

SCFA REPORTS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Fall Quarter, 1974

Volume 2, Number 1

Dear Colleague:

This is our first Newsletter of the year. Because of rising costs, we plan to issue only two more Newsletters, one during the Winter Quarter and the other towards the end of the Spring Quarter, 1975. Herein we present an update on the agenda items detailed and reported in the Spring Quarter, 1974 Newsletter.

A. Progress Report on Issues Concerning Early Retirement, Health Insurance, Performance of Faculty Retirement Funds, Fringe Benefits for Part-Time Faculty, and Sabbatical Leaves

The SCFA presented its recommendations on these issues for action by the Faculty Senate on May 30, 1974. These recommendations were published in the Minnesota Daily of May 16, 1974. The Committee prefaced its recommendations on the first four issues with the following general comment:

After salary the most important faculty benefits are probably retirement plans and insurance programs. The range of faculty benefits is multivarious and constitutes a very significant proportion of a faculty members "real" income.

Direct compensation in the form of salaries will be of great concern during the University's 1975-1977 budget, and this concern will almost certainly center around the eroding effect of inflation on the salary structure. However, if the University is to attain its objectives it will need an overall compensation plan that will attract, retain, and motivate its faculty. Indeed, both salary and fringe benefits will have to be (1) competitive if the University is to protect its external labor market situation and (2) reflect internal consistency according to some criteria of merit and equity if the University is to provide an atmosphere consistent with scholarly pursuits.

Nationwide, fringe benefits in 1967 made up 12 1/2 percent of the total wage and salary bill, and the latest estimate by Gordon and Bleu suggests that this will increase to 50 percent by 1985.

This underlines the critical importance of fringe benefits in facilitating the attainment of the University's objectives both now and in the future.

It must be cause for concern that as a result of inflation the real purchasing power of Minnesota salaries decreased last year by enough to wipe out the entire increase in real salary gains over the last four years or more. Further, the performance of invested monies flowing into deferred benefits, notably retirement fund investments, does not appear to have been spectacular. It was for these reasons that the five sub-committees, particularly the first four were appointed to make in-depth studies of certain fringe benefit items. The recommendations which follow are largely based on the studies made by the SCFA Sub-committees.

On the question of sabbatical leaves, the general comments made were as follows:

In an era of very low faculty turnover the sabbatical leave program should provide one of the best methods of keeping new ideas and points of view moving through the University community. It is so because the chief purpose for sabbatical leaves is for research, writing, and study at the level of trained active scholars refurbishing (sometimes refurbishing) the research and teaching tools of his or her craft. If the University intends to try and recover a position of intellectual eminence, it is absolutely essential that all possible means to achieve such a ferment should be used. Sabbatical leave programs should be intellectually enriching and should improve the teaching and scholarship of the person who takes leave.

The Senate took two actions: (1) It accepted all of our recommendations, and (2) Asked the Central Administration to send, in writing, to the SCFA and the Faculty Senate, their views and reactions to the recommendations before the end of the Fall Quarter, 1974. Our exact recommendations on the five issues and the action taken by the Senate will be in the printed minutes of the Faculty Senate of May 30, 1974. Please watch for these minutes. They should be out shortly.

So far we have heard from the Central Administration only on one issue: Early Retirement. The Administration would like us to appraise them of faculty views on the recommendations made by the SCFA on this subject. The Committee has agreed to conduct a faculty opinion survey on early retire-

ment and is now in the process of making the arrangements necessary to carry out such a survey.

B. Faculty Benefits

While the Central Administration has been examining our recommendations, a Sub-committee of the SCFA is studying the entire range of faculty benefits.

This Sub-committee was appointed by the Chairperson in June of 1974 and consists of Professors Robert H. Beck (Chairperson), Edward Coen, Stephen Hoenack, Andrew Whitman, Dean Paul Cartwright, ex-officio, and Mahmood A. Zaidi, ex-officio. The Sub-committee met twice during the summer to discuss individual benefits as well as their relationship to each other. At present the Sub-committee is assisting the SCFA in preparing a questionnaire for the faculty opinion survey on early retirement. Following completion of the questionnaire, the Sub-committee will give its full attention to the components of a comprehensive plan for faculty benefits.

