

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
January 14, 1988**

Present: W. Phillips Shively (chair), Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Lynnette Mullins, Ronald Phillips, James VanAlstine

Guests: Provost Roger Benjamin, Gayle Grika (Footnote), President Kenneth Keller, Geoffrey Maruyama, Patrice Morrow

**1. Open Time**

The four members of the committee present during the "Open Time" discussed at some length the situation of women faculty on the campus.

**2. Report of the Chair**

Professor Shively reported that Professor Frickey, Chair of the Tenure Committee, has asked to establish a Task Force to address issues raised by the elimination of the mandatory retirement age for faculty (which takes effect in 1994). Professor Shively said that FCC, SCFA, and the Tenure Committee would cooperate in setting up the Task Force and that there may be a proposal in front of FCC at its next meeting.

Professor Shively also reported that FCC was scheduled to have dinner with the Regents at Eastcliff on Thursday, February 11. Following discussion of the meeting held by the three women members of the Board of Regents (see below), it was agreed that FCC should suggest that the spring meeting between FCC and the Regents be substantive rather than social.

Professor Berscheid reported that she had attended the meeting hosted by the three women members of the Board of Regents and said all three of the women did a marvelous job during the meeting. She suggested that the next FCC event with the Regents might be devoted, at least in part, to a discussion of the issues raised at that meeting.

Professor Berscheid moved, and Professor Shively seconded, a motion that FCC thank Regents Craig, Moore, and Schertler for holding their meeting with women on the campus. The motion passed unanimously.

Committee members next discussed the probability that the faculty would achieve some sort of formalized representation to the Board of Regents. They agreed that any suggestions would be welcome, in addition to the proposal that one faculty member sit with each committee of the Regents, and also agreed that the matter would be presented soon in an issue of Footnote.

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Shively reported that Professor Maruyama had been nominated to be President of the UMFA; the election will be conducted at the annual meeting of UMFA, which will be held on January 29 in the Campus Club. Vice President Heydinger will be at the meeting to discuss the legislative request.

### **3. Topics for Footnote**

Gayle Grika reported that the first issue of Footnote would appear next week. Each issue will contain one main article plus other smaller ones. Professor Berscheid suggested a column by David Swanson on Employee Benefits.

### **4. Implementation of the Faculty Assembly resolution on Affirmative Action**

Professor Shively welcomed Professor Patrice Morrow, one of a group of women in the sciences that has been addressing issues of the working environment for women. Professor Morrow had been asked to develop proposals for incentives and disincentives for administrators to create better working conditions for women.

Professor Morrow began by noting that there were not a lot of ideas on working climate. The general attitude seems to be that women are hired, they are here, now they sink or swim and if they are unhappy they can file a grievance. The central concern, for these purposes, is that women be permitted to work in an atmosphere which permits them to live up to their potential. She proposed incentives and disincentives as follows:

Disincentive 1: Permit women faculty members to pick up their line item and go to another department or college (related to the field in which she works), one which is supportive and which fosters productivity. Supportive colleagues in a slightly different discipline are better than a hostile department. The abandoned college or department would lose the line item for the duration of the appointment but the research interests and teaching would not be lost to the University; they would accrue to the credit of the new department. The administration should facilitate the move by providing funds for remodeling space and working equipment where necessary.

Disincentive 2: An individual who is responsible for creating a hostile environment would be charged by the department head or dean with unprofessional conduct and might be docked merit pay, denied access to joint facilities, etc. There would be appeal rights (e.g., to the Judicial Committee); other details would need to be worked out. It would be essential, however, that the administration, not the victim, bring the case; burdening the victim with bringing the charge only serves to further victimize her. Comments were these: Subtle harassment would be the most difficult to contend with, the harassment could continue when the perpetrators are powerful or the department chair is weak, the harassment could be part of the culture of the department and the chair could be part of the problem.

