

# FOOTNOTE

☐ July 14, 1992

☐ Volume 6, Number 1

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Bognanno Looks Ahead

New FCC chair outlines the issues for the coming year

*Mario Bognanno is just beginning a one-year term as chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). A professor of industrial relations in the Carlson School of Management and director of the Industrial Relations Center, Bognanno has been involved in faculty governance at the University for most of the past 20 years. His teaching and research interests are in the areas of labor relations and labor economics. In addition, he has acted as a consultant with numerous outside agencies and organizations, including the U.S. Department of Labor, the World Bank, the South Korean Ministry of Labor, and the Minnesota Legislature.*

**Footnote:** What are the top issues facing the faculty this coming year?

**Bognanno:** I believe that the University's condition in 1995 will determine whether it is a rising academic institution or a fading one. We are facing a watershed. This year the University will be coming out of two years of serious budgetary restrictions as we shouldered our share of the burden required to deal with the state's budget-balancing crisis. One campus has been closed, departments have been eliminated, staff and faculty have either lost jobs or vacant lines have gone unfilled—all this to help balance the state's 1990-92 biennial budget.

The faculty does not look forward to two more years patterned like the last two. In discussions with colleagues around the University, I have found a general sense that we have been trimmed to the bone and should now protect the marrow. Part of our task is to explain to the public, more particu-

larly to the legislature and to the governor, that the University is lean, is administratively reorganized, and has its strategic focus in place—and that to continue to burden this institution with cuts running into the tens of millions of dollars may compromise the University's long-run stature and credibility as a leading American research university.

As we approach the 1993-95 biennium the University's biennial request will be at the top of our agenda. In addition to asking for adequate consultation with the administration before the request goes to the legislature, we will also want to be involved in developing contingency plans in the event that our request is not well received.

**Footnote:** Speaking of past cuts, the central administration has had extensive consultation with faculty and students, through their representatives on the FCC and the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), about budgeting and allocating reduced state funds. Are you interested in some kind of nonfinancial accounting of how cuts have been realized on a college-by-college basis?

**Bognanno:** Absolutely. Before pushing forward with plans that may involve further reductions, it would be helpful to get answers to questions like, What has been the impact of current cuts on the faculty, academic support staff, and student body? What has been the impact on our teaching and research programs, and support for undergraduate and graduate studies? I'm referring to the need for real consultation as opposed to a financial analysis and information. With this

information in hand, FCC consultations over the 1993-95 budgetary plan should be of greater value to the administration.

**Footnote:** What do you think such an analysis will show?

**Bognanno:** I anticipate that it will show that the cuts fell most heavily on units that do not generate a large number of student credit hours and that programs, departments, and colleges with the highest demand for graduate and undergraduate studies probably gave up the least in relative terms. I believe that allocation of burden was supposed to have been driven, in part, by student-based criteria. But I may be wrong. Moreover, I expect to see that programs that are largely self-sufficient, that operate on the basis of grants, were protected. That's what I anticipate, but I really don't know. I have never seen any real numbers.

**Footnote:** You said earlier that by 1995 we should be able to determine whether the University is a rising or a fading institution. How will we know if the University is a fading academic institution? And are some of the signs already there?

**Bognanno:** The University isn't an island unto itself. As conducting research and recruiting of quality graduate students become increasingly difficult, the faculty responsible for educating graduate students and for creating our quarter-billion dollars in research activity will look elsewhere to fulfill their academic interests. The ultimate test is going to be our ability both to retain top faculty and to recruit new top faculty. From my own experience, I can tell you that this

*Bognanno, next page*

*Bognanno, from previous page*

has become increasingly difficult.

In my own center, we had two retention cases this year. Competitive universities offered two colleagues several thousand dollars more each year than we were paying them. We had a salary freeze last year, and we're allocating only 5 percent in raises next year. Other universities are aware of this. Fortunately, we were able to retain the two professors in my unit. But it was difficult. And if a third or fourth top member of our faculty had received an offer as rich as these two, I'm not certain we would have been able to find the resources to retain them. We have been and are operating under rigid budget constraints, and academic administrators can only push goodwill and collegiality so far. We have tapped the goodwill reservoirs. Now we need some fiscal stability and the assurance that the University is positioned to ascend the ladder of

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 1  
July 14, 1992

*Managing Editor:* Richard Broderick  
*Copy Editor:* Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455 (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

academic excellence.

