



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
December 8, 1983
354 Coffman Memorial Union
10:30 - 12:10

Members present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe (Chr.), M. Mattson, J. Merwin, I. Rubenstein, D. Stuthman, B. Sundquist, J. Turner.

Guest: Maureen Smith.

Agenda: Faculty participation in the review of the president.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to determine what Professors Howe, Stuthman, and Turner would propose regarding faculty participation to the Regents committee on the review.

1. An invitation from either the Regents or the FCC to all faculty to write.

FCC members would like to be able to read all letters submitted by faculty so as to have a good grasp of faculty views before meeting with the reviewer. FCC should have access to all the responses so it won't represent only some of the expressed faculty opinion. Some faculty members, suspicious of how the FCC might interpret or "massage" what it reads, will want to write directly to the Regents.

2. An invitation to selected faculty for written commentary.

FCC wants informed comments. It wishes to solicit responses from FCC members of the past five years and from the chairpersons over the same period of Senate committees which work with the President's office. FCC would inform each person by letter that the review was underway and that FCC was channeling faculty views for the Regents, and would invite each to make comments, particularly on certain questions the FCC would specify. Responses would have to be signed and would be available to the Regents and to the President. The responses would help FCC organize its report to the Regents.

FCC needs a legal opinion on whether a report it wrote on behalf of the faculty would become a public document.

Committees the FCC considers including: Planning, Judicial, Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs.

FCC agreed it was essential to structure the questions in order to get a comprehensible pattern in the answers.

Question: Would FCC copy to the Regents the letters it receives?

FCC opinion was mixed on whether or not to solicit letters from chairs and heads of departments. On the one hand, they are the people charged, sometimes abruptly, with implementing policy changes. On the other hand, they are in line for input through their deans.

3. FCC meeting with the reviewer.

Professor Howe proposed FCC write a statement to the consultant in advance of its meeting with him, to register clearly a faculty voice. FCC should also ask the reviewer to put to FCC in advance any specific questions he or she has for the committee.

FCC agreed the last five SCC chairpersons should be included in the meeting with the reviewer. In his introduction, John Howe would explain briefly to the reviewer the governance structure and how the SCC is chosen and what it does.

4. Reporting.

FCC will want to make its report to the Faculty Senate at the end of the process. (The Regents will report to the community.)

5. Questions to incorporate in the review.

Professor Turner had developed a set of questions from the performance criteria the Regents used in the 1978 review, and Professor Howe had drawn up questions from literature on presidential reviews generally.

FCC members agreed they would like Professors Howe, Stuthman, and Turner to share a set of questions with the Regents committee on December 9 as an example of how FCC believes the review should proceed. They will present basically the Turner list augmented by questions from the Howe list and from the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
Recorder

Questions for Faculty Use in the Presidential Review

1. How well has the President performed in developing good relationships with the State government and the legislature?
2. How well has the President performed in developing good relationships with community leaders, business leaders, and alumni?
3. Has the President represented the University well nationally, before government agencies and within educational bodies?
4. How well has the President performed in providing leadership for the Board of Regents in his role as Chief Executive Officer?
5. How well has the President performed in providing academic leadership for the faculty, staff, and students?
 - a. Has he articulated and supported basic educational values?
 - b. Has he sought to promote educational quality and the innovations that are needed during a period of declining resources?
 - c. Has he exhibited an understanding of the University and the educational issues that confront it?
 - d. How well has he worked with the duly-constituted governance bodies in terms of communication and consultation?
 - e. Has he been "forward-looking" -- has he articulated a clear image of what he would like the University to be in the decades ahead?
 - f. How well has he worked with constituent groups and the Board of Regents in developing a realistic, imaginative long-range planning process?
 - g. Has his leadership moved the University in a direction that makes it more attractive to outstanding scholars and the most able students?
6. How well has the President performed as an administrator/manager of the University?
 - a. Has he developed a rational and effective pattern of organization in central administration?
 - b. Has he seen to it that highly qualified senior-staff have been selected and carefully supervised?
 - c. Has he seen to it that the method of preparing the budget is adequate, including consultation with groups with whom consultation is expected?
 - d. Has he seen to it that resources are well managed and controlled?
 - e. Has he seen to it that policy decisions are properly made and promptly implemented?
 - f. Has he been willing to accept responsibility for decisions?
 - g. Has he provided effective leadership in areas of affirmative action and equal opportunity?
7. How well has the President performed in addressing the major recommendations of the last review?

