

Minutes
Senate Finance Committee
January 14, 1988

Present: Mark Brenner John Clark, Shirley Clark (chair), Gerald Clement, David Hamilton, Sally Jorgensen, Geoffrey Maruyama, Cleon Melsa, Tom Scott, Walter Weyhmann, Bill Kukowski

Guests: Roger Benjamin, David Berg, Richard Heydinger, Patricia Mullen, Irwin Rubenstein

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the November 13, 1987 meeting were approved.

2. Discussion of the Legislative Request with Vice President Heydinger

Vice President Heydinger began his comments by telling the Committee that his view of lobbying and external relations consisted of coordinating the employees and students of the University; it is not something he does. He said he had six responsibilities in external relations: federal relations, state relations, alumni relations, University Relations, and the more vague concept of "University entertaining"--that is, who's meeting with whom. Closely allied to his efforts is the work of Tony Potami and Office of Research Administration and Technology Transfer.

A major thrust of his vice presidency, he informed the Committee, would be to try to have the work of the six areas be more integrated in order to bring more leverage to the efforts of the University. His office, as now constituted, will have more responsibilities than it did under Vice President Kegler.

The first priority of his job will be state relations, since the State provides 60 - 65% of the University's operating budget. For the 1988 session, he will personally do as much as he can but former Vice President Kegler will also help out; they will divide up the work in whatever way seems best. He said he wanted to obtain as much first-hand experience in lobbying as possible in order to be able to assess how much time he will need to spend in St. Paul. He does not believe he will need to spend as much time as Vice President Kegler did, in part because the University may hire a lobbyist to do some of the work. That lobbyist would work very closely with President Keller.

In lobbying, he intends to take a team approach. He will serve as the point man, but intends to call on a lot of people from the University to testify. He also plans to bring a lot of legislative information back to the campus, and will discuss that procedure at a later time with the Finance Committee.

The Committee reviewed with Vice President Heydinger the current prospects for the legislative request and also raised several questions about items contained in the request (a copy of which was distributed to Committee members).

Professor Weyhmann asked Dr. Heydinger how he hoped to coordinate lobbying when the University had so many different groups and constituencies. The capital request, for instance, could cause different units or groups to make special pleas. Dr. Heydinger replied that he intended to speak with the deans and other administrators about the value of a team approach and that compromises had to be reached. Another part of the message had to be that people can do considerable harm to the request by doing end-runs.

2. Decentralization of Fringe Benefits

Professor Clark reviewed the discussion that took place at the last meeting of the Committee. Professor Weyhmann reiterated the point that putting fringe benefits in the departments might tempt chairs and heads to move to temporary and part-time appointments. Provost Benjamin replied that he has asked Assistant Vice President Betty Robinett to monitor the situation closely; if evidence suggests that department chairs are doing more temporary or part-time hiring, his office will review the policy. He did not believe it would emerge as a concern. Dr. Benjamin added that a far greater concern to him was whether or not his budget would be able to sustain the guarantee he made to the departments that their fringe benefit costs would be covered. In response to a question from Professor Weyhmann, he clarified that the guarantee was not for one year, it was in perpetuity. But the principle of decentralization had strong arguments to support it in the greater flexibility and accountability it permitted. Ultimately, he said, if there are problems, they will have to be dealt with, and perhaps the University would have to return to the centralized system.

It was agreed that no further action on the part of the Finance Committee was appropriate now, but Professor Clark told the Provost that it might ask him for a report at the end of the year on how the decentralization program was working.

3. Graduate Student Health Insurance Benefits

Patty LePage, representing the Council of Graduate Students (COGS), reviewed for the Committee the circumstances which led to the COGS proposal that health insurance be provided to graduate students who had 50% time appointments. It has, she said, been a terrible problem for many graduate students; inadequate or no health coverage is not unusual. Wisconsin, she noted, provides benefits to graduate students who have 1/3 time appointments or more, and one of the first questions asked by prospective graduate students interested in Minnesota is whether or not there is fringe benefit coverage.

