



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee

220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue

St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE AND
FCC CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT
March 18, 1982

FCC Chairman Douglas Pratt convened the FCC at 11:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 18, in 300 Morrill Hall. Other members present were Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton, John Howe, Marvin Mattson, Donald Spring and Patricia Swan.

Guests: Jack Merwin, Carol Pazandak, Maureen Smith.

1. Joint-mode Faculty/Administrative task force on "Barriers to Faculty Productivity."

Jack Merwin, chairman of the task force, summarized the group's progress since its inception late last spring. The task force has examined the recent work of Ruth Eckert and of Shirley Clark and Mary Corcoran (ongoing) and has heard from informed guests. The task force has concluded that it is important for the faculty to be aware of the University's concerns about faculty vitality and about identifying hindrances. Conducting a survey faculty-wide will both bring the widest possible response and advertise the existence and purpose of the task force.

John Turner has drafted a questionnaire for a survey this spring. The questions will identify some background information on each respondent, and will include both items taken from past longitudinal studies and open-ended questions seeking suggestions.

Suggestions for the survey from the FCC:

- Encourage faculty to think about cost-free solutions;
- Get advice on the instrument by someone experienced in market research, to arrive at a design which will yield highly usable data;
- Conduct the survey not immediately, but when the spring term is underway, warm weather has returned, and the latest financial crisis is, we hope, resolved.

The FCC has ascertained from Marilee Ward that Senate funds from unspent budgeted items are available for the survey costs. Pratt told Merwin that the SCC is prepared to authorize the Senate paying half the survey costs.

2. Faculty Legislative Liaison: Request for Funding in the Summer.

Eaton reported Peter Robinson has asked the SCC's Legislative Relations Subcommittee for summer funding, as he believes he could hold useful discussions

with the legislators during the time out of session. The subcommittee recommends this support to the FCC. They suggest Pratt and the President work out the details of fraction of time and portion of the summer for compensation. Purple's perception is that the faculty liaison and the University of Minnesota's Faculty Association efforts mesh effectively. Howe said that the FCC has a responsibility to learn just what the expenditure means. The FCC will ask for a report from Robinson this spring.

Swan moved the FCC request that President Magrath authorize continuing support of the legislative liaison in the summer. Motion carried without dissent.

3. FCC's Nominating Responsibilities to Senate and Assembly Committees.

Materials were handed out and circulated regarding composition and appointment needs for All-University Honors, Business and Rules, Planning, and Intercollegiate Athletics. (There are no at-large vacancies on Finance for 1982-83.) Swan asked that the FCC be informed which members presently serving are eligible for reappointment. (Eaton noted that Wayland Noland had been the FCC's choice a year ago for Honors, and that he had indicated a strong desire to serve there but was pressed to serve an additional year on the Library Committee as its chair.)

Spring reported that Virginia Gray's comments at the Facilitative Committee on keeping committee memberships at full complement had been misconstrued. With the exception of the Judicial Committee, the committees have been filled more easily and there have been fewer mid-term resignations than in the past.

Board for sexual harrassment cases. It was moved to concur in the recommendation from the offices of the President and of Academic Affairs to appoint Jean Ward to replace outgoing Nancy Anderson. Motion carried without dissent.

4. Nominations to the President's Student Leader Recognition Dinner.

The FCC voted to nominate Kit Wiseman, Dave Lenander and Rick Linden from the SCC's student membership.

This portion of the meeting concluded at 11:40 a.m.

CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

Attending: FCC members Robert Brasted, Marcia Eaton, John Howe, Marv Mattson, Rick Purple, Paul Quie, Donald Spring, Patricia Swan; President Magrath, Vice Presidents Keller and Kegler; Guests Arthur Williams, Carol Pazandak, Maureen Smith.

1. Faculty Legislative Liaison.

Pratt reported to the President that the FCC favors funding Peter Robinson through at least part of the summer.

Discussion. The President observed there will be a considerable turnover in membership at the legislature for the next session. He asked what activities

are anticipated for the liaison in the summer. Eaton reported Robinson finds great time constraints during the session; legislators haven't time to listen to full answers to their questions. Summer provides time for one-to-one meetings.