C. 1975-1977 Legislative Request for Faculty Salaries

(1) During the summer of 1974, two members of the Committee, Professors Leonid Hurwicz and Hugh Kabat, met and discussed with Vice-President Stanley Kegler and his associates the faculty salaries for the next biennium. These two representatives not only represented the SCFA very well but also reinforced two recommendations of the Committee: (1) a strong case be made for a cost-of-living clause in the budget request; and (2) a separate request be made for pension improvement of the retired faculty.

(2) During the Fall Quarter, 1974, the Chairperson and Professors Hurwicz and Kabat attended two meetings called by President Magrath to discuss the 1975-1977 Legislative Request for Faculty Salaries. After listening to all of the arguments presented at these meetings and after consider-

able discussion, the SCFA sent the following recommendations to President Magrath on November 4, 1974:

(i) Budget

<u>Type of Increase</u>	<u>1975-76</u>	<u>1976-77</u>
Cost-of-Living	14.5%	COL Formula
Merit	5.0%	5.0%
Internal Equity	<u>1.0%</u>	<u>1.0%</u>
	20.5%	6.0% + COL

(ii) Distribution Method (s)

1. Cost-of-Living Increases: The Committee favors a system which will permit granting larger increases for smaller incomes than for larger incomes. At this time SCFA is not in a position to specify a distribution method for the COL increases. The Committee needs time to study this issue further.
2. Merit Pay: It is the Committee's hope that the Central Administration will make as much merit money as possible for distribution at the Department levels.

D. Task Force on Academic Salaries

(1) The Committee appointed Professors Virginia Kivits and William Robbins to coordinate the activities between the SCFA and the Task Force. Over the summer months, the two representatives kept the SCFA fully informed of the deliberations of the Task Force on Academic Salaries.

(2) At the invitation of the SCFA, three members of the Task Force, Professors David Giese (Chairperson of the Task Force), Robert Lambert, and Barbara Stuhler, met with the Committee and discussed their Report. Since the Task Force's major recommendations were for the 1977-79 biennium, and since the Task Force was still working on its final report, the Committee decided to postpone further discussion of the Report until later in the year.

E. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Policies Related to Faculty Accountability

Because of the concerns expressed to us by many faculty members on the

issues discussed in this Report, the SCFA spent considerable time in its evaluation. The Chairperson appointed a Sub-committee consisting of Professors Leonid Hurwicz (Chairperson), Bill W. Kennedy and Clare K. Woodward to study the Darley Committee Report and make recommendations to the entire Committee. The Sub-committee, after consulting with as many concerned faculty members and faculty organizations as possible, presented its recommendations to the SCFA. During the three long meetings, the SCFA reviewed each section of the Report and after considerable discussion agreed to propose certain amendments to the Report. These proposed amendments were published in the November 14th and 21st issues of the Minnesota Daily. By proposing these amendments, the SCFA identified the issues warranting the special attention of the Senate and the faculty - even though the Committee itself was not of a unanimous view on all of the amendments.

F. University Search Committees

The SCFA discussed the controversy on consideration of religion alleged to have been involved in the recent selection process of the President. The Committee decided to take-up this issue again after reports of (1) the Regents' Presidential Selection Review Committee and, (2) the State of Minnesota Senate Sub-committee have come out.

G. Tuition Grants for Dependents of Faculty

The SCFA has been asked to consider and develop a case for an added fringe benefit, namely, making University courses and programs tuition-free to faculty dependents who qualify for admission to the University. The Committee will be very grateful if you could send us, in writing, reactions to this proposal.