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

It should be clear that the following list identifies only the major and general objectives the Board of Regents has for the President of the University of Minnesota. One could expand or refine this listing considerably.

Also, we are dealing here with expectations of effort rather than outcomes. It would be simplistic to attribute all success or failure to presidential behavior. Yet, the priority expectations or objectives remain as the basis for reviewing performance. Within these limitations, then, are the following objectives:

1. To improve the University's relationships with the State government and with the Legislature, including its ability to attract maximum financial support for its programs and services to the people of Minnesota.
2. To be an effective spokesman for the University with all of its various external constituencies, including agricultural and industrial groups on the state and national scene. Although not exclusively his responsibility, such activity will result in greater resource acquisition from both private and federal sources.
3. To provide leadership to the Board of Regents and to establish and maintain the confidence of the Board in his role as Chief Executive Officer.
4. To establish effective relations with faculty, staff, and students, relating well to the duly-constituted internal governance bodies for purposes of consultation and communication.
5. To be an effective force for the improvement of educational opportunity, educational quality, and necessary innovation in a period of declining resources. To articulate and support the basic educational values of the University of Minnesota.
6. To be an effective administrator-manager: seeing to it that highly qualified senior-staff personnel are selected and supervised; that resources are well-managed and controlled; that budget preparation is adequate and involves those with whom consultation is expected. Also, sees to it that policy-decisions are properly made and promptly implemented.
7. To work with all of the constituent groups and the Board of Regents in developing an adequate long-range planning process, including a Mission and Policy statement reflecting basic objectives, goals and priorities.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
614 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

February 27, 1984

To: Faculty members of certain Senate committees

From: Faculty Consultative Committee

As you know, the Board of Regents has begun a review of the last five years of President Magrath's administration. There was such a review five years ago, and he has now asked that there be another.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has taken on responsibility for arranging faculty input into the review. We have met with the Regents' subcommittee that is organizing the reviews and with Joseph F. Kauffman, Professor of Educational Administration at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, who will actually be conducting the review, and have worked out two modes of faculty participation.

The Regents have announced that any member of the University community-- faculty, students, or staff-- may write directly to Professor Kauffman, c/o the Office of the Board of Regents, 220 Morrill Hall. Communications must be signed and will be held in strict confidence. The FCC encourages you and any of your colleagues to write directly to Professor Kauffman. We think such faculty letters will be most effective if they comment particularly on questions #5 and #6 on the attached sheet.

Just as importantly, the FCC has scheduled two meetings with Professor Kauffman during February and April at which we will offer our own substantive commentary on the President's administration. So that we might be better informed and more accurately represent faculty opinion, we are holding a series of meetings with faculty who have served on Senate committees during the last five years, who have been involved in University governance, and who are in a position to comment in an informed way on the President's administration. That is the reason for this letter to you.

We now invite you to attend one of those meetings, on Monday, March 12, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m., in Room 325 of Coffman Memorial Union. We hope very much that you will be able to come and participate, for these meetings will strengthen the FCC's ability to play an effective role in the review process.

2/27/84
page two

The Regents have emphasized that the central purpose of the review is to enable the President and the Board of Regents to improve the University by identifying areas that need improvement and strengthening. They also wish to emphasize that the assessment is not only of the President himself, but also of the administration of the University -- the office of the President, the Board, and their relationships.

It is important that the faculty contribution, if it is to be effective, be informed, thoughtful, and constructive. In that spirit, we have fashioned a set of "Questions for Faculty Use in the Presidential Review." A copy of those questions is attached. We welcome your response to any of them, but are particularly interested in centering our discussions on questions #5 and #6. Those two questions will provide points of departure in our discussions with you.

We hope to see you on the 12th. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact any member of the FCC.

Phyllis Freier (373-3327)

Virginia Fredricks (373-4574)

John Howe, Chairperson (373-2709)

Marvin Mattson (218)281-6510, ext. 308 (Crookston Campus)

Jack Merwin (373-1329, 373-5213)

Irwin Rubenstein (373-1733, 373-0966)

Deon Stuthman (373-0860, 373-1345)

W. Donald Spring (1-589-2211, ext. 6259) (Morris Campus)

John Turner (373-2682)

JH:mp

Enclosure: Questions