



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
220 Biological Sciences Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES  
SENATE FACILITATIVE COMMITTEE  
April 22, 1982

The spring quarter meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee was convened at 1:15 on Thursday, April 22 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall by Douglas Pratt, SCC Chairman. Others present were Virginia Gray (Committees), Andrew Baily (for Hart, Physical Plant & Space Allocation), Stephen Gasiorowicz (Tenure), David Giese (Business & Rules), Fritz Herrmann (for Lehmborg, Educational Policy), Kim Munholland (Judicial), Wayland Noland (Library), Patricia Swan (Finance), Arthur Williams (Faculty Affairs), Patricia Williamson (Social Concerns) and Anthony Zahareas (Research).

1. Document on financial emergency.

Professor Pratt announced that the Faculty Consultative Committee is preparing a document on financial emergency (declaration of, and procedures under, including those relating to faculty rights) which the FCC hopes the Senate will approve this spring, and the Regents then approve. It would then serve as an interim standard until the entire tenure code can be revised and passed by the Senate and the Regents. A draft of the document will be distributed to several Senate committees early in the week of April 26, with a request for them to comment by May 6, which is the printer's deadline for the May 20 Senate docket. (Sec's note: The draft is being sent to Business & Rules, SCEP, EEOWC, SCFA, Finance, Judicial, Planning, and Tenure.)

2. Senate committee business, including items for May 20 Senate meeting.

A. Judicial. Munholland. For the Senate: Judicial will propose certain modifications to its operating procedures which are intended to enable Judicial to deal more appropriately with challenges. Judicial will propose to (1) permit each side in a hearing one peremptory challenge and (2) clarify the provision for challenges for cause.

B. Social Concerns. Williamson. Ms. Williamson will meet with the SCC at its April 29 meeting to discuss the committee's reporting procedures. She explained that the Regents Committee on Physical Plant and Investments is currently considering a proposal from Vice President Bohlen on a change in policy regarding investments in companies doing business in South Africa. It is the policy Social Concerns reported to the Senate in its 1980 annual report. Professor Pratt asked Professor Giese to have Business and Rules give its interpretation of the Senate constitution's wording regarding the reporting procedures for Social Concerns.

C. Library. Noland.

(1) Request for external review. The special Library Review Committee chaired by Frank Sorauf completed its report last summer. In January the Senate Library Committee requested Vice President Keller to arrange an external review of the libraries, as recommended by the special committee. The vice president asked the Library Committee to provide guidelines. Professor Noland summarized for the Facilitative Committee the Library Committee's just-completed report to Vice President Keller describing the areas an external review should address. In brief, they are:

(a) Automation, including the library's membership in the Research Library Group, a telecommunications catalog, the overall intent to develop the best possible automated information system, and many more aspects of library automation. Because of this large area of concern, the Library Committee wants external reviewers who are familiar with operating systems.

(b) Governance and personnel policies, which continue to be a festering problem. Because the library has such high personnel costs, it is imperative to make the best use of the staff. The pay scale here is much higher than at universities located in non-metropolitan areas.

(c) Building collections. Is the current "subject bibliographer" approach the most useful one in a university of this size?

Professor Noland explained that the detailed communication now going to Keller concludes what the Library Committee can do as follow-through on the Sorauf report's recommendations.

(2) Grievances against libraries. Through an individual case, the committee has become interested in knowing what appeals are available to a graduate student with a fees grievance. The student should first use the library's grievance mechanism, of which the final step would be an appeal to the director. The Library Committee does not think it their place to appoint a special neutral hearing committee, but they do perceive a gap in the grievance mechanisms concerning cross-unit grievances. It is unclear that the complainant has anywhere to go beyond the top of the unit she believes erred.

D. Finance. Swan. No items for Senate action. The committee will present its annual report in writing.

E. Research. Zahareas. The annual report will be printed for the fall quarter meeting of the Senate. Concerns:

(1) Indirect Cost Recovery Funds. Research wants to develop and study a "biography" of a typical grant's indirect costs, to analyze how the legislature treats indirect costs, and to try to determine what percentage of recovery is fair and why.

(2) Contracts between the University and private industry. Important questions are going to arise regarding renewals of contracts (and of grants). Committees should in a friendly way alert central administration and the Regents to these.

(3) Effort reporting controversy. This university takes a more conciliatory attitude toward federal requirements than does, for example, the protest group at Yale.

(4) Use of Human Subjects in Research proposed policies revision is on agenda for next meeting of Research Committee.

(5) Inclusive white paper on research at this University--continuing interest in developing. Prof. Zahareas circulated an outline.

(6) Planning: Is there a correlation between overall University planning and departmental planning? If there is, is it understood by faculty? The University has well-ordered and well-planned procedures. Is there enough real substance? Are all pertinent key issues considered?

(7) What kind of research is going to be appreciated?

(8) How does one measure the productivity of a social scientist, as opposed to the productivity of an applied scientist?

(9) Library policies and automation.

Professor Pratt suggested that Research might want to hold some joint meetings with other committees, such as Planning. He observed too that the SCC can serve as a meeting point or conduit for concerns which are important and lie outside the purview of an existing committee.

F. Committees. Gray.

(1) Motion to Senate on May 20: Abolish the Committee on Liberal Education and distribute its obligations between the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

(2) Motion to Senate on May 20: Amend the Constitution by adding a policy (which will be spelled out) whereby civil service eligibility for representation on the various Senate committees can be determined.

(3) The major tasks of filling committees are almost completed. Most committee chairpersons will be announced at the May 20 Senate meeting.

G. Business and Rules. Giese. For the Senate: Business and Rules will propose an amendment permitting certain class(es) of P/A employees to vote for senators. The proposal will make little numerical difference in Senate representation except for a very few units such as Continuing Education which has approximately as many P/A employees as it has faculty.

H. Tenure. Gasiorowicz. The committee asked law professor Robert Morris to review its draft of Tenure Code Section 15. Morris saw numerous problems with the draft, and the committee has almost fully corrected them. Tenure respects the point of not introducing sections of the Tenure Code separately to the Senate. The committee will not submit any items to the Senate this spring. Since Section 15 has been the most difficult portion to re-write, Professor Gasiorowicz anticipates that the remaining revision can be completed rather rapidly. Professor Morris will chair Tenure next year.

I. Faculty Affairs. Williams. Next meeting April 30. For the Senate:

(1) Long-range policy proposal for faculty salary increases.

(2) Sick leave/maternity leave policy--crucial to adopt.

(3) Policy on outside faculty consulting. The Regents take issue with the definition of a work day in the revised policy which the Faculty Senate approved in 1975 and which went to the Regents only this winter following the collective bargaining election. SCFA will probably propose to the Senate that a faculty member be permitted to describe the fraction of a day he/she has consulted, instead of defining the day by hours.

Professor Williams described SCFA's recommendation to central administration on distribution of faculty salary increases for 1982-83. The committee voted to recommend that of the anticipated 6.5% available after a two-month delay, 2% be awarded across the board and the remainder be awarded for merit. SCFA also recommends that the delay period be pro-rated according to the faculty member's term of employment. If an A-term employee has a 2-month delay, a B-term employee should have a proportionate delay (1.5 months). SCFA asked central administration to work out the delay periods equitably.

Professor Swan reported that Vice President Keller had informed the Finance Committee that summer pay rates on grant monies could be figured proportionately based upon what the paid-out increase will be over the '82-'83 year.

3. Final Senate item: Special Committee on the University Calendar will give a preliminary report at the May 20 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Meredith Poppele, SCC Secretary,  
Recorder