If you want to write or converse about any of the subjects discussed in this Newsletter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Cordially yours,

Mahmood A. Zaidi, Chairperson

Professor & Director of Graduate Studies
Industrial Relations, College of Business
Administration, West Bank
Minneapolis Campus 373-3827

Robert H. Beck
Professor & Head, Social & Philosophic Foundations
of Education
203 Burton Hall
Minneapolis Campus 373-2286

Thomas Bowman
Professor & Head, Secondary Education
218 Bohannon Hall
Duluth Campus 726-7157

Leona Classen
Assistant Professor Education
200 B Education 589-1464 Morris Campus

Leonid Hurwicz
Regents Professor of Economics
1060 Business Administration Bldg.
Minneapolis West Bank Campus 373-4385

Hugh Kabat
Professor & Head, Clinical Pharmacy
318 Harvard St.
Minneapolis Campus 376-5312

Bill W. Kennedy
Professor Plant Pathology
225 Plant Sciences
St. Paul Campus 373-1351

Virginia Kivits
Professor Literature, Communication & Philosophy
202C Nicholson Hall
Minneapolis Campus 373-3721

William Robbins
Assistant Professor Electrical Engineering
356 Electrical Engineering
Minneapolis Campus 373-9719

Clare K. Woodward
Assistant Professor of Biochemistry
353 Gortnor Lab.
St. Paul Campus 373-1766

MFF/F119 SC

SCFA REPORTS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Winter Quarter, 1975

Volume 2, Number 2

Dear Colleague:

In this edition of SCFA Reports we wish to present a report of the new issues received by SCFA and to itemize and report on the matters treated during the Fall Quarter, 1974.

I. President's Mission Statement

Because of the concerns expressed by many faculty members on the points made in the first draft of the President's Mission Statement, SCFA spent considerable time evaluating it. The SCFA review and discussion resulted in the following response addressed to the President:

A. INTRODUCTION

The intent of the following comments is to suggest that a statement of this University's mission should be conceptual, that is, focused on a statement of the chief ends to be served and the means to reaching those ends. Ends are a declaration of purpose; functioning as guidelines for establishing basic policy. In the light of these policies, priorities are set for budgets, programs and all other significant means.

In order to assess effectiveness in attaining the stated ends, at least two actions are suggested: (1) more careful planning is required both centrally and in the several colleges, institutes and similar units; and (2) this planning should receive a periodic review of outcomes or, put in ends-means terms, the extent to which means seem appropriate and the extent to which the ends themselves should be recast--with new means suggested.

What follows does not specify all the stellar ends or the most promising means. The purpose of the SCFA response is not comprehensive-ness. Rather, SCFA's ambition is to sketch the outline of a conceptual model--one specified in terms of ends-means.

B. ENDS

1. Reaching and maintaining community within the university. In a "multi-university" it is natural for adversary relations to develop

between the Regents, administration, students and faculty. One of the perennial challenges to university leadership is to reconcile divergent views and to work towards a strong community of interest. It is only for the sake of keeping the University's task manageable that a variety of objectives is noted. Each objective is to be thought of as an end. The objectives are at least three: public, student and faculty. It is hoped that the three can be kept in balance.

2. It goes without saying that a university's greatness is in no small means due to its climate of intellectual freedom and this climate could not have developed without the University's respect for due process in dealings with the faculty, staff, students, self-government through the Senate and its committees, and its commitment to the principle of tenure. One would hope that these points will find a place in a University Mission Statement either in the form suggested below or in an alternative form.

3. Public objectives are to be served. A necessary first step is to state the basic characteristics of this University, e.g., what is the significance of being a land-grant institution, what can be said about the urban and rural setting of the university and the locales from which students come, about the degree of obligation to rural and urban communities ("communiversity"), the State, as well as national and international opportunities for service.

Governmental bodies must have access to University people, programs, and facilities that can be useful in the improvement of government's service to the public. However, in order to keep the public interest and end in perspective, it is necessary to insure that off-campus service not be allowed to interfere with primary obligations in teaching and scholarship. This is one instance where a harmonious balance must be reached, with appropriate mechanisms put in place to monitor the balance.

4. Basic student objectives are to be served with attention to differentiation by level of study (i.e., undergraduate and graduate), as well as attention to individual and group differences (e.g., 2-year programs leading to Associate in Arts degrees, University College. . .).