Purple spoke for maintaining a presence and momentum; Robinson is becoming known around the legislature. He has been monitoring the sessions and making acquaintances. UMFA considered his presence invaluable. Purple called the Robinson-UMFA relationships simbiotic. Robinson through UMFA generated crucial appearances by suitable faculty members during joint conferences on budget plans. Vice President affirmed the emotional impact of two faculty members showing up at midnight in a blizzard for a key hearing. Purple added that Robinson is in a position to identify needs of individual legislators and can sometimes assist them in locating that help.

The costs to the University are for some release time, the loan of a car, and a small supplies and expense fund.

Kegler and Keller indicated it will be highly important to release the liaison part-time in the fall when proposals for the next regular session are being assembled.

President Magrath said the University would support the liaison during the summer. He called it "an investment."

2. University's Prospects in Face of Latest State Revenue Shortfall Forecast.

Vice President Kegler explained the beauty for the University of the bill presently under consideration. It provides for \$50 million in tax increases, \$60 million in spending cuts, and approximately \$100 million in obligations to be rolled forward to next year. Under the plan the University would lose between \$600,000 and \$700,000 instead of \$14.6 million which would be its share if every state budget were charged an even 7%. If the legislature fails to agree on a bill, the governor is permitted to make cuts to balance the budget, but not to juggle items, so across-the-board pro-rating would surely occur.

Spring asked how the proposed bill, if passed, would affect the bargaining units in educational institutions. Keller said they would have to find the contracted salary money in their own salary lines, by holding every vacated line.

3. Forum on Faculty Salaries.

Pratt explained that a proposal for the forum had originated recently in the Faculty Affairs Committee and has been approved by the FCC. The faculty will need the help of the Budget Executive to understand the facts and issues.

President Magrath said that a 5% average salary increase appears to be available for 1982-83 out of the state appropriation for salary increases. Following upon the 10% increase of 1981-82, that 5% would hold Minnesota faculty highly competitive within the Big Ten; all faculty salaries have been eroded, however. Salaries for Associate Professor and Professor ranks are improving their position within the Big Ten. Most other universities will make awards in the range of 3% to 7% for the next year; no others gave as much as 10% in the past year. Wisconsin's cap, recommended by the governor, sets a 4% limit on increases to salaries over \$30,000.

Since central administration has to present a budget document for information to the Regents in advance of their April 15 meeting, any recommendations coming out of a forum held the previous week could not affect that presentation. If contrary arguments arise at the forum, the President might be persuaded to reconsider his recommendation and to review it with appropriate committees.

Arthur Williams, Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee, explained that SCFA has been struggling to formulate a recommendation to central administration on salaries. The members have been unable to agree among themselves, and wish for a broader representation of faculty to advise the President on the matter. SCFA's immediate interest is in learning what trade-offs would be required for an increase in 1982-83 markedly greater than 5%. For the long term they hope for a University goal not simply to match the increases of the state university system, but to return the faculty to the same competitive salary position as in the early 1970's. Before recommending any retrenchment to improve salaries, they want to know how much money would be needed, how many jobs would be lost, and who would be affected. There are still people asking for a 10% increase.

Williams noted that while last summer there was not time for consultation before the 2.16% retrenchment was assessed across-the-board to permit a 10% salary increase, this spring there is time for consultation.

Vice President Keller said he believes the faculty are not yet aware of the effect of the 1982-83 budget cuts. To raise faculty salaries an extra 2% would require doubling the '82-'83 retrenchment.

President Magrath said central administration is seeking guidance from the faculty regarding the trade-offs which will precede formalizing the 1983-85 legislative biennial request to the Regents.

Purple urged that SCFA develop a long-range policy on faculty salaries and submit it this spring to the Senate for a vote, as well as to the President and the Regents.

Eaton said the faculty should be made aware of alternatives or trade-offs in the long-range plans as well as for the coming year as they approve a policy. Comparisons are needed with other faculty and professional groups and with how all fare now relative to their positions of about a decade ago. Williams said SCFA will study those data soon. Faculty are also interested in knowing how much further percentage increase would be necessary to bring the value of faculty salaries to what it was around 1972.

Spring said that because of the weight of external variables, faculty will expect to be told the means for achieving a long-range goal. Their satisfaction with a salary increase for '82-'83 will depend upon their faith in a long-range plan.

4. Change of Date for Senate and Forum.

President Magrath and Vice President Keller recommended against holding the Senate meeting and Forum on April 8 since that is the first full day of Passover. Brasted moved the FCC recommend that the Senate Consultative Committee change the date of the Senate and the Forum to Tuesday, April 6. The motion carried without dissent.

