

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
March 3, 1988**

Present: W. Phillips Shively (chair), Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Lynnette Mullins, M. Kathleen Price, James VanAlstine

Guests: Roger Benjamin, Mary Bilek, Gayle Grika (Footnote), Kenneth Keller, V. Rama Murthy, Maureen Smith (Brief)

Committee members spent about an hour discussing the interrelationship between the legislative request, the cost overruns and expenditures, and various related issues. There was agreement that irrespective of what else may occur, the discussion and advancement of planning must continue.

1. Revision of P.U.F. Chair Selection Procedures

Provost Benjamin joined the meeting for a discussion of the revision of P.U.F. Chair selection procedures; Professor Brenner distributed a draft set of procedures that had been developed in consultation with Academic Affairs and several faculty appointed by Professor Shively. Provost Benjamin expressed satisfaction with the proposal, except that in unusual cases he wished to be able to have a majority of the faculty on the search committee be from outside the department. The faculty in the department where tenure would be held would still have to vote to grant tenure, but the Provost wanted to be sure that a group "not at the national level" not be permitted to determine the pool of individuals to be considered. The Committee members concurred with the change.

There was general agreement on several other points:

- That no prior approval was required for a search committee to consider candidates in seriatim fashion rather than as a group.
- That the Dean and department would negotiate with the candidate about the purpose for which discretionary funds would be used.
- That the Deans should have a bigger role in the search process (e.g., in the appointment of the search committee), as is now the case in some collegiate units.
- That "significant" discretionary funds was to be interpreted as "significant" in the culture of the department.

The Provost told the Committee he would take the revised procedures to the Deans and then distribute them.

* 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.

2. Budget, Salary, and Fringe Benefits

Associate Provost Murthy and Mary Bilek provided to Committee members data concerning salary and fringe benefit increases for 1988-89. The major problem, Provost Benjamin reported, is that much of the money available for salary increases will be eaten up by a significant cost increase for fringe benefits (health care coverage). Of the total of \$16.6 million available for salaries (all employees), fringe benefits, and SEE budgets, over \$7.5 million must go for fringe benefit increases. That leaves only roughly \$9 million for everything and everybody else.

The Provost said there were basically three options: One, live with the amounts available (which would be terrible for morale); Two, retrench other parts of the budget to increase salary funds; or Three, at least think about sharing the cost of the fringe benefit cost increase with users and ask Vice President Vanselow to try to develop a more attractive package.

Professor Shively expressed the sentiments of the Committee when he noted that the numbers were "just ducky; this rounds out the week." Committee members noted that salary increases of less than 4% would be substantially less than the goal set by the Regents to restore faculty salaries, and that while fringe benefit cost increases could be explained, the problems would be with expectations as well as the continued ravishing of the SEE budgets.

Provost Benjamin agreed that these were very preliminary numbers and that a meeting with SCFA would be appropriate when a set of proposals has been developed. Professor Shively promised that when there were proposals to consider, SCFA and FCC would act promptly.

3. Relationship with the Regents

Committee members agreed that although the discussion of faculty representation on Regents' committees has been recessed, Professor Shively should nonetheless continue conversation with Regent Lebedoff about the nature of any permanent arrangement which might be established.

4. Membership of the Student Senate Chair on SCC

It was agreed to delay discussion until a proposal was presented by the students.

5. Discussion with President Keller

President Keller reviewed with the Committee the current state of affairs. It was suggested that there be an open meeting, perhaps of the Faculty Senate, at which the faculty could have a conversation with the President. The President agreed, said it was a very good idea, and that such a meeting should be scheduled after the two audit reports are complete.

The Committee adjourned at 12:15.

-- Gary Engstrand