Professor Clark inquired if there might be other classes of people at the University who are similarly situated; Mr. Berg told the Committee that the cutoff for insurance coverage for anyone with a University appointment is 75% time. Professor Hamilton commented that a graduate student appointment in excess of 50% time is rare, so that graduate students are effectively frozen out of health insurance coverage. Other points made were that under the new tax law, if the coverage is extended to graduate student appointments, it might be legally necessary to also extend the coverage to all other employees with the same percentage time appointments; that the benefit might be taxable; that the University might extend the coverage to other employees as a matter of fairness; that it is possible to "beat the system" if a department or college is of a mind to do so; that the health coverage and other fringe benefits accrue to individuals because of the status as employees, not as students.

The Committee agreed that it needed information on the cost of extending health coverage, both to graduate students and to all other employees, and asked Mr. Berg if it would be possible to obtain the data. It was also agreed that COGS would solicit information from other schools on the coverage provided to graduate students.

4. Faculty Development Committee

Professor Maruyama reported the action that the Faculty Affairs Committee had taken on the recommendations concerning faculty development. The basic thrust of the proposals is to provide flexibility to the sabbatical programs so that those who are not now using them will do so.

The Committee reviewed and discussed each of the proposals, and voted unanimously to specifically endorse those proposals which carried some cost with them. In the case of proposal #10, providing for augmented sabbaticals, the Committee support was conditioned on the development of guidelines for evaluation.

5. Sexual Harassment Survey

Professor Clark informed the Committee that this proposal came about as the result of action by the Faculty Senate in May of 1984, when it had approved a sexual harassment survey. Recently, the Provost's office had made funding available for the survey, as proposed in the material before the Committee, but that Provost Benjamin wished to have the advice of the Committee before proceeding.

Ms. Mullen briefly reviewed the history of various survey proposals; the present one was the inexpensive version which was intended to obtain information not only incidence but also the effect of programs designed to educate.

Professor Scott expressed the opinion that the survey could cost more money than budgeted, especially if there were to be adequate sampling on all five campuses. He also pointed out that it would be very important to get a high response.

Committee members had other observations:

--That the decision to conduct the survey was really administrative, except that the Committee did wish to establish the principle of its own involvement

--That this survey was not a one-shot affair, but would or could be used to compare with the results of future surveys

--That this whole idea was an uneasy mix of graduate student research and administrative data-gathering for policy purposes

--That if the proposal was a legitimate graduate student research project, then it ought to be reviewed and funded by the Graduate School

--That perhaps the money could better be spent on intervention or education on sexual harassment

--That the Committee, in being asked for advice on the survey, was not privy to other institutional research proposals and had no idea where this did or should rank in priority

--That in order to achieve consistency over time, if future surveys were to be conducted, and in order to ensure that it was constructed and conducted in a professional fashion, the Minnesota Center for Survey Research be used.

Inasmuch as the funding for the survey was already available, it was agreed that Professor Clark would write to Provost Benjamin to outline the comments and concerns of the Committee; he could then proceed in the manner he thought best.

The Committee adjourned at 5:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Engstrand

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

January 14, 1988
Regents Room, Morrill Hall
3:15 - 5:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- 3:15 1. Discussion about the University's legislative request process. (Guest: Vice President Richard Heydinger) (Tentative)
- 3:35 2. Decentralization of fringe benefits: Wrap-up of extended discussion from November 13, 1987 meeting.
- 3:50 3. Preliminary discussion of graduate student health insurance benefits. (Guest: A representative of the Council of Graduate Students, unnamed at the time this agenda was printed) (Enclosure)
- 4:05 4. Further discussion of Senate Finance Committee activity on the report of the Faculty Development Committee.
- 4:25 5. Preliminary discussion of the proposal for a Sexual Harrassment Survey. (Guest: Pat Mullen, Director, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action) (Enclosure)
- 5:00 6. Adjourn.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

1480 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

December 18, 1987

Professor Shirley Clark
Chair, Senate Finance Committee
Higher Education and Administration
275 Peik Hall

Dear Shirley:


Welcome back to the West. We didn't manage to slough off appreciably during your absence. On December 3 SCC enjoyed a discussion with Council of Graduate Students representatives about their set of recommendations submitted last spring for consideration in the academic planning process. The minutes contain a synopsis of our talks.

