



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 1, 1983

11:00 - 12:00

626 Campus Club

AGENDA

1. Minutes of November 10 and November 17 (enclosed).
2. Faculty Input and the Presidential Review.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

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

DRAFT
MINUTES

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

December 1, 1983
626 Campus Club
11:10 - 12:25

Members present: Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe (Chairperson), Marvin Mattson, Jack Merwin, Donald Spring, Deon Stuthman, John Turner.

Guest: Paul Schulte.

1. Minutes of November 10 and 17. No corrections were offered at the meeting. Members should call the chairperson or the assistant if they find corrections need to be made.

2. Scheduling Faculty Senate meetings for Tenure Code consideration.

Professor Howe reported that Professors Purple (Business and Rules) and Morrison (Tenure) find it is the Faculty Consultative Committee's responsibility to call special meetings of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Fredricks moved the FCC order special meetings on the four dates already scheduled by the Tenure Committee (January 26, February 9, February 23, March 8). The motion carried without dissent.

3. Review of the President: Building in Faculty Participation.

Professor Howe reported on his recent conversations with President Magrath, Regent Krenik, and Regents' Secretary Wilson on faculty participation in the review of the President. At their invitation he examined the file of the 1978 review and has made copies of the basic documents.

Regent Krenik sounded very receptive to Professor Howe's two observations:

(a) That in the 1978 review process there was a sense that faculty involvement was too limited; faculty are interested in working with the Regents this time in developing and carrying out the process;

(b) That there needs to be some sort of culminating report, probably from the Regents to the faculty, about the outcome.

Professor Howe in addition made two suggestions:

- (a) That the FCC serve as the agency for coordinating, organizing, focusing, clarifying, etc., appropriate faculty input into the process;
- (b) That several FCC members sit with the Regents to conduct the review.

Regent Krenik was receptive to the first but not to the second. The review is fundamentally a Regental responsibility.

The Regents are not yet far along in the process. They are looking to the last review as a model. Mr. Krenik will appoint a committee of Regents to oversee the review. They are inclined again to hire an outside reviewer to conduct interviews and write a report to the Regents.

Professor Howe has told Messrs. Magrath, Krenik and Wilson that the FCC would discuss (a) the appropriate faculty role in the process and how FCC should facilitate that; and (b) what questions should be asked as part of a presidential review. FCC would forward its recommendations on these two questions. Messrs. Magrath, Krenik and Wilson were agreeable to that approach.

Professor Howe emphasized that there is a good opportunity for better faculty participation this time.

Professor Howe then sketched the way in which Professor Kauffman had proceeded with the last review. He distributed copies of the performance objectives drawn from the original search description and used in 1978 to guide the information gathering.

The 1978 review included a review of the interaction of the President and the Board of Regents, a self-evaluation of the Board of Regents, and a self-evaluation of the President, as well as a performance review of the President. Professor Howe read to FCC Regent Moore's September 1978 letter to then-SCC chairperson Mahmood Zaidi outlining the process.

Professor Howe gave FCC two assignments:

- (a) to specify what is an appropriate faculty part in the process and decide which faculty members should be more involved;
- (b) to specify what FCC wants to suggest regarding performance objectives.

Professor Stuthman said part of the second review should be to find out to what extent the recommendations in the first report have been carried out.

Professor Spring told the committee it would be hard to orchestrate a representative faculty voice. We ought to focus on pretty important issues, he said, and not dissipate our effort through a "laundry list."

Professor Howe said there is a sense the president's first review (which was rather a rarity in universities at that time) had started the University's current set of reviews of central and high unit administrators. The President has stated that all major administrators should be hired for terms and undergo reviews.

Professor Mattson recommended FCC use particular people to respond to the reviewer on specific issues: we have found that by doing so we make the most effective response and get our point of view taken seriously.

FCC members agreed it is desirable for the Regents to encourage all faculty who wish to write their contributions to the review. There was a general consensus that those letters should be sent to the reviewer through the Regents Office, but that they should be accessible to the FCC. The FCC would acquaint itself with the responses before talking with the reviewer. FCC members said it is crucial to establish FCC credibility by making itself aware of the range and content of faculty responses. They will provide FCC the basis for summarizing faculty views.

Professors Spring and Merwin remarked that it would be helpful if the Regents would recognize the groups outside faculty governance that could have an interest in contributing.

FCC tentatively scheduled a second meeting at which it would complete its proposal on faculty participation. (Note: that follow-up meeting was held on December 8.)

Summary of intentions. FCC will reach a consensus and make a recommendation to the Regents for faculty participation, including the following points:

(1) Faculty participation

- (a) through Regential invitation to all faculty to write;
- (b) through a selected faculty group, probably the FCC augmented by representatives from other key Senate committees, meeting with the reviewer.