Other signs I think you would see include slipping SAT and GRE scores, increasing difficulty in winning research grant competitions, and faculty receiving and accepting offers from other academic institutions. My chief concern is that the University of Minnesota be able to compete favorably in the broader academic marketplace. If the public fails to support our underlying mission, then our ability to compete on favorable terms will probably be lost.

**Footnote:** Besides the budget, what other issues do you expect to be working on?

**Bognanno:** We have a couple of major issues that carry over from last year. One is adopting grievance and parental leave policies, both of which may require modifying the tenure code. The other carry-over issue involves coming to terms with a strategy for involving the nonunion faculty members on the Duluth campus in the governance system.

I'm also hoping that faculty, the academic staff, and students will become involved in the nagging question of what the mission of a land-grant university actually is on a day-in, day-out basis.

During my years here I've always assumed that my job comprises three major activities—teaching, research, and service. But I'm no longer certain the legislature, the governor, and perhaps the people of this state recognize that mission. Recently I was at a meeting in which a legislator challenged one of our central administrators, asking him why faculty here teach only six or eight hours a week. The question was put in such a way that it was an implied criticism of faculty and University.

It seems to me that our performance ought to be judged on the basis of what we do in and beyond the classroom. "Teaching," for example, also means advising and supervising Plan B papers, master theses, and doctoral dissertations. This part of our work load goes beyond a mere count of classroom contact hours. But these aspects of teaching are difficult to quantify.

The medical student ostensibly learns as much while on rounds with a senior resident as in a classroom setting. This message is not effectively communicated. The University's faculty are also expected to conduct research and to bring in research support above and beyond state support. And we do that. We do that to the tune of \$250 million per year. One would expect that these allocations of time should help explain why professors here spend, on average, fewer hours a week in the classroom than professors in other parts of the state's higher education system.

That \$250 million in research money contributes to our stock of knowledge, it leads to new technologies and products, it partly finances the creation of future scientists, and it increases the state's rate of economic development. This is what a land-grant university is all about. Extension activities are also expected of the University's faculty and professional staff. There is an extension service in agriculture, of course, but even here in the Carlson School services are produced, linking us to the community. For example, we produce services that update workers and employers on duties, rights, and responsibilities under the burgeoning area of labor and employment law.

I worry that we are not being properly credited for our service contributions. My sense is that the faculty is a bit frustrated because what we are supposed to do appears to be inconsistent with what others think we ought to be doing. We're confused. Some feel defensive.

My hope is that the question of differentiating between faculty "work load" and faculty "teaching" load can be accomplished before winter 1993. We shouldn't go into the next legislative session without a policy that clearly articulates the principles governing our work load.

**Footnote:** How much do you think the misunderstanding is real, how much politically motivated?

**Bognanno:** People challenge us on work load for two reasons. One, many people simply do not understand what it is we do. I don't think they really appreciate what the

terms "research" or "service" mean in an institution like ours. I don't think they know what teaching means, either, for that matter—it's certainly a lot more than standing in front of a class six to eight hours a week.

Secondly, the issue [of faculty work load] is raised to challenge us, to make us focus on how and why we are different from other parts of the higher education system. I don't think people are being mean-spirited; they want to hear us articulate a rationale for what we do. I don't think there is political manipulation going on to support further budget cuts. Friends of ours in the legislature who raise the issue want us to provide an answer. They need that. I really believe that President Hasselmo and Vice President Infante have their jobs cut out for them. They lead the University. We should be prepared to help them articulate what is implied by the teaching-service-research trilogy.

**Footnote:** If you were to make the case, how would you formulate it?

**Bognanno:** Central to that case is, first, undergraduate and graduate studies. Beyond offering quality education across a wide range of undergraduate majors, this university is the state's premier educator of Ph.D. and professional-degree students.

Second, there is research and technology. It is in institutions like ours that the frontiers of knowledge and technology are rolled back, that ideas are converted into products and applications designed to improve the human condition. This is also the place where the human dictates—the arts and the way we live—are criticized and shaped in part by the writings of academics from anthropology to law to philosophy.