Counseling complements effective teaching in the University's attempt to help reach student objectives. The University not only acknowledges this but will attempt to assess teaching and counseling, to provide care for social and physical well-being, for vocational preparation and placement and, above all, for the intellectual development of the student.

It is also crucial that the student body becomes an integral part of the University community--an effective part of its governance and curricular life.

5. Basic faculty objectives are to be served--with attention to differentiation in terms of teaching, basic and applied research (i.e., creation of new knowledge--an essential adjunct to teaching), and service. In order to strike a balance among these three activities, it is imperative that once a University Mission Statement is endorsed

by the Board of Regents it be reviewed by Collegiate units with an eye towards harmonizing their mission statements with that of the University. In the same manner departmental mission statements should be drafted and/or reviewed to bring them into conformity with the University-Collegiate statements of mission. This must be more than a rhetorical harmonization if the life of the University is to be affected.

As with students, the chief officers of collegiate units and of the central administration are challenged to exercise their power in such a way that a sizable fraction of the faculty does not feel alienated and impotent. Effective and continuous communication must be nourished as well as such vigilance as is exercised by a "loyal opposition."

C. MEANS

1. A high level of faculty performance necessitates that attention be given to matters involving recruitment, retention, up-dating, graduate faculty status, academic freedom tenure, due process in adjudicating grievances, adequate support (i.e., clerical service, supplies. . .), affirmative action, measures of effectiveness, and such faculty benefits as retirement plans, health insurance and so forth.

2. An essential means is organization and administration including central planning and personnel policies. (a) The responsibilities of those involved is to serve the ends sampled in B-above; organization and administration never is an end-in-itself. (b) The distribution of power is a crucial matter. The University Mission Statement should clearly suggest the scope of authority lodged with the Regents, President (and Presidential aides), Deans, and such other collegiate administrators as chairpersons of departments, the faculty and the students. However distributed, this power is governed by the controlling principle that it exists to serve as a means to facilitate reaching the ends suggested in B-above. Involved is the role of the Senate and its committees.

3. A most important means is represented by the multiple roles of the Graduate School and its function through such agencies as its General Research Advisory Committee, Policy and Review Committees, Unit Committees and collegiate Directors of Graduate Studies. The Graduate School's modest organization and budget suggests that its primary responsibility is not administrative but rather helping the faculty in review of graduate student programs, graduate faculty status and research programs of high quality, visibility and service in the land-grant tradition and the commiversity ideal.

D. PERIODIC REVIEW

A University statement of mission is not meant to be timeless. Not etched in stone, it should provide for periodic review. While SCFA does not suggest a means for reaching that end of review, it would suggest that thought be given to the creation of such an instrument.

The second draft of the President's Mission Statement is now available.

Please feel free to direct any comments you may have regarding the SCFA response or the second draft to SCFA and President Magrath's office.

II. Report on SCFA recommendations as approved by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to the Central Administration for it's perusal and action:

A. Recommendations

The recommendations have been published and may be found in the Senate Minutes of May 23, and May 30, 1974, No. 8, pages 199-207.

B. Questionnaire on Retirement Plans

At the request of the Central Administration, SCFA developed a questionnaire to solicit faculty opinion on various retirement plans designed to improve faculty retirement benefits. The questionnaire, graciously prepared by Professor Robert H. Beck (Social and Philosophic Foundations of Education), Edward Coen (Economics), Stephen Hoenack (Public Affairs), Leonid Hurwicz (Economics) and Mr. William Weiler (Assistant Director, Management Information Division), was difficult to create since it is nearly impossible to describe our present retirement system, and proposed changes in it within the space of a few paragraphs. It is hoped that you will answer it conscientiously. Your own interests are substantially involved in the final policy outcome.

If you need clarification on any of the questions raised in the mailed questionnaire, feel free to contact Professor Edward Coen at (612) 545-7220 either in the evenings or over the weekends.