(2) Focusing faculty attention on a few of the existing performance guidelines; FCC might specify the implied questions in more detail.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
Recorder



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

December 8, 1983

Marilee Ward
Clerk of the Senate

Dear Marilee:

The Faculty Consultative Committee on December 1 voted unanimously to call special meetings of the Faculty Senate for January 26, February 9, February 23, and March 8, 1984, for the purpose of considering the proposed new Tenure Code. We believe these are the dates the Tenure Committee has requested.

Thanks in advance for all your help in arranging for those meetings.

Sincerely,

John Howe, Chairperson
Faculty Consultative Committee

JH:mp

c: Fred Morrison
Rick Purple



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MEMORANDUM TO THE FILE.

DRAFT
MINUTES

EXECUTIVE SESSION

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH
December 1, 1983, 2:45 - 3:05, 626 Campus Club

Present: President Magrath, Vice President Keller, Charles Farrell, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe, Susan Hunstiger, Marvin Mattson, Jack Merwin, Mitch Richter, Donald Spring, John Turner, Julie Iverson, Paul Schulte, Scott Singer.

At the conclusion of the SCC agenda, President Magrath requested an executive session with the Senate Consultative Committee for personnel and legal matters.

Professor Spring moved, Professor Fredricks seconded, convening in executive session. The motion carried without dissent. The guests left the meeting.

1. Search for Vice President for Finance. President Magrath told SCC that having now received the quite unanimous report of the search committee, chaired by Donald Rasmusson, he would like to invite Acting Vice President David Lilly to become the University's Vice President for Finance.

He described the search as "expedited but thorough." At one point, he said, he had seriously considered cutting short the search and simply continuing Mr. Lilly as Acting Vice President; consultation with the committee and others persuaded him to continue the search.

Of the five candidates invited for interviews, two decided not to come; one of the other candidates fared very well with the search committee and one did not fare well; the search committee declared that Mr. Lilly was far and away the leading choice.

Mr. Howe spoke of the widespread high regard for Mr. Lilly. He said we are glad the process moved as far along as it did; that will serve Mr. Lilly better. He asked if there was no concern about the rather short term built in (Mr. Lilly could not serve beyond June of 1987, when he will be 70). Professor Fredricks reported that she hears colleagues ask how we can have good financial planning when we keep losing our financial vice president. The President said there was not concern about the limited term. If Mr. Lilly remains at the job to the limit he will have held it longer than his immediate predecessors. He added that he would rather have a turnover of high quality people sought after by others than a long-serving person of just ordinary talents. There is administrative continuity in good assistants and associates.

Professor Turner asked whether there was any sense as to the reason for the relative paucity of well-qualified nominations and applications. The President responded that this is not an easy position for complex universities to fill. Universities frequently find themselves in long searches to fill this spot; the salary is lower than outside academia, and there are not a lot of people with the background for this complex job.

He mentioned Professor Rasmusson's suggestion the University consider hiring a professional firm to do the search next time the position is vacant. But, said President Magrath, it is essential the person we get understands and supports academic values.

Professor Freier asked if the University is bringing in and cultivating bright young people who might grow up to this job.

2. Vice President for Administration and Planning. The President told SCC that by early January he wants to announce an internal search to fill this position, and said we will work together on designing the search. He recommends a small committee.

President Magrath and Vice President Keller indicated they wanted to discuss with SCC the nature of that position and would send materials. Planning will be part of the portfolio; there is a proposal to add a responsibility for academic services -- specifically the day-to-day reporting regarding academic affairs.

Professor Howe told Drs. Magrath and Keller the SCC would welcome the opportunity to discuss the position.

3. Collective Bargaining. President Magrath told SCC that the Regents would have to decide on December 9 whether or not to submit the contract differences with the UEA to binding arbitration.

Professor Turner told the meeting he believes everyone is concerned by the comparative closeness of faculty salaries at the Twin Cities campus and the other universities in the state, given the differences in mission and the vulnerability of the Twin Cities faculty to being hired away.

If we submit to binding arbitration, he said, the result could well bring the Twin Cities faculty to unionization. That, he said, would be antithetical to what we stand for. It would mean salaries based on seniority and not on merit. It will be better to refuse binding arbitration, he urged, even with the threat of a strike.

President Magrath said he personally opposes using binding arbitration because we stand on the principles (of the salary differentiation). He will recommend to the Regents that the University stay with the offer currently on the table, while remaining open to further discussion. The Regents are divided on the question.

Professor Howe told the President the SCC is reassured with the position he has articulated and reinforces him in it.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.