Third, there is service. New machinery, new drugs, new seeds, new fertilizers, or new laws require interpretation and application. The latter in turn are what link the University to the community at large, whether the linkage is in the legislature, on a factory floor, in a court of law, in the middle of a 280-acre farm, in an operating room, or in a trade union hall.

**Footnote:** What else do you hope to accomplish in the coming year?

**Bognanno:** First and most important, to provide top-drawer consultation to the president and his executive team.

Other goals I'd like to see us accomplish include the adoption of a uniform grievance procedure. Right now, there is a different policy for virtually every person at the University. The institution has also been embarrassed—unfortunately so—with a public airing of charges of conflict of interest. I'm hoping that the FCC and University Senate will be able to help clarify what our conflict-of-interest policy should include and how it ought to be administered.

I think there is work to be done in the area of performance reviews for line administrators. This last year, we adopted a new policy that provides for reviews of tenured and nontenured professors. Meanwhile, our academic and civil service staffs have long had annual reviews. So there is no shortage of appraisals and review processes at the University except perhaps at the level of department chairs and deans. Who reviews them? In my 22 years at the University, I have never been called upon to comment on the performance of any deans with whom I have worked.

I'm also hoping we will be able to move forward on a parental leave policy—but that will probably require amending the tenure code.

**Footnote:** Julia Davis, dean of the College of Liberal Arts, argues that in these times faculty must play a more active role in "selling" the University to the public and the legislature. She says she believes the faculty are beginning to realize that it must play this role. Do you agree with her assessment?

**Bognanno:** I agree with Dean Davis. Leadership comes from the top, but that leadership has to know that faculty and academic staff stand with them, willing to help out in any way they can. At this point, it's really a matter of leadership organizing faculty and academic staff to do the "selling" work that needs to be done.

I have very practical evidence

that the faculty are beginning to realize this. Last winter, Virginia Gray, the FCC's representative in the legislature, asked me to host a reception in my home for the state senator and two representatives from my senatorial district. She felt that a group of perhaps 25 to 30 people would be an appropriate-sized group. I proceeded to contact 40 faculty members from my district. About 30 showed up. I was amazed.

We spoke with our senator and reps for a good two and a half hours. If such a meeting had been held even 10 years ago I would have been surprised if I had gotten 10 professors to show up. So attitudes are changing. The facultare changing. The faculty realize that we all have to do our share. ■

—Richard Broderick

# Conflict-of-interest issues discussed

Some people can't help believing it's wrong for anyone to make big money, especially anyone who is a public employee.

Some of those people are newspaper reporters. A belief that University faculty researchers shouldn't get rich may have been one reason for a May 31 story in the *Star Tribune* on Dr. David Knighton's research on wound healing. Vice President Jim Infante said at a Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) meeting June 4.

Potential conflicts of interest always exist when faculty members do research for private corporations or set up their own companies. Partly because of the attention given to the Knighton story, the issues were discussed at the FCC meeting and the June 12 regents meeting.

Allegations of wrongdoing have not been supported by the internal or external reviews of Dr. Knighton's work, President Nils Hasselmo told the regents, "and I have not seen evidence that either our policies or our enforcement have failed."

But Hasselmo said he sees "nuances and new issues that call for continued attention, not the least of which are the distinctions among conflict of interest, potential conflict of interest, and the appearance of conflict of interest.

"These distinctions, alone, pose a

wide range of interpretation and communication problems that we must...continue to address," Hasselmo said, and this need is "one important reason why I decided to add the vice presidency for research." That vice president, Anne Petersen, will lead a national conference on the Twin Cities campus in the fall on conflict-of-interest issues.

The University is not just a teaching institution but is committed to research and service, Infante said at the FCC meeting. It would be wrong to take the position that the University will do nothing that will raise conflict-of-interest questions, he said; such conflicts will occur.

In the Knighton case, Infante said, he and Hasselmo have carefully reviewed the matter and are satisfied that University policies were followed. What might be in question is whether correct judgments were made. Mistakes may have been made, he said, although he has no evidence that they were, and it may also be that policies need to be further elaborated to be more appropriate.