Incentive 1: The University once highlighted outstanding departments in research, and they received University-wide recognition and additional merit salary funds. Why not do the same with affirmative action--call for each college to nominate a department with a good record on affirmative action and reward those departments which are selected. It should be college-based, in order to recognize the smaller talent pools available in some fields. Rewards might include such things as seminar funds, TA funds, fellowships, visiting professorships, post docs--they could vary by college.

Incentive 2: The University create a fund to bring in outside speakers; departments could petition to bring in women speakers.

Incentive 3: Where there is a small pool of women in the discipline, alter recruiting such that positions are advertised for several years, until an appropriate woman faculty member is found.

Incentive 4: Create a fund to recruit outstanding women (and minorities) when they become available. Harvard, Stanford, and other universities have "targeted opportunity" funds that allow them to snap up such individuals whenever they become available. Provost Benjamin pointed out that there is such a fund for minorities but not for women; he also noted that Academic Affairs has a working rule to accommodate spouse combinations (that is, regular appointments for both husband and wife).

Committee members agreed that this was a good set of ideas and that there should be a many-pronged approach. It would be important that the efforts be positive as well as negative; using only negative tactics sours the whole effort unnecessarily and usually further victimizes women. It was suggested, too, that Minnesota suffers to a certain extent from excessive legalism, that the EEOWC is tied up in legal issues, that these proposals represent social and cultural approaches, and that it is hard to deal legally with issues of quality.

In response to an earlier comment, Provost Benjamin recalled that there was a Provost's Advisory Committee on Women's Affairs when he was at Pittsburgh. Professor Shively said he strongly supported the creation of such a body at Minnesota and commented that it could be different from EEOWC, whose charge was largely defined by the Rajender consent decree. An advisory body could have an open mandate to advise the President. Professor Morrow said there is a need to get away from lawsuits; Professor Clark agreed, and observed that while EEOWC could continue the monitoring function, a separate group could play an advocacy role. Professor Shively suggested that the Provost could have conversations across the campus and the University could move from the legal to a richer but more difficult phase.

Professor Berscheid said there is also a more immediate need, and that is someone or some group to whom women can talk about their problems. She told the Committee that she receives calls from women asking for a referral and doesn't know what to tell them. The need is for counseling, perhaps a therapist, to help them look at (usually non-legal) issues. It would help if the administration could identify such counselors. The creation of an ombudsman specifically for women and minorities in Academic Affairs would help. Professor Morrow concurred, and suggested also that the development of support groups could help to prevent crises by fostering discussions prior to potential difficulties. (Being the single woman in a department makes her a freak; it is presumed that she speaks for all women; bringing women together, perhaps under the auspices of the deans, would help them considerably.)

Professor Shively thanked Professor Morrow for her appearance and said that FCC would continue to address the proposals and issues she had raised.

## **5. Changes in Sabbatical Programs**

Professor Maruyama reported that SCFA had prepared several recommendations for changes in

sabbatical programs and asked if FCC wished to endorse them. Committee members discussed the proposals, with special attention paid to the costs that individual departments would be expected to absorb. SCFA will be meeting with Assistant Vice President Kvavik at its next meeting to clarify procedures and issues.

FCC voted unanimously to endorse the proposals from SCFA.

## **6. Discussion with President Keller**

Professor Shively told the President that there were two issues that FCC wished to discuss with him:

1. How and when would they be consulted on the planning document that he was preparing?
2. What about the apparent disparity in salary increases granted to the bargaining units?

On the first issue, the President reiterated Provost Benjamin's concern that the provisions of the document not appear in the media before they are presented to the Regents. He agreed that some arrangements would have to be made in order that consultation could take place at an appropriate time.

On the second issue, the President said that salary increases at Duluth and Waseca were smaller than for the rest of the University in the first year and larger in the second; in terms of salary money delivered, however, the two campuses received exactly the same as the others. Any salary increases beyond the allocations would have to be achieved through contraction on the campuses. Duluth, he noted, did receive some money for funding rank adjustments, based on peer comparison studies.

The Committee adjourned at 12:10.

-- Gary Engstrand