C. SCFA sub-Committee on Faculty Benefits

While the Central Administration has been examining the SCFA recommendations, the Benefits Sub-Committee has been studying the scope and level of faculty benefits in an effort to determine their standing relative to other comparable institutions of higher learning. At present, the sub-Committee is concentrating on the following two issues:

1. Performance of Faculty Retirement Funds

Professor Steve Hoenack and his associates, in cooperation with Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Company and the Central Administration, are generating further information needed to evaluate the current policies and practices governing the management of faculty retirement funds. As promised in its Annual Report last year, SCFA will review the performance of faculty retirement funds this year and report the result of its investigation to the Senate in May, 1975.

2. Tuition Grants for Dependents of Faculty

Early in the Winter Quarter, Professors Thomas Boman and Hugh Kabat began studying the issue of tuition grants for dependents of faculty. They have surveyed every college and university with more than 4,000 students to assess the level and scope of such a benefit. Though approximately half of the institutions have responded, 145 offer some form of tuition remission to faculty dependents. A detailed assessment of each respondent's program and the resulting financial implications is underway.

D. Issues Concerning (i) Health Insurance, (ii) Performance of Faculty Retirement Funds, (iii) Fringe Benefits for Part-Time Faculty, and (iv) Sabbatical Leaves and (v) Early Retirement

On March 24, 1975, SCFA received the following formal response from President Magrath regarding its recommendations on these issues:

“ I am sorry that it has taken so long to respond to the comments and recommendations submitted by your Committee to the University Senate on May 30, 1974. I am sure that you can understand the problems which I have encountered in trying to prepare for my first Legislative Session here in Minnesota. I do wish to assure you, and the members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, that I consider these matters of personnel welfare to be of the highest priority in the University -- indeed, I believe that our decision to place faculty compensation adjustments at the top of our priorities for Legislative action is tangible evidence of this mutual concern.

However, we are faced with an unusual situation in trying to develop an appropriate response to your Committee's recommendations.

As you know, we are faced with a Bureau of Mediations Services Cease and Desist order under which changes -- perhaps even discussion of changes -- in matters which could be the subject of collective bargaining are prohibited. As with all such bureaucratic regulations, it is not totally clear how we might continue our dialogue with the Senate in these matters without providing some evidence of violation of either the letter or spirit of the Cease and Desist order.

After extensive consultation with my colleagues in the administration, I have determined that perhaps a "philosophical" discussion of some of the issues addressed in SCFA's report would be an appropriate approach toward continuing our dialogue and at the same time complying with the BMS order. Accordingly, I will comment -- to the extent possible -- on each of the five major sections of your report, and hopefully I will be able to provide you with some guidance as to the attitudes and opinions of the administration toward the subjects as well as some thoughts on the feasibility of the recommendations. In the first section of your recommendations, SCFA addressed itself to fringe benefits for part-time faculty. It is apparent to me that the nature of the University is such that there are substantial numbers of individuals whose appointments do not fall within our normal categories, and whose contributions to the life, character, and mission of the institution are significant. I agree that these individuals should be accorded privileges and benefits commensurate with their role in the institution, but it is extremely difficult to devise any hard and fast rules as to who should be included and who should not be.

In some instances -- for example social security -- the individual is also required to make a contribution to the benefit. I can envision situations where individuals might find it less attractive to remain with the University in a part-time capacity if their compensation arrangements require 5.85 per cent contribution to social security. It is also apparent that our entire fringe benefit package for faculty is an expensive undertaking, and that the extension of these benefits to a large number of additional members of the University community will entail the diversion of funds which are sorely needed to alleviate the "purchasing power deterioration" in faculty salaries. I believe that we should continue our exploration of these possibilities and that we should seek the views of those who would be most affected.

The second series of recommendations in your report covers the general subject of early retirement. I am particularly interested in your comment about viability of the present program. It seems to me that the most crucial question in evaluating any early retirement program is whether or not it works. Clearly, most such plans are devised with good intentions, and on paper they appear to be extremely attractive and valuable options. However, all too often the level of benefits provided under such a program is inadequate to maintain any reasonable standard of living. Obviously, this subject is one which deserves continuing attention, but here again we must realize that substantial improvements in retirement benefits are a very costly endeavor. One final point -- I am very much concerned over the "voluntary" aspects of early retirement plans. Here again, I am sure that in theory it is possible to provide appropriate safeguards to insure that such separations are, in fact, voluntary. I am not quite so confident that practice follows theory in this particular area. This is not to suggest that involuntary retirement is necessarily something to be avoided, but only to express my personal concern that such separations not be accomplished under the guise of a voluntary early retirement system.