Working relationships with industry have grown at the University in the past few years and represent a major success story,

Hasselmo said. "We have done what we said we'd do. We have built an even stronger University role in successful economic development for the state. We have fostered mutually beneficial cooperation between the academic and business communities."

In all of these successes, he said, there is "no evidence that our policies and our enforcement have failed to keep up." But the relationships are "growing ever more complicated," and the issue continues to be "how to keep up with these developments in the modification, creation, and enforcement of policies."

Extraordinary steps were taken to ensure full disclosure in the contract with Curative Technologies, associate vice president Tony Potami said, and the University's guidelines were "followed to the letter." The University is more vigorous than most universities in monitoring relationships with industry, he said. "To discourage this kind of activity would be a disservice to the state." ■

—Maureen Smith

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

### IN THIS ISSUE

Interview: Mike Bognanno

Conflict-of-Interest Issues

Next Footnote—August 12

# FOOTNOTE

□ August 12, 1992

□ Volume 6, Number 2

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Retiring ways

### For many faculty, retirement doesn't mean an end of service opportunities

Some days Eloise Jaegger feels like she works harder now than before she retired.

"At times," she says with a chuckle, "I feel like I've gone back to work."

Since retiring in 1986, the former assistant dean in the Division of Kinesiology has volunteered her services to United Way's First Call for Help, Unity Hospital, and numerous other organizations and agencies. Recently, she has taken on a whole new task: helping set up ElderMentor, a partnership between the University of Minnesota Retirees Association and the St. Paul Park elementary school system.

Retired volunteers in the program make presentations to large and small groups of schoolchildren and work one-to-one with students who need tutoring in the retiree's field of expertise. This spring, Jaegger coordinated the school's pilot program, which proved such a success that she now finds herself trying to line up volunteers for the coming school year.

"So far the response from the retirees I've contacted has been very good," she says.

Which is not surprising, given the number of retired University faculty who engage in volunteer work. Jaegger is just one of several hundred retirees who donate their time, energy, and expertise each year to a host of worthy causes, from blood banks to the Boy Scouts, drivers ed for seniors to literacy training, and more. Many, though not all, retirees have worked through the University Retirees Association.

Willard Thompson, professor emeritus in the journalism school and past president of the retirees

association, says retirees volunteer for a variety of reasons—to stay active, to keep some structure in their lives, to meet new people. But the primary motive, he says, is that retirees "are looking for an opportunity to be helpful."

Says Jaegger, "Personally I find volunteering a wonderful learning experience. First Call for Help, for example, has taught me a lot about people's needs. There's a certain satisfaction you get from giving something back to your community. That satisfaction is the chief benefit and attraction for volunteers."

A few years ago the association organized a volunteer center, which Thompson coordinates, for the purpose of linking retirees with organizations in need of their expertise. The center was inspired by a now national program initiated by the Junior League that matched retired executives from the corporate world with volunteer positions.

"The idea behind the center was a recognition that many University retirees have unique talents and experiences that shouldn't be allowed to go to waste," Thompson says. "It was also an opportunity to show the Twin Cities that University people aren't just ivy-tower folk, but are concerned and active in their communities."

Requests for volunteer help come to the center, Thompson says, "in not quite a flood." Each year, the center works with about 200 University retirees. Four years ago, the University began funding the center's modest budget—\$4,500 a year—and offered it office space on the St. Paul campus.

"The needs out there are very great and everyone is looking for help," says Thompson. Information

is fed into a small computer system, then matched to names of retirees who have registered with the center. Recently, the center has also begun to develop partnerships with outside agencies. ElderMentor, the program Eloise Jaegger is coordinating, is the fruit of one such collaboration, this time between the center and a statewide literacy training program.

While many retired faculty get involved in volunteer work that may or may not relate to their life's work, a certain percentage view retirement as a scaling back, not a termination, of their academic career.

In fact, during 1990-91, 37 University departments used retired faculty to teach courses; a smaller number had retired faculty deliver individual lectures, advise students, participate in research programs, and serve on departmental committees. Meanwhile, a recently completed survey of the retiree association members found that a third of them would like to be more closely associated with the department from which they retired.