Vice President Keller agreed to publish data in the Daily in advance of the Forum. He said data similar to those provided for consideration of the tuition surcharge question can be the basis for salary increase discussions.

5. Appreciation to Staffs for Work on Retroactive Pay Increases.

At Pat Swan's suggestion the FCC agreed to send letters of thanks to Vice President Hasselmo and Assistant Vice President Thomas for the outstanding efforts of their staffs in executing the retroactive salary increase payments. There needs to be a way found to thank also the many employees in the various units who also labored over this unusual task.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

March 12, 1982

C. Peter Magrath, President
University of Minnesota
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

At our next meeting with you, on March 18 at 11:30, the Faculty Consultative Committee wishes to discuss two issues:

1. Continued funding for the faculty legislative liaison including, perhaps, through the summer months. Could we expand our discussion to consider the overall coordination of University efforts to inform and persuade the legislature?

2. Designing a forum on faculty salaries. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has proposed a forum for a broad exchange of viewpoints on this matter. The Senate or Faculty Consultative Committee will, I expect, decide on March 18 to co-sponsor such a forum with SCFA. The likely occasion is April 8, immediately following the Senate meeting. We would like to discuss with you and with Vice President Keller which facts and figures will be most useful for all participants to have in advance to promote an informed discussion.

We are pleased to read the official announcements of Steve Dunham's appointment as general counsel and we will welcome further discussion with you on what this appointment will mean for the University.

Cordially,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair,
Faculty Consultative Committee

DCP:mbp
cc: FCC members
Ken Keller



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All-University Senate Consultative Committee
220 Biological Sciences Center
1445 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

March 15, 1982

Kenneth Keller, Vice President,
Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

At our meeting on March 18 the Faculty Consultative Committee will be discussing the desirability of holding a Senate forum on faculty salary issues on April 8. In our discussions last week at the meeting of the Senate Finance Committee you suggested the approach of preparing materials describing alternative options for distribution at or before the meeting, to facilitate discussions. This sounds like an excellent idea to me.

I hope that you will be able to attend our meeting with President Magrath on March 18 from 11:30 to 12:30. We would value your suggestions as to just what types of materials might be most helpful.

Cordially,

Douglas C. Pratt, Chair,
Faculty Consultative Committee

DCP:mbp

APR 21 1982

date April 20 19 82

to Douglas C. Pratt

from Jack Merwin

Re: Committee for Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty
Faculty Survey Questionnaire

For your information, attached is a copy of the questionnaire, which is being mailed out today.

We will be dividing up costs when we know what they are.

We appreciate your help.


Jack Merwin/by Faye Powe



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

April 13, 1982

Dear Colleague:

Most of us have accepted projections that the size of the University faculty will remain relatively stable in the foreseeable future, with fewer new faculty members coming to the University. This prompts some concern about how to maintain intellectual vigor and excitement among the faculty during this period. In response to this concern, we have been asked jointly by the Senate Consultative Committee and President Magrath to suggest policies that will help to preserve and to stimulate vitality. We need your help.

Available evidence suggests that the University of Minnesota, like other institutions of higher education, has entered a new era--one that is characterized by diminished resources. In preparing for this change, it will be helpful if we can anticipate potential problems and take steps, as much as possible, to meet them in advance. What can we do, for example, to offset the possibility that faculty members may find it more difficult to attend professional meetings, to secure funding for sabbaticals and research, to develop new courses, and to have new colleagues with whom to exchange ideas? In other words, we need to devise innovative ways to facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty.

Because the Committee is studying this potential problem with a view toward suggesting to the Senate and administration some imaginative policies designed to meet the challenge, we want to tap the views of the faculty as a rich source of ideas. We seek your input at this time through completion of the enclosed questionnaire.

The key question to be answered is Question 9: At the present stage of your career, what can the University do, in specific ways, to facilitate your scholarly activities (teaching and research) and help you to enrich your professional life during the next five or ten years? We suggest that you first answer Questions 1 through 8 and then work on Question 9. Although it will take time to give us your thoughtful consideration, we have kept the questionnaire brief, and we sincerely hope that you will take the time needed to complete it and return it to us.

We hope you share our belief that it is very important for each of us to have opportunities to maximize our professional contributions in the years ahead, and we invite you to join us in helping to secure the enactment of policies designed to reach this objective.