Among their recommendations, whose purpose is to attract and adequately support outstanding graduate students, is the following:

"Full health insurance benefits should be given to graduate students holding 50% appointments. Students with 25 to 50% appointments could buy coverage prorated to their appointment (similar to the tuition waver)."

This is so heavily a budget question that SCC steers it straight to the Finance Committee to explore its implications. At the same time, we're asking Geoff Maruyama to have SCFA keep in mind that if the University should decide to go it alone on a health insurance plan for employees, graduate students might well like to have the option of participating.

Sincerely,


W. Phillips Shively
Chair, Senate Consultative
Committee

WPS:mp

c: Lynne Grouse
President, COGS



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action
419 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 624-9547

November 4, 1987

Dr. Roger Benjamin
Provost and Vice President
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Roger,

Enclosed is a proposal for conducting a survey on sexual harassment in the student body and among faculty and staff. In addition to looking at the incidence of harassment, the survey will provide information about the effectiveness of enforcement and publicity efforts at the University of Minnesota.

Such a survey was recommended by the Faculty Senate, May 17, 1984. The original proposal has been modified to reduce the cost and increase the scope beyond a study of incidence alone. I think the proposal has benefitted from this extra effort and will produce useful information.

The Sexual Harassment Board was directed by President Keller to forward this request to you after I reviewed it. (See attached correspondence). I am sending it on to you with my full endorsement. When and if it is approved, it will be necessary to clarify where the administrative responsibilities will be located. Because the Sexual Harassment Board is not a Senate Committee there is usually some confusion about this, leading to delay.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Mullen
Director and University Equal
Opportunity Officer

PAM:vr

enc.

cc: Shirley Clark, Chair, Senate Finance Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

March 27, 1987

Professor Gary N. McLean
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
420 Vocational and Technical Education Building
St. Paul Campus

Dear Professor McLean:

I am sorry that I had not responded earlier to the request from the Sexual Harassment Board for funds to conduct a survey on the subject of sexual harassment. While I do have some concerns about the relative cost effectiveness of conducting a survey rather than investing in educational, preventative, and enforcement activities, there is a larger question of procedure in your Board's approaching me directly on the matter.

To give proper consideration to requests of the kind you are making, they must be handled in an orderly fashion. The administration has delegated responsibility in the area of sexual harassment to the Equal Employment Opportunities Officer, Ms. Patricia Mullen, who works with your committee. It would seem appropriate to take your request to her so that she can forward it with her recommendation. She, in turn, would properly bring the request with her recommendation to Provost Roger Benjamin, who is the chief operating officer of the Twin Cities campus and the key individual in setting the agenda of the Management Committee.

In matters of significant dollar requests, especially when the request is likely to be recurring, it is important for us to consider it not in an ad hoc way, but in the context of all requests for funding. We seek faculty and student advice on those decisions through the Senate Finance Committee. Therefore, it would also be appropriate for you to forward your request to that committee so that we can have its advice as we make choices for next year.

I can assure you that, despite my own misgivings, I will give careful consideration to the recommendations of others in the administration and in our faculty/student consultative groups.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth H. Keller

KHK:pln

c: Vice President Roger Benjamin
✓ Ms. Patricia Mullen

A Proposal for a Sexual Harassment Survey
at the University of Minnesota

Submitted by the Sexual Harassment Board, October 15, 1987

Sexual harassment in higher education drew national attention in 1977 when five women sued Yale University for having inadequate policies for handling sexual harassment complaints. In 1979 research conducted by the American Psychological Association revealed that 25 percent of its surveyed members who had graduated in the prior seven years had engaged in sexually intimate relations with a professor.

Since 1977 many studies and surveys have been conducted at institutions of higher learning, chief among them Michigan State, Rhode Island, Florida, Arizona State, U of California (Davis) (Berkeley), Harvard, and U of Pennsylvania.

Incidence of sexual harassment is difficult to determine in any general way due to varying definitions and research procedures. Using the University of Penn study (which is based on Harvard's study), we find "on average in a given year," 35% of undergraduate women experience some form of sexual harassment, 19% of graduate women, 11% of faculty women, and 11% of staff women. Overall at Harvard the numbers were 29% of women and 6% of men. These percentages were obtained using the broad definition of sexual harassment ranging from unwanted teasing or jokes to sexual assault. In other studies the percentages have ranged from 20% to 60%. No comparable figures have been determined for the University of Minnesota.