George Seltzer is one emeritus faculty member who continues to teach in his old department.

Seltzer, former associate dean of the business school and professor emeritus in industrial relations, retired four years ago. Each year since then, he has been teaching a graduate seminar in industrial relations. He also serves from time to time on examining committees and has represented retiree interests to the University Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

He continues to teach and to participate in other departmental

*Retirement, from page 1*

and University affairs, Seltzer explains, "because, first of all, the University is my institution. Secondly, I am a professional, and I have a professional interest in many matters pertaining to my department and to the University at large. I care about the University's well-being."

Miriam Seltzer, wife of George Seltzer, was president of the retirees association from 1991 to 1992. "To me," she says, "the biggest issue is to try to get the University to make better use of its retired faculty. They represent an incredible human resource that, without in any way threatening current faculty and staff, could do wonderful things for the University and, of course, for themselves."

To avoid that waste, she and other association officials and board members have been encouraging the University to upgrade perquisites and benefits for retired faculty so that they are at least comparable with those offered by other institu-

tions. Currently, the University ranks near the bottom of the Big 10 in retiree benefits and perquisites.

"The kinds of the things I'm talking about," she says, "are office space and secretarial service for retirees, and support services of other kinds."

Making the changes, she believes, would require a "major policy statement from the central administration and then implementation by colleges and departments." It so happens that central administration was working on a comprehensive policy, but that effort was sidetracked by last year's budget crisis.

A consistent, comprehensive policy on the University's relationship with retired faculty would have an impact that goes beyond the satisfaction of retirees or even the staffing of academic departments and research labs. After 1993, there will no longer be mandatory retirement for faculty, meaning that tenured professors will, theoretically, be able to work as long as they want. Upgraded benefits—and the opportunity for continued involvement with old units—may play a role in some retirement decisions.

"For some people," she argues, "voluntary retirement is more than a question of monetary security. For some, it will also be a question of their continued usefulness."

Right now, according to many retirees, the disincentives to retire are great enough that many faculty members may choose to go on teaching—perhaps even beyond the time when they should retire—to avoid some of the negative consequences that now attach to retirement.

These consequences go far beyond losing the connection with a faculty member's old department and feeling unproductive. Topping the concerns of retirees or those considering retirement are health care and income. Right now, the University does not cover health insurance for retired faculty, although retirees may participate in University programs at their own expense. And retirement pay is not indexed to the cost of living.

"We have retirees who retired 25 years ago who are hurting," says

George Warp, a retiree involved in coordinating the retiree association's membership survey. "They were receiving top salaries at the University at the time they retired, but that pay is no longer sufficient. Things like that will discourage people from retiring if they don't have to."

For a number of reasons, including the University's ability to recruit and promote younger faculty, Warp argues that the institution must make retirement "attractive" for the current crop of faculty nearing retirement age. His findings mirror those of the mandatory retirement task force three years ago. One thing he believes will burnish the image of

**"For some people, voluntary retirement is more than a question of monetary security. For some, it will also be a question of their continued usefulness."**

retirement is the opportunity for those faculty members who want to, to continue their academic and research work within their departments or colleges.

"A lot of retirees might not want to," he says. "They feel they've worked enough and it's time to relax. Or they might be willing to continue their relationship in some very limited way, like serving on a committee once or twice a year."

Enlisting the help of retirees, in Miriam Seltzer's opinion, would be an "addition and an enrichment for the University" and would help add to the "institutional memory" so important in reaching workable decisions. From her perspective, retirees could regularly contribute to their departments or units in several ways, only one of which is teaching.

"Certainly, teaching is one thing retirees could do—not to replace existing faculty but to add to the teaching program offered by a department.

"But that's not all. Retirees can also mentor new faculty, answering

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 2  
August 12, 1992

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, or phone 612-624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

questions and concerns that junior faculty might be reluctant to discuss candidly with their current colleagues. They could also mentor students, particularly in specialized areas of study. Nowadays, if somebody retires, their program goes with them."

And then there is committee work. "No faculty like working on committees, so why not tap retired faculty to help out?"