The third portion of the SCFA report is directed toward the subject of performance of faculty retirement funds. I think it fair to point out that the three recommendations within that section speak more to the options granted under the plan and certain policies and procedures of either the University administration or the insurance carriers providing the annuities. In general I am sympathetic to the suggestion that options under the plan should be diverse enough to provide for a program tailored to the needs of the individual rather than one which forces individuals into a standard package. Certainly there have been in recent years modifications which move toward this type of flexibility. I think it appropriate that we continue to explore the addition of other optional investment programs, but I must caution against such a proliferation of options that participants have little or no chance of making reasonable evaluations and selections from among them. I believe that the assumption by SCFA of responsibility for an annual review of investment performance and submission of a report to the Senate is a very positive step.

The fourth section of the report to the Senate contains a substantial number of recommendations relative to the health insurance provided for University faculty and other employees. While we are entirely sympathetic to the suggestions for broader coverage, higher limits, and even to the possibility of some improvements in conversion privileges, it is apparent that the basic Blue Cross/Blue Shield policy covering all State employees is a very attractive plan, and that responsibility for negotiating the terms of that contract does not rest with the University. We have and will certainly continue to provide input to those who do negotiate with the carriers, and we are confident that the evolutionary improvement of these plans will continue.

The final set of recommendations within the report to the Senate are addressed to the subject of sabbatical leaves. In this area there are clearly some deficiencies in the existing program. I personally place a high value on the sabbatical, both as it provides for professional development as well as simply to provide the opportunity to "recharge one's batteries." However, the provisions of the system apparently are not viable for all of the members of the faculty. We find evidence that only those who have substantial external sources of income are regularly availing themselves of this opportunity. However, I must suggest that remedying this particular problem is clearly going to take an intensive amount of attention and effort. The suggestion of salary supplements is useful, but I question how we might generate adequate dollars. I certainly feel that perhaps the most realistic recommendation involves the further promotion of faculty interchange with other institutions, and I assure you that this subject will have the careful attention of the appropriate members of the administration.

In summary, let me comment on the question which seems to appear time and time again throughout all of the sections of the SCFA report. It is imperative that we carefully evaluate the level of counseling and communication which we provide for participants in our various benefit programs. I think it fair to say that we have a major investment in both participant and institutional dollars in a program which has major impact on a large number of people. The nature of this program is such that each participant should be as well informed as possible, if we are to expect to maximize the value of these investments to the participants.

I am sorry that this letter cannot be more responsive directly to each of the issues raised, but I am sure that you understand the situation which dictates the course of action which I have followed.

I urge you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to continue your excellent work in evaluating and critiquing these very important programs and assure you that I and other members of the administration will do everything possible to facilitate the work of the Committee and, where possible, to implement your recommendations.”

The Committee has not yet had a chance to carefully study this response, a matter to be discussed at our April meeting. SCFA's reactions to President Magrath's response will soon be communicated to the President, Senate and faculty.

III. University Committee on Tenure and University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

According to the Handbook: A Compilation of Rules and Operational Procedures, University Senate, January, 1974, "University Committees are standing committees created by the University Senate and assigned a relationship and responsibility to appropriate Senate Committees" (Page U1.32). To strengthen the existing working relationship between the SCFA and the University Committee on Tenure and University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, henceforth this Newsletter will carry also news items on the activities of the latter Committees.