At the University of Pennsylvania, despite the 35% of undergraduate women reporting harassment on the survey, none of them lodged a formal complaint. The most common reasons for non reporting were "reprisals," "personal cost," and "lack of information." Complaints filed centrally at the University of Minnesota range between 20-30 a year--which is probably far under the actual occurrences.

The University of Minnesota was one of the first to establish strong policy and provide resources to deal with sexual harassment. In addition to the recent, widely-distributed brochure, several other attempts have been undertaken to diminish the incidence of sexual harassment at the University of Minnesota, including: individual letters to faculty members and supervisors from the University president, Daily articles, an annual report of the Sexual Harassment Board (SHB) to the Senate, reports of sanctions against respondents, establishing the Sexual Violence Program, departmental and college-wide workshops, letters to individual faculty members at their homes from department chairs, individual consultations, and so on. In spite of all these efforts, however, their effectiveness has not been evaluated. Further, the University community may have suggestions that have not yet been thought of by the SHB or the administration.

For all of these reasons, the Sexual Harassment Survey mandated by vote of the University Senate in 1984 and pursued in several ways since (see Appendix A for an historical narrative of how support for such a survey has been sought) should be conducted.

Survey Objectives

The SHB believes that each of the following objectives is an important reason for conducting the proposed survey.

1. To determine areas in which our policy or procedural statements may need to be modified.
2. To identify what further education and enforcement programs are needed.
3. To determine how effectively campus sexual harassment problems are currently being identified and resolved.
4. To assess the extent to which survey respondents are aware of the existence of policy, procedures and resources relating to sexual harassment.
5. To determine the perception of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the policy and its enforcement.
6. To determine how persons who are experiencing sexual harassment on campus are handling these experiences.
7. To discover how survey respondents define sexual harassment.
8. To raise consciousness on the part of survey respondents on the issue of sexual harassment; in essence the survey provides an educational process in itself.
9. To establish a data base (as each of the above objectives does) of the type and extent of sexual harassment and the channels for reaching remedies. By comparing future results with this data base, evaluative purposes will be served in determining the effectiveness of various undertakings to eliminate sexual harassment from the University of Minnesota campus.

It is our expectation that this survey will be administered periodically to determine our progress and to identify continuing deficiencies.

Process to be Used

The Sexual Harassment Board is recommending that Central Administration set aside a budget of \$25,000 to fund the necessary research on a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, with the assumption that the actual research will be carried out by a graduate student (perhaps as a doctoral dissertation under the direction of a graduate faculty advisor), a faculty member, or a university-affiliated organization. The advantage to a graduate student in pursuing the

RFP is that all research costs for the dissertation would be covered by the University. The advantage to a faculty member, especially a junior one, is the opportunity to obtain financing while furthering research interests and skill development. The advantage to the University using either approach is that high quality work would be done without costs associated with paying for a project director or assistant.

The SHB will establish a subcommittee charged with reviewing the RFP responses. We would hope to be able to advertise the RFP early in January, with a deadline of February 15, with the award to be made by the end of February. We would advertise the amount of money available (\$25,000), the deadline, the objectives, and the requirement that the procedures proposed be replicable. To accomplish this, we would hope to have Central Administration's approval by December 1. We are prepared to move more quickly if the approval process permits.

To assist Central Administration, we have developed what a subcommittee of the Sexual Harassment Board considers to be an appropriate proposal as a sample of what such a study might look like and to indicate how the \$25,000 funds might be utilized. The Board would be willing to make this request available to any interested respondents, and such willingness to share this proposal would be included in the announcement of the RFP.

Possible Methods

This section will describe possible questionnaire development, sampling procedures, data gathering, data analysis, and report distribution.

Questionnaire Development. The project director will develop a draft of an instrument, using surveys used in other studies, a review of the literature, and interviews with knowledgeable persons on campus. That draft will be reviewed extensively by the SHB and will then be reviewed further by the EEO office at the University of Minnesota, appropriate offices on the coordinate campuses, and other appropriate university agencies. Revisions will then be made, and the survey will be administered to a small group (about 30 each) representing each subgroup--undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and academic staff, and civil service personnel. This pilot group will not be included in the final sample. Revisions will again be made, resulting in the final draft.