Such proposals, she recognizes, might stir opposition and even fear from current faculty. Critical to any such venture, then, is "to make it absolutely clear that nobody is replacing anybody. We're not talking about taking on retirees full- or even half-time. We're speaking of occasional or additional courses or seminars—the kind of thing retirees are already doing in some departments." ■

—Richard Broderick

## □ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Mario Bognanno  
*Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee*

My predecessor, Tom Scott, has successfully passed on the faculty consulting and governance baton. I learned a great deal from him during this transition, and, at the onset of my term, I wish to express my personal gratitude for all he did for me and, on behalf of the faculty, our appreciation for the quality job he turned in.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has met twice so far this summer. A critical development that arose at our first meeting relates to issues Tom Scott highlighted in his last column: namely, that the University of Minnesota's mission will need to be revisited as we prepare for the 21st century, and that land-grant institutions across the country are under increasing public pressure to adopt higher standards of accountability.

Commenting on behalf of central administration, Vice President Anne Hopkins reinforced these points for us, reflecting mainly on the pressing internal and external need for a University of Minnesota work load policy.

Following discussion, the FCC ultimately elected to establish a blue-ribbon University Work Load Task Force to report by mid-September. We envision that the report will be presented to the faculty, perhaps through a system of open forums, and to three committees of the Faculty Senate (faculty affairs, educational policy, and, ultimately, consultative) for critique and revision. Our target is to bring the revised report—a policy on work load—to the November meeting of the senate for action.

This is a significant undertaking. Essentially, the task force is charged with explicitly defining how faculty should allocate their effort. It is amazing that an explicit policy does not already exist. Implicitly, we know what the proper balance among teaching, research, and service is—or at least most of us

think we do. An explicit policy should clarify our own thoughts. Moreover, communicating to the external community about what we do is a need chasing a policy yet to be written. (I refer you to Senator Gene Waldorf's interview appearing in the last issue of *Footnote*.)

The University's campuses, colleges, and departments have different missions, and properly so. The task force has been asked to undertake the difficult job of framing a work load policy comprising overarching principles or guidelines. In turn, we envision that, through their own decisional processes, units will write work load policies that interpret these general principles, giving them applied or operating meaning consistent with the unique teaching, research, and service missions of our varied campuses, colleges, and departments.

I expect that, in addition to drafting principles, the task force will also describe the activities rightly classified under the terms teaching, research, and service. These terms now include different sets of activities at different higher education institutions. What they mean to us as faculty of the University of Minnesota needs to be stated, particularly as the University, like other public institutions, is a subject of greater public scrutiny.

A subsequent issue of *Footnote* will be devoted to the University Work Load Task Force. Until then, I acknowledge and thank the following task force members for their willingness to serve: Carl Adams (chair), Victor Bloomfield, Sara Evans, William Gerberich, and Karen Seashore Lewis from the Twin Cities; Mercedes Ballou and W. Daniel Svedarsky from Morris and Crookston, respectively; and Vice President Anne Hopkins, *ex officio*. ■



## State begins environmental review of steam plant

The state's Environmental Quality Board (EQB) has voted to review the University's steam plant renovation plans. Earlier, the Board of Regents agreed to participate voluntarily in the review process.

In April, the regents awarded a 25-year, \$297 million contract to Foster Wheeler, which took over operation of the University's three steam plants in July. Foster Wheeler will upgrade two of the existing plants and close the third. Construction and renovation of the power plants are supposed to be completed in 1997, at which time the facilities will burn a combination of coal, gas, wood, and fuel oil. The company's proposal also includes plans for "cogeneration," in which excess steam is used on-

site to create electricity. Ultimately, the Foster Wheeler operation should save the University money by heating the St. Paul and Minneapolis campuses more efficiently while reducing the University's use of power from NSP.

The EQB's decision is the first step in compiling an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), a process that generally lasts about 15 months and includes a public comment period and, after the EIS's completion, a public hearing on the statement.

In a July 17 letter to the University community and other interested parties, Nils Hasselmo encouraged "thoughtful participation" in evaluating the environmental

impact of the Foster Wheeler plan. Wrote Hasselmo, "Directly or indirectly, we are all involved in this project; we share a common interest in making sure the best choices are made at each stage of the project."

