



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

TENTATIVE AGENDA (P)

All-University Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 17, 1980 12:30 - 1:00 p.m.
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

1. Fix Agenda
2. Minutes of April 3rd (enclosed).
3. Report of the Chair (below).
4. Steering Committee Business: none presently requested
5. Committee and Subcommittee Reports:
 - a. Professor Blake's Subcommittee on Coordinate Campus Representation on the SCC
 - b. Other committee or subcommittee reports.
6. Old Business: none received at this date.
7. New Business: a draft of our annual report will be circulated. Finished action on it must occur at the May 1st meeting.
8. Adjournment.

Report of the Chair.

Four items are presently scheduled for discussion with the President at the scheduled 1:00-3:00 meeting: a) Progress report on searches for the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Finance; b) Continuation of dialog on the 1981-83 biennial request; c) Progress report on revision of the "INGOPS" document; d) The President's comments on the final draft of the plan for Senate reorganization. Other topics which you wish discussed should be promptly forwarded to the SCC office. If we have too many topics, we will have to prioritize at this meeting.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373- 3226

Approved 5/1/80

Minutes

All-University Senate Consultative Committee
April 17, 1980

Chairman Richard Purple convened the seventeenth meeting of the 1979-80 academic year of the Senate Consultative Committee at 12:40 p.m. on April 17 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall. Other members present were Robert Brasted, Scott Carlson, Marcia Eaton, Jim Gelbmann, Wendell Glick, Russell Hobbie, Rich Kottke, Cleon Melsa, Judy Nord, Sue Pribyl, Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Krishna Seeley, Don Spring, John Weis and, jointly representing Waseca, Kari Simon and Annette LeGare. Visitors to the meeting were Danna Elling of the Daily, Maureen Smith of University Relations, and students Mark Casey and Elise Krueger.

The minutes of the April 3 meeting were approved with the correction of the spelling of Mr. Seeley's name. A correction was reported to the already-approved minutes of March 20: p. 84, par. 4, l. 4 should read, "Regents Executive Committee", not "Regents Committee on Faculty and Staff Affairs."

The Chair reminded the members that the May 1 meeting will be on the Crookston campus. Carpools will be arranged to the Anoka airport from the Twin Cities campus.

The Chair announced a meeting of the TCCA steering committee Tuesday, April 24 from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in the Campus Club.

Committee and Subcommittee Reports.

A. Subcommittee on Crookston and Waseca representation on the SCC. Professor Blake's proposal for his subcommittee's way of proceeding was distributed. No dissent to the proposal was expressed. The subcommittee plans to meet on April 24 with faculty on the Waseca campus and on May 1 with Crookston faculty. Mr. Kottke stated that without a change in the student representation schedule from those two campuses, alternate classes of students are effectively eliminated from representation. Mr. Scott Carlson remarked that there seems to be opposition to making the form of representation from Waseca and Crookston identical to that of Duluth and Morris since Waseca and Crookston are smaller. The question will be discussed by the SCC alone and with the Crookston faculty on May 1.

B. SCFA Subcommittee on Sexual Harrassment. Professor Eaton reported that Professor Raskind, chair of the subcommittee, has convened the subcommittee a number of times and that they have heard much testimony. The subcommittee is grappling with definitions. They have concluded they must exclude from their purview charges of sexism in conversation and in class. They feel they must address issues of discrimination, whether by threats, failure to write letters of recommendation, or similar abuses. They are unable to meet the May 1 deadline

for agenda items for the May 15 Senate meeting. Professor Eaton agreed with the subcommittee that hearing all relevant testimony was more important than reporting this spring.

C. Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization. Professor Spring reported that the SCC will be asking the Senate on May 15 for agreement in principle to the recommendations of the subcommittee. If approved, those recommendations will go to the Committee on Committees who will write the required Handbook changes. Professors Spring, Purple and Altholz (Business and Rules) will meet May 8 with the Committee on Committees to spell out with them their task for the coming year. Professor Spring remarked that he had received in the previous five days the greatest number of comments upon the proposal of the entire 18 months of the subcommittee's working life.

D. UCBRBR. The Chair reported for Professor Morrison that one effect of the legislative session just concluded will be to keep UCBRBR busy until June. Since the bonding bill, which contained 85% of the University's capital requests, did not pass, the entire six-year capital plan must be reassessed by the budget executive. UCBRBR will also review the budget executive's six-year "contingency budgets" ordered by the state finance department.