Sexual Harassment Board Survey Proposal

Page 4

Sampling Procedures. The focus of the survey will be on the four groups identified above. Actual employment and enrollment as of February 1, 1985, was:

	<u>Twin Cities</u>	<u>Duluth</u>	<u>Crookston</u>	<u>Morris</u>	<u>Waseca</u>	<u>Total</u>
Faculty & academic staff	4,592	458	81	133	70	5,334
Undergraduate students	30,857	6,539	999	1,592	1,280	41,267
Graduate/Professional students	11,787	321	0	0	0	12,108
Civil service personnel	<u>9,920</u>	<u>637</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>10,967</u>
Total	57,156	7,955	1,190	1,915	1,460	69,676

To achieve a 95% confidence level that the results are within $\pm 5\%$, a sample size as follows will be needed:

	<u>Twin Cities</u>	<u>Duluth</u>	<u>Crookston</u>	<u>Morris</u>	<u>Waseca</u>	<u>Total</u>
Faculty and staff	320	217	81*	133*	70*	821
Undergraduate students	383	350	278	330	320	1,661
Graduate students	375	175	0	0	0	550
Civil service	<u>370</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>110*</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>110*</u>	<u>962</u>
Total	1,448	982	469	595	500	3,994

A 60% response rate will require a sample of:

	2,413	1,637	654	903	713	6,320
--	-------	-------	-----	-----	-----	-------

*Entire population used

A total mail sample of 6,320 will be required. While it would be possible to survey only the Twin Cities campus (2,413), the SHB recommends that all campuses be included in the survey. A proportionate random sample based on gender will be selected, except that additional females may be required within the faculty and academic category.

Data Gathering. The survey would be mailed out in three waves. First, all selected respondents would receive a copy of the survey, with a cover letter and stamped envelope for returning the survey. Procedures for assuring confidentiality of respondents would be built into the process. Second, one week later, each person would receive a reminder postcard. Third, two weeks after this, all persons who had not yet returned their completed survey would

receive a final mailing containing another cover letter and a second copy of the survey with a return envelope. Using these procedures, it is possible for a mailed survey to achieve a 70% or better response rate.

Data Analysis. The project director will be responsible for overseeing data analysis. Frequencies and percents will be determined for each of the four groups, University wide, by campus and by gender.

Report Distribution. A draft of the final report will be written by the project director, to be reviewed by the SHB and EEO, with recommendations for revision transmitted back to the project director. Copies of the final draft of the report will be distributed to members of the SHB, and to EEO, the President's office, the Student President's office, the Faculty Senate, the Minnesota Daily, and the Women's Task Force of MPIRG. Additional copies will be distributed on request.

Estimated Budget. Two budget estimates follow--one is under the condition of sampling from each campus, the other based on the Twin Cities only.

Option 1. All Campuses (Sample of 6,320)

<u>Budget Item Description</u>	<u>Est. Costs</u>
Printing (letters, questionnaires, postcards, report)	\$ 6,000
Sampling and labels	500
Addressing and mailing labor	1,300
Envelopes	500
Postage for students only (including postcards)	3,000
Data entry	6,000
Statistical analysis assistance	1,000
Computer supplies	600
Clerical assistance (letters, questionnaires, postcards, reports, etc.) (25% for 9 months)	3,000
Graduate student stipend	<u>3,100</u>
TOTAL	\$25,000

Option 2. Twin Cities Campus (Sample of 2,413)

<u>Budget Item Description</u>	<u>Est. Costs</u>
Printing (letters, questionnaires, postcards, reports)	\$ 3,500
Sampling and labels	400
Addressing and mailing labor	800
Envelopes	300
Postage for students only (including postcards)	1,200
Data entry	2,500
Statistical analysis assistance	1,000
Computer supplies	600
Clerical assistance (letters, questionnaires, postcards reports, etc.) (25% for 9 months)	3,000
Graduate student stipend	<u>2,700</u>
TOTAL	\$16,000

ASSUMPTIONS for Both Sampling Options:

- Postcard reminder sent to entire sample
- Second mailing sent to 60% of initial sample
- 70% response rate for coding data entry estimates
- Computer time to be donated by the University

provide professionally trained counselors for consultation by victims before a complaint is filed and during and after any official proceedings. Efforts are at present being made by the Women's Center and EO&AA to obtain help from Boynton Health Service and Student Counseling. The subcommittee foresees a need for additional personnel in the counseling offices, and all personnel engaged in this work will need additional training.