For information about the project, call External Relations at 612-624-2855. The *EQB Monitor* is a biweekly publication that carries notices of public comment periods, public meetings, and related information. To get on the mailing list, write to: Environmental Quality Board, 300 Centennial Office Building, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul 55155, or call the EQB Review Program at 296-8253. Outside the Twin Cities call 1-800-652-9747. ■

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

**IN THIS ISSUE**  
**Retirement Options**  
**Steam Plant: Next Move**

Next Footnote—September 9



# FOOTNOTE

□ September 4, 1992

□ Volume 6, Number 3

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## The next great sector of reform

A conversation with Curt Johnson, the governor's chief aide on higher education

*Since December, Curt Johnson has been a senior adviser on Governor Carlson's staff, a job he took with the understanding that he would focus his attention on higher education issues. Before coming to government, he was for 11 years the executive director of the Citizens League and editor of its newsletter. For the past half dozen years he has also collaborated with journalist Neil Pierce on regional studies done for local metropolitan newspapers. He came to Minnesota in 1971 as president of Hibbing Community College and has served as president of both Inver Hills Community College and Minneapolis Community College. He holds a doctorate from the University of Texas.*

**Footnote:** In an article you published last fall, you proclaim that higher education has become a "prisoner of politics" and a "first-class mess." Has that situation changed or gotten any better? And if so, why?

**Johnson:** There is evidence that this condition is beginning to change. Even at the time I wrote that piece, I was impressed by the magnitude and ambition of change contemplated at the University of Minnesota. In other articles I was remarking on how little we appreciated the difficulty for University leaders—with whatever consensus support they were enjoying—in fundamentally changing the institution's priorities. It was as formidable a task as the controversial restructuring of any billion-dollar corporation.

This change was probably inevitable but still ought to get more applause, as should the people who are pushing it along. One of the things that Ken Keller said

during his brief time as president was how many of the University's problems were related to its excessive size. That sounds like an almost trivial statement until you examine its implications. The fact is, it's hard for me to find any problem at the University that doesn't relate substantially to its size.

So I started out in this job with a lot of appreciation for the change that was already under way in higher education. Since then, largely because of the energy and controversy surrounding the new higher ed board—the so-called superboard—a lot of heretofore unmovable objects are being confronted by the force they can't resist. Originally the board was written off as a legislative coup, a surprising move by a legislative leader [Senate majority leader Roger Moe, DFL-Erskine]. Lots of people thought it would go off over the side in some kind of political deal. But it didn't. Instead it gained respect, and now people are contemplating the very serious possibility that the merger of the three systems called for in the law establishing the superboard will actually happen.

**Footnote:** Do you think an appreciation for what the University has tried to do with reallocation is in any way pervasive at the legislature?

**Johnson:** No, I don't think that appreciation is anywhere near sufficient yet.

But that's part of what I mean by prisoner of politics. The University is trying to do things that were considered impossible for a long time, then when they pull it off, [University administrators] get the feeling that if they are not actively

punished for doing it, at least they are not rewarded for it. Where have been the rewards for biting the tough bullet that Waseca represented? Whatever they are, they are not very tangible. In fact, during the same session where that courage was acknowledged, the University absorbed a substantial cut in its funding. That cut was not punitive but it was real nonetheless.

The University leadership understandably believes that they are still forced to practice a politics of geography—that it must be fundamental to their legislative strategy to have stakes in different parts of state.

To the degree that this is true—and I don't argue with their assessment—we are forcing a kind of captivity on the University that prevents it from taking necessary or cost-effective or quality-oriented steps toward reasonable change. We will know we have done something about this prisoner premise when the University can do the things it is best at doing without risking legislative reprisal; when we recognize that we have only one institution of this size and kind and must let it be more selective, let it focus on research. If we let it do that without visiting an old-time populist revenge on the University, then we'll know we have freed the prisoner.

The truth is that lots of things we are contemplating in the merger [of Minnesota's higher education systems] are things we would have done a long time ago except that we have trapped these systems in a political prison. There is no excuse for our not having reorganized a long time ago the collection of tech schools—now elevated to colleges—

*continued on next page*

or removing them from school districts—except for all the things we couldn't sort out with the unions and other political dynamics that remain the major barriers in front of us.

