment complaint procedures guidelines will go to the Senate April 16. Marcia Eaton thanked the several committee chairpersons who assisted in developing the document.

3. The revised Senate constitution will have its second vote in the Senate April 16. Anticipating approval, the SCC and the President are taking it to the Regents for information in April and for action in May.

4. UCBRBR. M. Eaton read a report from Pat Swan. UCBRBR will meet jointly with SCC on April 16 to discuss with President Magrath and Vice Presidents Keller and Hasselmo the Institutional Planning Statement, and planning for difficult academic decisions in the 1980's. She invited the Facilitative Committee members to take part as well, or to send another representative from their committees. UCBRBR's April 23 meeting will address contingency planning and the changes the University has made from its original plans for meeting the \$14.1 million budgetary shortfall in the current fiscal year. The May UCBRBR meeting will consist of discussions with Vice President Bohlen about the several support services for which his office is responsible. P. Swan invites people to forward their comments.

5. Business and Rules. C. Sullivan reported good attendance at the April 2 forum to discuss Senate representation for P.A. employees. Academic Affairs has been delayed in forwarding its estimates of total P.A. positions and categories, at least in part because some units have delayed reporting those numbers. The opinion expressed at the forum was that among P.A. employees, only those on probationary or temporary appointments should be eligible for Senate membership and election voting, and not people on term or limited appointments.

On the one hand, the warning is advanced that large numbers of research

specialists, presumably non-teaching and with little or no student contact, could alter the complexion of the Senate. On the other hand, there are persons in the libraries and CEE who fear they must relinquish their present privileges of Senate service and representation as a consequence of being reassigned from faculty to P.A. status. (Since 1974 CEE people have not been able to be hired on probational or tenure basis.)

P.A. job titles often fail to indicated clearly the nature of the job, hence clarification is needed. R. Hexter recommended that young researchers, as part of the University, should have representation in the Senate. Lehmborg noted that additional kinds of non-traditional academics might later join the University, such as native speakers of exotic languages. Sullivan suggested there would be no problem in including people from various P.A. position on pertinent committees.

If being paid out of hard money were a criterion for Senate eligibility, many faculty, especially in the sciences, would be screened out. Some units, especially medicine, have tenured faculty on soft money.

Academic Affairs appears to want support from the Consultative Committee and Business and Rules to find a way to gain Senate representation for the P.A. class. The committee chairs present agreed with Sullivan that there is simply not enough data yet to take a position.

6. Institutional Planning Statement. There was very general discussion about the nature of the statement. Among the questions raised were whether a statement of this generality serves any useful purpose; what was the impetus behind its development; whether its acceptance will be used to justify any hard steps central administration needs to take in the coming years; what kind of schedule central administration intends for University discussion and, when it arises, faculty rebuttal, on specific planned changes; whether the collegiate planning papers and the drafts of this document influenced each other; and, more specifically, for information on the sources of funds and of pressures to establish special programs at the University (such as the China project, p. 10) which sometimes remain isolated from faculty in allied fields.

7. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilitating Individual Faculty Activity.

While Vice President Hasselmo's genuine interest in helping faculty facilitate their own activity and productivity was acknowledged, there were three concerns voiced regarding the proposal. One was that interested faculty members with expertise who were appointed to the committee could be severely overworked in relation to the administrative and staff participants. A second was that answers to some of the questions raised are already common knowledge (e.g., most faculty do not take sabbatical furloughs; faculty are strapped by departmental frugality--unable to make long-distance calls, or get their papers typed, etc.). The third was that Senate committees and the Senate process are weakened when special studies of this sort are undertaken outside the Senate structure. SCFA, Tenure, and other Senate committees can address themselves to several of the issues defined in the report. The staff recommended in this report could give their data directly to the relevant Senate committees. It was recommended in Facilitative that Senate committees examine the document and determine which topics could be referred directly to the Senate.