The Chair distributed the outline for the SCC annual report and solicited comments. From committee and subcommittee chairs, he invited copy or notes to round out the description of their work for this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
5-255 Millard Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

Approved 5/1/80

CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT
April 17, 1980

A meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee with President Magrath was convened at 1:10 p.m. on Thursday, April 17 in the Regents Room of Morrill Hall. SCC members present were Robert Brasted, Scott Carlson, Mark Davis, Marcia Eaton, Jim Gelbmann, Wendell Glick, Russ Hobbie, Rich Kottke, Cleon Melsa, Judy Nord, Sue Pribyl, Rick Purple (Chair), Vera Schletzer, Skip Scriven, Krishna Seeley, Don Spring, John Weis and, jointly from Waseca, Kari Simon and Annette LeGare. Present from the administration were Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs Al Linck, and Assistants to the President Jim Borgestad and Carol Pazandak. Other visitors were Professor Donald Gilmore, Kate Stanley and Danna Elling of the Daily, Maureen Smith of University Relations, and students Mark Casey and Elise Krueger.

1. Vice Presidential Searches.

A. Academic Affairs. President Magrath thanked the SCC for its part in the selection process for the Vice President for Academic Affairs. He said that the SCC interviews appeared to have helped the candidates orient themselves to the rest of their visit on campus, and that the SCC's written and oral comments had been helpful to him.

B. Finance. The President said the search committee has been active and within a week will have screened the applicants to a slate of six to eight candidates. He wants the SCC to again be a part of the selection process. Mr. Gelbmann asked if there has been any outside advisory committee of financial experts employed for this search. The President and Dr. Pazandak replied that there had not, except for letters submitted voluntarily by persons outside the University. Professor Purple said he would be interested in learning, after the completion of the search, if the newly adopted post-employment policy deterred any candidate.

2. Biennial Request. President Magrath said that he would respond in writing to the SCC and UCRRBR on those questions they raised to which a response is possible. Professor Purple asked if it is true that the budget executive now has three more tasks regarding a six year budget plan. Vice President Linck, Chairman of the budget executive, replied that that is correct. The order came from the state finance department in the executive branch of the government. He allowed that it could be a formidable job. The order is to estimate contingency budgets for three successive two-year periods, assuming a 10% reduction in the budget for the next biennium and for the following two biennia. The same demand has been made of every state agency. President Magrath said the order appears to be an attempt to get all agencies to identify their absolutely essential aspects. He hopes University people will not get unduly exercised over the order. He described the order as an exercise in fiscal stringency and a "sign of the times." Vice President Linck noted that the University will be simultaneously submitting a real budget with a request for increases and a contingency plan with the requested 10% cuts.

As a reminder of how tentative long-range plans turn out to be, the President noted that considerable University effort went into developing the six-year capital plan which has now been superceded by the fact of the legislature's failure to pass the bonding bill which contained 85% of the University's capital appropriation request. The result is that the whole capital plan must be reconsidered.

Professor Eaton inquired how the Weaver Report (designed to improve internal management and show the University ways to save money) would figure in new budgeting plans. She raised the example of an appendix which suggests trying out cuts of tenured faculty, and she asked if at this point that possibility should be taken seriously. The President said he hoped people would neither overreact nor underreact to the governor's request. Plans to increase and plans to cut, he said, are not the same as actual increases or cuts. He does not know whether the order for the 10% reduced budget is any indication of how the governor will react to the '81-'83 biennial request. For the present the assignment is for a theoretical contingency plan.

Professor Glick said that if budgets have to be cut, there will be plenty of time to plan the cuts. He said he did not understand the purpose of this kind of exercise. Vice President Linck then noted that the legislature already has the power to change "state specials" by the stroke of a pen.

President Magrath stated that his main concern is with the biennial request, which includes faculty salary increase requests and implications for tuition.

3. Institutional Planning Assumptions, Goals, Objectives and Priorities Statement. The President said he had received some very constructive and thoughtful responses from the University community, including Senate committees. In his revision he is addressing some of the definitional issues raised. He hopes for continuing dialogue following the distribution around April 25 of the second draft.

4. Senate Reorganization. Professor Spring explained that the copies being distributed today were the subcommittee's final report, slightly revised from the "draft final" in response to the comments of the reorganization subcommittee, the chairs of the Senate committees, and the SCC. This is the text which will be published for the agenda of the May 15 Senate meeting. President Magrath said his reaction was positive and he had no questions to raise. He specifically mentioned liking the linking of the Academic Affairs Vice President to SCEP; increasing the number of Senators serving on committees; identifying certain committees as "operational;" stimulating additional people to come onto committees; the thrust to improve communications. He said he had shared the report with the University vice presidents. In response to the Chair's question of whether he disliked removing the practice of double slates from which the President would name committee members, President Magrath replied he did not dislike the change. Professor Spring announced the planned meeting between his subcommittee and the Committee on Committees (May 8) to set the tasks for next year of the Committee on Committees.

Mr. Kottke inquired what the President thought of the request for increased staff support for SCRAP and SCEP. (That had been added only to the final report and the President had not seen it in advance.) President Magrath replied that the Senate runs on a restricted and inadequate budget and that it would be necessary to examine the budgetary implications. He said there is broad agreement that the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is seriously

understaffed for the needs it should be filling and the initiative it should be taking. If we can get that improved, he said, Academic Affairs should be able to aid those committees. Vice President-designate Ken Keller is going to develop a plan for the office which will include increasing the staff, and a way to implement the plan.

