

University
of
Minnesota
memo

date January 10 1983

to My FCC colleagues

from Pat Swan / mp

FCC MEETING REMINDER

Thursday, January 13
9:15 - 11:00
606 Campus Club

Below, copied from a January 7 letter, are agenda items the President proposes for a closed February 3 FCC meeting with him.

As we have said before, we will want to discuss on the 13th our own desires for the agenda as well.

Excerpt from letter, President Magrath to Pat Swan:

Moreover, let me suggest three specific items that I would like to present and review with FCC in a non-public session at our next scheduled meeting which is in February. Later, I will send a bit of back-up material that might be helpful to the Committee, but the agenda items would be these:

1. University Relationship with Minnesota Business Partnership -- efforts being made to enlist their support for the University's educational and budget needs.
2. An expanded role for the University of Minnesota Foundation -- need for discretionary operational money in the years ahead.
3. The tenure issue and our budgetary and priority setting concerns: can we get it modified?

These suggest some of the questions that are very much on my mind, and that we have of course touched on in various ways in other settings. But I would like to specifically outline some of my thoughts and receive the benefit of your Committee's views and reactions. There may be additional items that we will need for the February agenda, but of course these can be added by FCC or me as needed. Obviously, while Ken is in dialogue with the Senate Finance Committee on the budget cuts that we are currently being compelled to make, we will want to have at least some update and discussion with your Committee on this as well.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

DRAFT
MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Thursday, January 13, 1983
606 Campus Club
9:15 - 11:00

FOR FCC MEMBERS ONLY

Members present: P. Freier, J. Howe, M. Mattson, D. Pratt, P. Quie,
W. B. Sundquist, P. Swan, J. Turner.

1. FOR LEVITY. Swan proposed FCC invite their faculty colleagues to join them at a women's athletic event, the U of M-Purdue basketball game on the night of March 10. Ward off cabin fever, end the quarter on a light note, see some not-bad athletes. She further suggested FCC invite the Regents to join them and other faculty for dinner at the Campus Club before the game and to continue on to the game, in place of the Winter Quarter FCC-Regents meeting. Vote for FCC to promote this was 5 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstaining. Freier expressed her reservations about the value emphasis.

Publicity: Ask Maureen Smith to announce the occasion once or twice in Brief. FCC personally drum up support among friends via a flyer and notes.

2. PLANNING/CONSULTING. Freier lauded Irwin Rubenstein and the Planning Committee for initiating the Senate resolution requiring unit consultation with faculty and students in Second Cycle planning, and she said it is really making a difference in her unit, for one.

3. FACULTY NEWSLETTER, WINTER QUARTER. With so much important going on, faculty have remarked they would welcome a newsletter. It should include:

- List of committee chairs and phone numbers; encourage faculty to contact appropriate committee when they have concerns;
- Report of where the governance system has made a difference. SCC and other committees have affected business of concern to our colleagues of which our colleagues are unaware;
- Judicial Committee's request to faculty at large to cooperate with the Judicial Committee (testimony, depositions);
- Items also from SCC, SCFA, Finance, and perhaps SCEP.

The Op-Ed page of the Daily might serve as a cost-free alternative, but Marilee Ward has estimated about \$200 for a two- to four-side mailing.

TENURE CODE REVISION.

Turner asks that the Tenure Committee hold at least two two-hour open meetings for faculty during the revision process; FCC should encourage attendance. Swan described her recent conversation with Bob Morris in which he declined to chair open forums during the same period as redrafting the entire code. Even were a separate redrafting committee constituted, he would remain unwilling.

Swan reported the Tenure Committee has completed the easier part of its task--the section on how tenure is granted. It is moving on to the section on financial exigency. The committee continues to wonder whether to include a section permitting removal of tenured faculty for program planning reasons. Sam Krislov, who served as an advisor to the committee until his recent departure for Europe, is firmly against the tenure code's enunciating any provision for removal other than for cause, even though the administration and regents legally have such a right at present. Swan reported Morris is willing to try adding to the code a section on planning for the dismissal of tenured faculty but that he doubts the Senate would approve it.

Howe said our exaggerated concern over self-fulfilling prophecies keeps the faculty from planning for eventualities. Since regents have the power, he said, we should take care to influence the process.

Pratt doubts the regents will want to make decisions of this kind without help, and he reminded FCC of the regents' and President's effort last year to draft the FCC as an appeals body for planning decisions.

Many doubt there will be time to set up procedures if and when financial emergency should hit and the Regents ask for faculty help.

Swan proposed and the FCC approved inviting Bob Morris to join FCC's February 3 meeting with the President in closed session for conversation relating to President Magrath's third agenda item: "The tenure issue and our budgetary and priority setting concerns: can we get it modified?"