The intimate nature of sexual harassment complaints requires also a variety of possible counselors, so that victims can feel sufficiently at ease to explain the circumstances fully. This problem is particularly acute on the outstate campuses, where very few women, for example, hold high administrative positions, and where counseling personnel are also few.

5) PUBLICATION

The subcommittee also found unanimous agreement that the University sexual harassment policy and procedures must be more widely published. Here we quote one of our consultants:

It is important that every member of the University community be informed about (1) what behavior constitutes sexual harassment, (2) the University's policy in regard to sexual harassment, and (3) the process by which such behavior is dealt with and corrective action taken.

Making such information available to faculty, staff, and students should serve the dual purpose of (1) letting recipients of such behavior know of their rights and procedural options and (2) preventing such behavior on the part of those who are informed that it will not be tolerated.

While information may be provided through recordings and films, and while EO&AA has conducted workshops on sexual harassment with every academic unit, the most immediate way is through printed material. Both the University of Iowa and Michigan State have already developed and distributed useful materials. The subcommittee recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs arrange as soon as possible for the following:

1. policy statement to be posted on all departmental bulletin boards, those for faculty as well as those for students;
2. a pamphlet, written in simple, clear language, advising students and employees of their rights and describing the complaint procedures. These should also describe a wide range of possible sanctions (e.g., denial of merit pay, postponement of tenure, reassignment of teaching responsibilities, suspension, or termination). The pamphlet should be distributed at the time and place of student registration. It should also be included in the orientation materials for all new University students and in the information given new University civil service employees. The same material should also be printed in students handbooks and should be given to new faculty, academic administrators, and academic professional staff as well;
3. anonymous descriptions of cases involving typical sexually harassing behavior, with appropriate sanctions and legal implications, distributed to students, faculty, and staff;
4. development and promulgation of a code of ethics for faculty, administrators, and supervisors;
5. publication of the sexual harassment policy and procedures in the *Daily* every quarter.

In addition, the subcommittee recommends that the topic of sexual harassment be included in relevant courses, such as those in human sexuality and those in civil rights. We believe that the EO&AA Office and the Academic Vice President's Office should publish at least once a year the number of sexual harassment complaints filed, the number or percentage of these offenses judged to have been seriously harmful, and the range of sanctions applied.

6) SURVEY

In recent studies, 31-90% of the respondents report having received some form of unwanted sexual attention. Estimates of "serious" incidents (unwanted touching, subtle pressure or overt demands for sexual favors, or physical assault) range from 2-12%. Several studies conducted in university settings estimate that 33-41% of the female students have encountered some form of harassment from someone in authority. In a recent study at Harvard University, 32% of tenured female professors and 49% of

untended female professors report having encountered some form of sexual harassment. Few of these studies have used stratified random samples or a rigorous research design. Therefore, it is difficult to project the true level of incidence at the University of Minnesota for particular categories of students, faculty, and civil service employees. (See Appendix D)

Our subcommittee recommends that the University sponsor a study of sexual harassment. Through such a study the University would be able to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment and the level of awareness, within the University community, of our existing policy and procedures. We would also learn how the respondents typically deal with this problem and what their needs are. Such a survey would have at least an immediate benefit in raising the level of awareness about this problem. Moreover, this study would demonstrate our continued commitment to eliminating all forms of sexual harassment at the University of Minnesota.

7) BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS

Few can be unaware that the past several years have been difficult ones, financially, for the University. We also know that it is easy for specialized groups to urge the spending of money in order, supposedly, to save it. Yet the subcommittee must observe that sexual discrimination has recently been one cause of oppressive costs to this institution. Sexual harassment, which is treated under the law as discrimination, can also prove expensive, in court costs and damages as well as in the waste of professional knowledge and potential. Consequently, we believe that the amount needed for counseling and educating the University community in this matter will be wisely invested.