A. University Committee on Tenure (Chaired by Professor Fred L. Morison, Law School, 125 Fraser Hall, Minneapolis Campus)

During the 1973-74 school year, the Tenure Committee issued four opinions. They dealt with the following subjects:

1. A faculty member may not be transferred from an A (12 month) to B (9 month) status without his consent. (Opinion of February 22, 1974)
2. Decisions made by a panel of the Judicial Committee of the University Senate may not be appealed to the full Judicial Committee unless all members of the Judicial Committee have heard all of the evidence taken in the case. (Opinion No. 1 of May 17, 1974)
3. The Committee elaborated on the procedures and standards for suspension of faculty members under section 13(b) of the Regulations, insuring full academic due process. (Opinion No. 2 of May 17, 1974)
4. A person holding a purely administrative appointment should not be given a regular appointment leading to Tenure Regulations. A person who holds a regular faculty appointment may, however, concurrently serve in an administrative appointment, but the

tenure decision should be made and judged on teaching, research and service performances in faculty functions. However, if an administrator has been improperly given a regular probationary appointment, the University is bound to consider that person for tenure on the basis of the duties which have been assigned to him. (Opinion of May 29, 1974)

The Tenure Committee has also considered the rights of faculty members who hold T appointments and has issued an advisory opinion letter which details the circumstances in which non-regular appointment may, and may not, be used.

B. University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

(Chaired by Professor Marian D. Hall, Psychology Department, N-218 Elliot Hall, Minneapolis Campus)

The UACFR has set a schedule of meetings, two per quarter, to deal with three major carry-over items from last year's Senate action confirming the Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. In that action of April 18, 1974, this committee was mandated (1) to review departmental and collegiate procedures for dealing with grievances. This is presently underway in a subcommittee chaired by Professor Benjamin Bayman. (2) The committee has, furthermore, attended to outlining its own procedures for hearing such grievances as may come before it for final review. Professor Barry Feld is in charge of drafting these procedures. (3) The third area of follow-up involves disseminating the intent and recommend actions of the Senate action of April 18, 1974. This has led to a series of meetings and clarifying memos with Dr. Shirley Clark, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Administration and Dr. Walter Bruning, Vice-President for Administration. At issue are such matters as the effect of the "cease and desist" order on the processing of grievances under UACAFR, the addition of civil service members to committees at all levels, the relationship between this committee and the Office of Equal Opportunity with its University Grievance Officer. The confusion between that administrative function and the function of the GRO for colleges and campuses (directed by the Senate action to be that of a "third party to monitor the grievance proceedings" and directly prohibited from being aligned with complainant, hearing committee, or administration) remains as the matter most needing clarification at this moment. Meetings to review the intent of the document with Vice-Presidents Clark and Bruning are scheduled in the near future.

- IV. If you want to write or converse about any of the subjects discussed in this Newsletter, please do not hesitate to contact us. If you are not receiving this Newsletter regularly, please do send the Chairperson your name and campus mailing address.

Cordially yours,

Mahmood A. Zaidi, Chairperson

Professor & Director of Graduate Studies
Industrial Relations, College of Business
Administration, West Bank
Minneapolis Campus 373-3827

Robert H. Beck
Professor & Head, Social & Philosophic
Foundations of Education
203 Burton Hall
Minneapolis Campus 373-2286

Thomas Boman
Associate Professor & Head of Secondary
Education
218 Bohannon Hall
Duluth Campus (218) 726-1464

Leona Classen
Assistant Professor of Education
200 B Education
Morris Campus 1-589-1464

Leonid Hurwicz
Regents Professor of Economics
1060 Business Administration Bldg.
Minneapolis Campus 373-4385

Hugh Kabat
Professor & Assistant Dean for
Administration, College of Pharmacy
318 Harvard Street, S. E.
Minneapolis Campus 373-5312

Bill Kennedy
Professor of Plant Pathology
225 Plant Sciences
St. Paul Campus 373-1351

Virginia Kivits
Professor of Literature, Communication
and Philosophy
202C Nicholson Hall
Minneapolis Campus 373-3721

William Robbins
Assistant Professor of Electrical
Engineering
356 Electrical Engineering
Minneapolis Campus 373-9719

Clare Woodward
Assistant Professor of
Biochemistry-Biological Sciences
358 Gortner Lab.
St. Paul Campus 373-1766

Please do not forget to return the questionnaire on the
proposed changes in the faculty retirement system.