The Committee for Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty

Jack C. Merwin, Chair

Carl R. Adams	Anne D. Pick
Elizabeth S. Blake	Richard E. Poppele
Mario F. Bognanno	Donald C. Rasmusson
Richard S. Caldecott	Betty W. Robinett
Edward L. Cussler, Jr.	John E. Turner
Ann M. Pflaum	John R. Wallace

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What percentage of your total professional activities do you estimate that you ordinarily devote to each of the following:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
-1- Teaching (including preparation, grading, thesis advising, oral examinations)	_____ %
-2- Research and scholarly writing	_____ %
-3- Counseling (personal and academic)	_____ %
-4- Other service to student groups/organizations	_____ %
-5- Committee assignments and administrative duties	_____ %
-6- Off-campus services (professional meetings, community talks, consulting services, etc.)	_____ %
	100 %

2. To which of the above activities would you prefer to devote more time if you could? (Circle the number or numbers that correspond to the activities.)

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. To which of the above activities would you prefer to devote less time if you could? (Circle the number or numbers that correspond to the activities.)

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Please circle the expression below that best describes your present attitude toward your professional career at the University of Minnesota.

Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

5. Please indicate your faculty rank:

- (1) Assistant Professor
- (2) Associate Professor
- (3) Professor
- (4) Other. Please indicate: _____

6. How long have you been tenured?

- (1) I do not have a tenure-track position
- (2) I have a tenure-track position, but am not tenured
- (3) Two years or less
- (4) More than two years but less than five years
- (5) Between five and ten years
- (6) Ten years or more

7. Please list the two or three major satisfactions that you derive from being a faculty member at the University:

-a-

-b-

-c-

Comments (You are invited to expand on your response to this question; if you need additional space, please use the back of this page):

8. Please list the two or three major dissatisfactions with being a faculty member at the University:

-a-

-b-

-c-

Comments (You are invited to expand on your response to this question; if you need additional space, please use the back of this page):

Given the reality of diminished resources, what are ways in which your present dissatisfactions can be turned into satisfactions? We look upon this survey as an opportunity for the faculty to have an input into policy-making. For this reason, we are asking all faculty members to give serious thought to this question:

At the present stage of your career, what can the University do, in specific ways, to facilitate your scholarly activities (teaching and research) and help you to enrich your professional life during the next five or ten years? For example, do you have ideas on innovative funding? Are you aware of policies and practices from other universities or other countries that might be applicable? Do you know of ongoing systems (e.g., systems of sponsorship, feedback, performance evaluation, rewards or recognition) that foster professional development? (If you need additional space, please use the back of this page.)

10. Please indicate the college/program/campus in which you are appointed:

Twin Cities Campus:

- (1) College of Biological Sciences
- (2) College of Education
- College of Liberal Arts:
- (3) Humanities and Fine Arts
- (4) Social Sciences
- (5) College of Veterinary Medicine
- (6) Continuing Educ. & Extension
- (7) General College
- (8) Graduate School
- Health Sciences:
- (9) Dentistry
- (10) Medical School
- (11) Mortuary Science
- (12) Nursing
- (13) Pharmacy
- (14) Public Health
- (15) Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

- Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics:
- (16) Agriculture
- (17) Forestry
- (18) Home Economics
- (19) Agricultural Experiment Station
- (20) Agricultural Extension Service
- (21) Institute of Technology
- (22) Law School
- (23) School of Management
- (24) University College
- (25) Other. Please indicate:

Crookston Campus:

(26)

Morris Campus:

(27)

UMD-Medical School:

(28)

11. For how many years have you been on the faculty at the University of Minnesota?
_____ years

12. Was your appointment as a faculty member at the University of Minnesota your first professional employment after you received your highest degree?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

If "No", how many years of job experience did you have before you came to the University of Minnesota?

Number of Years

- a. In teaching at other colleges or universities? _____
- b. In teaching at other types of educational institutions? _____
- c. In industry, government, etc.? _____

13. Sex:

- (1) Female
- (2) Male

-- Thank you for your time and cooperation --

If you have questions about this questionnaire, please call Faye Powe, Assistant to the Committee for Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty, 376-8446.

Please fold, staple, and return your completed questionnaire to the address on the back of this page. We would appreciate receiving your response by April 30, 1982. Respondents from the Twin Cities Campus may use the campus mail service.