Besides eventually saving money, prompt and proper attention to the problem of sexual harassment will confirm our professional commitment and improve the health of the entire scholarly enterprise here at Minnesota. In this regard we find appropriate the statement of John Imholte (Provost, University of Minnesota, Morris), "Civilized relationships among sensitive and intelligent human beings preclude all forms of harassment, including sexual." This University is fortunate in having in large measure prevented other forms. Nor is it wholly responsible for the lapse from professional integrity which the sexual harassment policy and procedures are intended to remedy. It is, however, obliged to help in correcting any abuse of professional authority and trust, and at this time sexual harassment requires its attention.

8) REVIEW

The original sexual harassment policy required continuous review of the procedures. Unfortunately, this was not done. The subcommittee members were forced to educate themselves in the complexities of this problem, as well as in its prevalence and seriousness, in a very short time. An unusual degree of interest and cooperation from members of the University community made it possible for the subcommittee to do an adequate job. We do not want future reviews to depend on this exceptional goodwill, nor should they require such concentrated effort from the review committee. We recommend, therefore, that the Sexual Harassment Board conduct a continuous review, as stipulated in the reformulated procedures.

V. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

The subcommittee recommends that the Faculty Affairs Committee forward to the Senate the motion: "That the Senate endorse the Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and the Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harassment against Academic Staff," as reformulated in 1984.

It also recommends the following:

1. wider and more frequent publication of the policy and procedures within the University community;
2. designation and training of counselors for victims and perpetrators;
3. a survey of University students, staff, and faculty to determine the extent and severity of sexual harassment and the distribution of offenders among the dominant parties in power relationships.

The University must publicize its policy and procedures more widely than it has thus far, or risk having its measures declared inadequate should cases of sexual harassment go



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

1480 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

January 19, 1988

Dr. Roger Benjamin
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Roger:

Last week you indicated to me that you were interested in receiving feedback from the Senate Finance Committee on the proposal for a sexual harassment survey at the University of Minnesota. As you know, the management committee recently approved an allocation to underwrite the costs of such a survey. Therefore, it would not make sense for our committee to offer advice about whether or not to fund the study and at what level, or in what priority to consider this request among other requests. What we can offer are some observations made during a lively discussion of the matter at the Senate Finance Committee meeting on January 14. Pat Mullen was present and helpfully offered information about the genesis and purposes of the survey.

Several of the Senate Finance Committee members are experienced survey researchers. They indicated that the costs of well-done survey research are not low. In fact, to adequately sample faculty, students, and staff on all campuses of the University, the costs may be higher than those projected. As the responsible parties for this survey make decisions about design, conduct, and analyses, consideration should be given to the possibility of entering into a contract with the University's own Minnesota Center for Survey Research in CURA. In the event that similar sexual harassment surveys are done in the future to assess progress made, there would be definite advantages in having the survey carried out by MCSR.

Alternatively, it was suggested that if a request for proposals process is used by the Sexual Harassment Board, the research proposal review committee of the Graduate School (Grant in Aid of Faculty Research program) might be asked to select the best proposal. A member asked, if this is bona fide faculty/graduate student research whether or not some contribution to the project should come from the Graduate School research fund.


Provost Roger Benjamin
January 19, 1988
Page Three

Other members commented on the uneasy mix of scholarly research and practical policy research combined in this proposal. Shouldn't the purpose of this survey be weighted toward practical results, e.g., whether or not current efforts to publicize the University's sexual harassment policies and to implement intervention strategies are working. Committee members also doubted that some of the sensitive matters (e.g., "to determine how persons who are experiencing sexual harassment are handling these experiences") could be approached adequately via a survey. The interview might be a more appropriate methodology for meeting some of the "survey objectives."

Finally, questions were raised about how far the estimated allocation of \$25,000 for the survey could go if used instead for campus education about the problem and for intervention. It may make sense to carry out an expensive survey, but we are consulting on this matter in a vacuum relative to related institutional research funded from within the University and other needs.

We hope that these comments, questions, and suggestions will be helpful to you in this important matter of dealing effectively with sexual harassment at the University.

Sincerely,


Shirley M. Clark, Chair
Senate Finance Committee

cc: Patricia Mullen
W. Phillips Shively