Turner reiterated his recommendation to ask the legislature for a special appropriation for severance-type pay for faculty members who are being phased out. That way the effects of a cut could be realized immediately, while the University preserved the whole concept of tenure.

LEGISLATIVE PROSPECTS. Turner indicated the University can hope for some success in changing the behavior of the legislators because of their growing awareness of the importance of the University and their consequent concern over its decline. A group of 20-30 legislators seemed receptive to Grad. School Dean Robert Holt's charts on the downward trend in reputational rankings. Pratt, who made a presentation to the same meeting, said he also sensed legislative concern, but has found that partisanship sometimes counters the concern.

Turner said he puts some faith in the added element of individual contacts between individual faculty members and legislators to get the University's story across. Faculty are, for instance, arguing the case that the legislature should let the University keep the overhead payment from federal grants.

Pratt reported CBS Dean Caldecott's belief that the technique of showing the legislature indications of the University's decline will backfire. The legislature may well conclude the University has not made good use of the resources it has provided. The fact that the proportion of the state's higher education appropriations going to the University has declined (as Swan reminded the FCC) must be made forcefully to the legislature.

Turner said the University needs supplementary lobbying within business and industry. He also wants the University to try seriously to influence the legislature rather than give up in the face of political difficulties. Swan and Pratt agreed on the need to operate energetically and optimistically, yet at the same time to appreciate the University is nevertheless likely to face budget problems this year and next, and perhaps for longer.

Swan recommended and FCC agreed adding to the February 3 agenda the topic of the University's legislative strategy for the next four years. FCC inclination is to invite both Peter Robinson and Phil Shively (new Faculty Association president) for that portion of the meeting.

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS. We need a better public relations job, said Turner. For example, faculty members have found legislators who believe the University is cutting across the board and not making choices. FCC members expressed some unease about the message and the tone conveyed in University-legislature relations.

There was some discussion on what are believed to be legislators' perceptions of the University. Some think that other branches of higher education have suffered because the University's lobbying has been so superior.

Turner commented that the University does not do enough to correct faulty public information put out from elsewhere. It needs a policy of catching all errors of fact (e.g. average salaries) and publicizing corrections.

There is a tentative plan to put on the March 3 agenda an item of University public relations in general and to invite William Carey, the new University Relations director.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. More names needed.

James Bodley (Biochemistry)

Mort Hammermesh (IT).

UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY RELATIONS. FCC is not pleased that the University seems to be letting this area slide. The special committee has yet to hold its first meeting. We have no indication the University was represented at the December 14-16 conference on the subject held at the University of Pennsylvania

and described in the most recent issue of Science.

HIGHER ACADEMIC STANDARDS FOR ATHLETES. FCC asked Swan to extend to President Magrath their compliments for speaking out at the NCAA convention on the right side of an important issue.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 11:00 a.m.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

*cc: FCC
1-13-83*

January 7, 1983

Professor Patricia B. Swan, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
Food Science and Nutrition
166 Food Science and Nutrition
St. Paul

Dear Pat:

Ken and I have chatted about some of the desires that FCC has in terms of our consulting and communicating relationship, and both of us now understand more clearly the thrust behind your earlier communications on this matter. I will be giving you a call in a few days, perhaps after the next Regents' meeting on January 13-14, but thought I would drop you a letter indicating my total receptivity to what you outlined with Ken the other day.

Moreover, let me suggest three specific items that I would like to present and review with FCC in a non-public session at our next scheduled meeting which is in February. Later, I will send a bit of back-up material that might be helpful to the Committee, but the agenda items would be these:

1. University Relationship with Minnesota Business Partnership -- efforts being made to enlist their support for the University's educational and budget needs.
2. An expanded role for the University of Minnesota Foundation -- need for discretionary operational money in the years ahead.
3. The tenure issue and our budgetary and priority setting concerns: can we get it modified?

These suggest some of the questions that are very much on my mind, and that we have of course touched on in various ways in other settings. But I would like to specifically outline some of my thoughts and receive the benefit of your Committee's views and reactions. There may be additional items that we will need for the February agenda, but of course these can be added by FCC or me as needed. Obviously, while Ken is in dialogue with the Senate Finance Committee on the budget cuts that we are currently being compelled to make, we will want to have at least some update and discussion with your Committee on this as well.

Professor Patricia B. Swan
January 7, 1983
Page Two

I will give you a call in the near future, but of course don't hesitate to contact me if you have any urgent concerns.

Cordially,



C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:djf

cc: Vice President Kenneth H. Keller, Academic Affairs