5. Mandatory/Refundable fee for the Daily. The Chair called attention to the fact that, while the SCC has a keen interest in the Daily, it has taken no active role in the controversy beyond the letter the Chair sent to the Regents last summer stressing academic freedom.

The President said it is totally appropriate for the SCC to take positions and to communicate a position to the Board of Regents. He recognizes that many people disagree with the recommendation he has made. The recommendation is for a one-year trial of permitting a student who wishes not to pay Board of Student Publication fees to request, within two weeks after fee payment, a refund and to get it. Professor Glick asked if there was any way to assess the financial impact on the Daily of such an allowance. He wondered if it could be crippling. The President said that one could only speculate but that it was his guess the impact would be very minimal.

Ms. Pribyl described students as being "shocked" by the proposal. She asked why a refund should apply to the whole Board of Publications fee instead of just the Daily's portion. President Magrath said he had not given that particular question a great deal of thought. Ms. Pribyl said she was surprised the administration did not back the Board of Publications proposal to set aside ten cents per fee for alternative publications. The President replied that there is currently a real and substantial problem with the effectiveness of that Board. In response to Ms. Pribyl's asking why he recommended a one-year trial for the proposal, the President said that (1) within a year the Board of Student Publications might be restructured and insure greater continuity and (2) if the effect turns out to be very costly for the Daily, that cost can be addressed. He wants the policy, if adopted, reviewed after a year.

Mr. Seeley commented that this controversy did not mark the first time the administration has "interfered with student rights." He asked if the President thought it was appropriate to bring a recommendation on this matter to the Board of Regents without first consulting with student bodies. The President replied that it was both appropriate and obligatory for him to do so. He reminded the body that it is a legal fact that only the Regents can determine tuition and student fees. Mr. Seeley asked what then was the place of the SCC on this issue. The Chair replied that the University has a fee-setting mechanism and that the advice of the SCC was not sought in this instance.

Mr. Weis remarked that, in contrast to the administration's usual posture of a balancing position between TCSA's position and the Fees Committee's position in recommendations to the Regents, it now appears to be taking a very active role in respect to the Daily issue and the MSA store issue. He then asked whether the present recommendation indicates more fees will become optional in the future when a fee recipient becomes controversial. The President replied that he is generally opposed to optional fees. He said that he had been involved earlier in fee issues from time to time and that on several occasions he had made recommendations that were not balancing but were, rather, contrary to other recommendations put forth.

Professor Eaton said that the perception on the campus is that the President's recommendation is made to silence external criticism. President Magrath responded that First Amendment protection is not incompatible with the removal of a mandatory fee.

Ms. Pribyl reported that the effect at Michigan State of removal of a mandatory fee for the newspaper has been to threaten the mandatory fee structure. It is said that students there seek a choice on virtually every fee. President Magrath wondered, though, whether Michigan State had actually responded to the various complaints and altered its mandatory fee other than to exempt the newspaper. It is interesting, he said, but not definitive, that allowing an optional fees raises questions. If indeed it was a mistake for the University to permit any optional fee, then that mistake was made several years ago with respect to MPIRG.

Ms. Pribyl noted that, while the President's is only one of the recommendations the Regents will hear on the subject, student recommendations lose out pretty consistently before the Regents where they differ from the administration's. She is afraid the Regents will accept the administration's suggestion on the Daily. The President recalled that not long ago there had been an argument that the administration should have no voice at all in determining fees. He took the position then that the student position should be put clearly and wholly before the Regents, and that on the other hand he would not relinquish his option to make recommendations upon those issues. He reminded the body that he had introduced his recommendation a month in advance of Regential action on the question. He hoped it would stimulate debate in the academic community.

Mr. Seeley asked the President's reaction to Vice President Wilderson's proposal to close the MSA store. President Magrath simply said that Vice President Wilderson had addressed that. Chairman Purple noted that the MSA store controversy is an item which will appear on future SCC agendas, by which time members will have received relevant materials and had a chance to think about the questions in advance of discussions. Mr. Weis inquired the President's opinion on the proposed change in the business policy. The President replied that there will be more exchanges on this, and no action before the June meeting of the Regents. He expects the item to be on the Regents May agenda for information.

Professor Glick asked whether the President had any information as to whether the governor is likely to call a special session of the legislature to address some of the items contained in the bonding bill which failed to pass. The President replied that he had no information and that it would be a political decision for the governor.

Professor Eaton asked what the Humphrey Institute people are going to do with no prospects for a new building. The President answered, "I guess we make do. People are more important than buildings."

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith B. Poppele

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary