



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
AND  
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

May 30, 1984  
Regents Room, Morrill Hall  
12:45 - 3:00

AGENDA

1. Minutes of May 16 (enclosed).
2. Reports:
  - A. Student Consultative Committee Chair.
  - B. SCC Chair.
  - C. Senate Finance Committee Chair.
  - D. Pre-Accreditation Self-Study Committee Chair.
3. Governance:
  - SCC's responsibility as a steering committee;
  - What specific work does SCC want to set in motion before the end of the current academic year? For example, should SCC establish a review committee composed of community members not involved in the governance structures, as suggested by the SCC's student subcommittee on governance?
4. Does SCC need a June 6 meeting?

DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

5. The president's items.
6. "Presidential Response to the Task Force Reports." Exchange, in general and specific terms, on content of the Response. What additional responsibilities do the SCC and other Senate and Assembly committees have relating to the task force recommendations and the president's response?
7. Observations regarding the requests for divestiture of investments in companies doing business in South Africa including, if available, recommendations from the president's special advisory committee.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
AND  
DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

May 30, 1985

1:05 - 3:20

Regents Room, Morrill Hall

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Irwin Rubenstein, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Bruce Williams. 2:30: Paul Schulte.

Members-elect present: Richard Goldstein, David Hamilton, Tim Pratt, Roy St. Laurent.

Guests: John Aune, Darcy Hanzlik, Mary Jane Plunkett, Maureen Smith.  
1:45: President Kenneth Keller, Vice President V. Rama Murthy, Marsha Riebe.

Professor Merwin introduced Professor Hamilton, elected vice chairman of the Senate and Assembly, and hence ex officio SCC member.

1. The minutes of May 16 were approved as distributed.

2. Reports.

A. SSCC Chair. Mr. Melby introduced Messrs. Pratt and St. Laurent. He announced that Professor Clark would talk with the students at the SSCC orientation.

B. SCC Chair.

(1) Professor Merwin announced the following two faculty appointments and one nomination, as previously recommended by FCC:

- Senate Planning Committee: Carl Adams;
- Recreational Sports Board of Governors: Roger Page;
- President's Student Behavior Review Panel: Sona Andrews' name has been forwarded to President Keller for his approval and letter of appointment.

(2) The Facilitative Committee's final meeting of the year consisted of a good, forward-looking discussion, question and answer exchange, and eager support for an early fall retreat for past and new committee chairpersons. The group agreed on a process by which Senate committees can divide up the

task force reports and presidential response, and the Commitment to Focus recommendations, for further consideration. Professor Stuthman noted it is hoped a Senate meeting will also address the documents.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman announced that because the legislature has not completed its work the SFC meeting is postponed from today to June 6 (1:30 - 3:00) to look at next year's budget prior to the June Regents' meeting. Professor Merwin has agreed to chair the Finance Committee for 1985-86.

D. Pre-Accreditation Site Visit Self-Study Committee. Professor Rubenstein said the committee may circulate its draft report to senators in October and hold a forum in November. The committee wants its report to serve as a benchmark for future reference. Site visit to the Twin Cities Campus has been set for April 14-16. It would be useful for people on campus to be familiar with the report prior to that visit.

There was a brief discussion as to the likelihood of an SCC meeting with the accrediting visitors.

### 3. SCC Responsibility and Self-Discipline.

Professor Sorauf was prompted by behavior relating to the Senate motions on divestment to call for an SCC self-examination regarding candor, trust, and mutual respect. (In SCC's May 16 discussion of its motion urging the Senate to delay a vote on divestment until June 6 so it could benefit by the information in the report of the President's special ad hoc advisory committee, there was no dissent and there was the appearance of strong and unanimous SCC support. Within the Senate meeting, that support did not fully hold.)

If the SCC wants to take a lead, Professor Sorauf told the committee, as is suited to its role as the Senate's steering committee, the committee must clarify its positions and stand up for the prestige of the membership and the committee. He asked if the Senate needs leadership, if the SCC is prepared to take that leadership and, if so, what that would require of SCC. Members appear generally rather diffident about expressing their views in the Senate and identifying themselves as SCC members. The cost of having leadership is that people have to provide the leadership.

He termed this matter an integral part of faculty-student governance and the SCC's part of it, and called for further discussion in the coming year. He questioned whether the SCC will function well as a group unless members air differences with each other.

### 4. Need for June 6 SCC meeting?

Members concluded it did not have business requiring a June 6 meeting. The tentatively scheduled meeting was cancelled. (Note: President Keller later in the meeting reopened the possibility of an SCC meeting with him in June. See page 7.)

### 5. Governance.

Mr. Melby reported that the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC)

wants action over the summer. He repeated the suggestion made in the SSCC's May 16 oral report that a group of University people not participating in the governance system study it and make recommendations to SCC. He alleged that SCC hasn't defined the problem and that, consequently, proposing solutions is premature.

Professor Stuthman noted that the SCC was awaiting the SSCC subcommittee's written report, and said the suggestions are more likely to get attention if they become part of the written record. He inquired what incentives members of such an outside review committee would have to invest their time reviewing a system they've chosen not to participate in.

Mr. Melby called the SCC's big chance to affect decisions at the University a big deal and asserted the SCC should do something, not go through another year taking up the matter when there's a spot on the agenda.

Professor Sorauf commented that SCC is not going to get a fresh look from the non-participating faculty. We have found all the interested ones and put them to work and we cannot use the ones who have refused to participate or are not wanted. He proposed SCC bring in people from other schools to look at our governance workings. The cost might be roughly \$2500 to \$3000.

Professor Clark recommended that any outside reviewers spend time also with current and past committee chairs. Outsiders' experience, she noted, is likely to be very institution-bound. Their observations and descriptions of other structures would stimulate our discussion and expand our sense of possibilities, but visitors would not redesign our system.

Professor Merwin remarked a connection might be made between such a visit and the fall retreat planned for committee chairs.

Professor Stuthman suggested SCC send a questionnaire to a number of institutions, then perhaps select its reviewers for their diversity.

Ms. Emanuelson noted that the University has internal resources as well in faculty who have recently come here from teaching at other institutions. Professors Stuthman and Merwin voiced their support for learning from members of this group who were involved at their former campuses.

There was a consensus to send a structured questionnaire to other institutions and choose from the responses some reviewers.

#### DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT.

At 1:45, President Keller and Vice President Murthy joined the meeting.

#### 6. Presidential Responses to the Recommendations of the Six Planning Task Forces.

President Keller remarked that in this recently-published report he had modified and augmented the response President Magrath had issued the previous summer.

In President Keller's foreward to his response, he wrote:

"The Senate Consultative Committee is being asked to coordinate the involvement of the relevant Senate groups including the Senate Finance Committee, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Senate Planning Committee, and the Senate Committee on Research in responding to the presidential report ."

Professor Merwin told the President he thought SCC accepted that charge. He inquired as to who would be responsible for monitoring implementation among administrators.

The President told SCC there will be a new staff person who will serve as the President's consultant on planning and who will do such monitoring. Progress reports will be issued.

Discussion regarding specific recommendations and presidential responses, taken from the text of the Presidential Response:

(Note: although comments on some reports were scattered through the discussion, they have been transposed and collected together in these minutes below each task force title.)

Task Force on the Student Experience. Recommendation #35:

"The vice president for student affairs should immediately take steps that will result in explicit attention to documentation of the quality of co-curricular activities. Guidelines should be developed describing how the quality of these activities will influence resource allocation to the units that sponsor them."

The presidential response indicates implementation is underway. Mr. Shope told the meeting that, while the recommendation is couched in general terms, an April 15 document illustrates consequences. Authored by Carl Nelson, it says the Office of Student Affairs wants some control over the operation of the Minnesota International Student Association, the Unions, the Recreational Sports Board of Governors, and the MSA Forum. The message is that their co-curricular programs, which are funded from student services fees, would have to meet the standards of a co-curricular dean. This implies, said Mr. Shope, a dean's allocation of a substantial part of student services fees.

President Keller requested a copy of the document, and suggested SCC might want to invite Vice President Wilderson to discuss the questions it raises.

Mr. Shope termed the implications "scary" and asked how the President perceived them. President Keller said one planning question for the OSA budget is how to determine the allocations to student services, weighing one against another (Financial Aid, Counseling, etc.). Considerations also extend to co-curricular activities and the question of available review mechanisms. The basic question is how to spend the OSA budget in keeping with the University's mission. We apply the same standards to the OSA budget as to other parts of the University. There is no hidden agenda, no attempt to lessen student participation, and discussion is only about the state resources the University puts into OSA.

Mr. Shope said he thinks OSA has a tendency to focus heavily on fee-supported activities because of high student interest in where their fees are going.

Mr. Melby called attention to the recognized need for common space around the University, including some open 24 hours a day. President Keller said the administration intends that and is building it into new buildings and achieving some from the space recouped from centralization of the libraries.

Graduate Education and Research: "Central Facilities" Recommendation 6:

"The University's libraries are faced with four major kinds of problems: of location, of main and departmental libraries, of acquisitions, and of library services."

Professor Rubenstein said he had hoped for a stronger presidential response to this observation. President Keller said the University's position on libraries has been to bring the acquisitions budget up to an excellent level. The University has been short on funding automation, but is about to achieve resources through a Bush Foundation grant. There is a move toward centralization along with longer hours and more automation.

An enormous amount of time has been spent on personnel questions, he added. He is not sure the problems have been solved, but thinks the situation is getting better.

Professor Rubenstein reported that his own surveying tells him faculty and graduate students see the libraries as not meeting their needs well. The President said the complaints Professor Rubenstein has been hearing are in the very areas the University is making inroads into right now (especially acquisitions and hours). He remarked that he can only deal with specifics when he knows them, and said he wants to know them.

Professor Clark told the meeting that the members of that task force, of which she was one, thought the University Library warranted its own task force. It is a very important area which they could not leave out of their report, but which deserves a system study.

President Keller said the Senate Library Committee should be continuously studying where problems are and how to relieve them. Professor Sorauf described the Senate Library Committee as being in an anomalous position: if it holds back it is accused of not doing anything, and if it is active it is accused of treading on administrative prerogative. He reported that he has seen a perceptible decline in the service in Wilson Library over the last three years.

President Keller asked Vice President Murthy to determine how much the Library's personnel budget had been cut in the last three years, and he suggested it may be the case that the consequent service loss has been too high.

In response to Ms. Emanuelson's statement that better signs are needed for new library users, the President noted the helpfulness of the library orientation tours, but only if students use them.

Graduate Education and Research: "Program Reviews." Professor Rubenstein spoke of the importance of being able to start up, on a trial basis, new programs proposed by faculty. We lack the needed mechanism, he said, for the ideas to flow upward from individual faculty to a review process.

Computation, Communication, and Information. Mr. Williams inquired as to whether the allocations include the coordinate campuses. The President replied in the affirmative, saying the funds have been distributed throughout the system.

International Character of the University. Professor Sorauf suggested that the President had perhaps been unnecessarily kind in responding to the recommendations of this task force. If the University has objectives in this area, they have to be stated more explicitly, he said. Work abroad per se is not more valuable than work elsewhere in this country. Faculty recognize good activities whether or not they are international.

President Keller noted that other faculty members, on SCC and SCEP, had also made that point. He said we don't want to reject the symbolism, but the specifics must be appropriate to the University and its mission. The Graduate Research Committee, for example, is the body to review international research proposals. He said the University must be clear about what we are trying to achieve.

Enhancing the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty. Recommendation #10:

"Department chairs should provide opportunities for faculty members to discuss their research, research interests, and ideas with departmental colleagues and students."

The presidential response begins, "Agree. There is little, if any, information to suggest that such interactions are not widespread." It requests information on any such lackings.

Professor Merwin emphasized that the task force members actually saw this problem; they heard testimony from young scholars especially on this lack. The President described himself as shocked at that finding. He said he had written the response in such a way as to try to elicit information because he would not be at ease sending out a broadside recommendation on an activity assumed to be the norm.

Mr. St. Laurent commented that graduate students also appreciate the chance to find out what other graduate students are doing.

Enhancing the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty. Recommendation #9:

"...Administrative seminars, workshops, or informal discussions could be used to emphasize an institutional priority in [factors affecting faculty vitality and resources available for enhancing it] ..."

Professor Merwin noted that the last such retreat for administrators was 10 years ago. President Keller and Vice President Murthy voiced their support for such a retreat.

Higher Education and the Economy of the State. Mr. Melby inquired about the extent of recent activities between the University and business and industry because most recent attention has been paid to the University and technology. The President identified a number of specific University links with industry. Mr. Melby then inquired how students can obtain internships with industry. The President said there are individual job opportunities

rather than institutional arrangements. Some organized programs exist within certain colleges.

7. University's Stock Holdings in Companies Engaged in Business in South Africa: the Divestment Issue.

President Keller announced that his special ad hoc advisory committee had not yet reported to him. When it did, he said, he would welcome the opportunity to discuss their recommendations with the Consultative Committee. He then commented to SCC at some length on the dilemma.

The equation that those who oppose apartheid support divestment is not yet entirely supported, he said. The barbarity of apartheid and the need to end it is not an issue.

Reports on the experience of other institutions say no changes in the value of their portfolios have resulted, but they also say that at this point one can draw no conclusions from that finding. If certain industries are no longer available for investments, there will be pressure on the stocks of all the others.

He raised the question of whether the University could accept, and whether it would continue to be offered, gifts from those companies which make profits from South Africa. The estimate, based on what those gifts have been, is that they come to about \$10 million per year. If the University does not continue to receive those, who should bear that loss? The units which would have gotten the gifts, or all of us jointly? Because there may well be a cost to divestment, it is fair to raise the question of how we will share that cost.

The Sullivan Principles reportedly are assisting only one percent of the black population of South Africa. Is divestment the best way to effect change in South Africa's government's laws and policies? Might the University keep what it makes on South African investments and turn it to help effect change? There are numerous possible ways to move.

Professor Clark inquired whether the businesses in which universities have invested are taking some constructive steps, since they have seen the divestment pressure coming for a long time. She also asked what universities are doing collectively to bring some pressure.

President Keller replied that he has been asking some companies when they will leave South Africa. Their response is that instability is not an incentive to their pulling out because there is very little, really only some working capital, that they could remove. The economic concern is less than the psychological or political concern. He said Wesleyan University heads a joint group, but that one is education- rather than action-oriented. He said he has called some other AAU institutions to ask if we could better work together to affect the companies; if they did so, they would not divest. The President voiced his wish that it be "possible for this conversation to be held on other than symbolic grounds." It is easier, he remarked, for an individual to adopt a symbol than for an institution to do so.



Mr. Shope asked if it does not follow that if the University decides to divest then not only must it not accept gifts, but also stop purchasing from those companies.

President Keller concluded the discussion by observing that there are many shades of moral gray in this issue and that the University has to decide at what point to draw the line.

8. Appreciation of the Chairman and Retiring SCC Members.

The committee members thanked for their service their colleagues now leaving the committee, and thanked Professor Merwin for his leadership. The SCC joined in a round of appreciative applause.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele,  
Executive Assistant