**Footnote:** So we have not reached the point where the University can do what is best for the University and those who attend it?

**Johnson:** Right. I don't think people appreciate how tenuous the position of a University president really is. By any reasonable measure it is a daily walk through a minefield. That minefield is mostly on the campus. The president's job is a powerful opportunity to persuade but it is *not* a command-and-control center. In an environment in which everyone feels autonomous and empowered to have a say in decision making, there are plenty of opportunities to cultivate enemies. The same things that make the University vibrant and stimulating make it nearly ungovernable.

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 3  
September 4, 1992

*Managing Editor:* Richard Broderick  
*Copy Editor:* Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquires to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Add to that the minefield of a distinctly Minnesota populism that wants to have it both ways—to have the University be the best it can be but with no barriers to anyone for attending it. It is clear to me that for the University to do what the state needs socially, culturally, and economically, it has got to be a place you are not *entitled* to attend. It has to become a place that is elite in a justifiable way—an elitism that anybody can earn but no one gets automatically.

**Footnote:** Given the nature of the state's culture and politics, is it realistic to believe the University could ever be run that way?

**Johnson:** I think we can make some gains on the practical front. And maybe the reorganization of governance of the other systems will provide some indirect assistance. But some practical reasons inhibit the University from being smaller and more selective. For example, it is the only public four-year institution in town. If it is to be smaller and more effective there must be a high-quality alternative. Within the next year, in fact, I think we will have proposals on the table for reorganizing our constellation of community colleges and Metro State University in such a way that we will create that alternative.

That's a practical problem with a practical solution. The philosophical milieu is a much tougher proposition. Dealing with that will require strategy and patience and endless conversations with legislators. It will also require a critical mass of legislators who understand the problems, combined with a governor who knows how to cultivate allies on this issue. With all that we have a shot at recasting what we expect of the University of Minnesota. But none of this will happen by next Thursday.

**Footnote:** Earlier you said that in order for the University to do what it has to do for the state, it must get smaller and its quality has to go up. What is it, precisely, that the University has to do for Minnesota?

**Johnson:** To answer that we need to review the unique contributions it has already made and which of those

we need it to continue providing.

Some of the most important contributions have been in primary research that has proven transferable, and in the technological innovations that have come out of University research, both of which largely explain the advantages we have here in industries and corporations. Having the University located in the state's urban and political center and its economic headquarters has added a cultural and intellectual strength that you don't find in many state capitols or in the largest cities in most states.

Are we going to continue to enjoy that kind of benefit from the University? Is it the kind of place where we can continue to expect breakthrough research and technology? The fact is, that is not an expectation we should take for granted. If we don't invest in that

**“People don't just want to know how much of a faculty member's time is devoted to research. They want to ask, what research? Who decides?”**

outcome, if we do not have the system in place to reward accomplishments—or conversely, if we are pushing policies that inhibit or discourage such activity—it won't happen. If any of us are parties to policies that result in low morale and the most talented people at the University considering going elsewhere, we will destroy the possibility that the University will play the kind of role in the future that it has played in the past.

In the early '80s I wrote that reshaping the role and function of the University was *the* most critical strategic decision the people of Minnesota would face in the coming years. What the University has done in the past explains our success more than the actions of any other institution. What we decide to let it do or, alternatively, push it to do will have a major impact on how well we as a state

perform, and we would be silly to ignore that fact—and at times it appears that we *are* ignoring it.

I know that Governor Carlson is sometimes seen as a booster, sometimes as a severe critic of the University, but he doesn't ignore this point. He strongly believes that this is the place that has got to be the center of academic productivity in Minnesota. So sometimes when he comes off as critical it's because he thinks there is inefficiency that has been tolerated too long, that there are productivity issues that people want to do a delicate dance around rather than confront head on.

**Footnote:** So his criticism is an acknowledgement of the University's importance.

**Johnson:** Exactly. That's why he gets so exercised about it.

But suggestions about change, as everyone who has been associated with the reallocation from Keller forward knows, is inherently and inescapably destabilizing. It gets in the nest and messes it up and it flushes out critics. It enables those who feel threatened by it to organize, to make sure they undermine the cause. It sets off in the academic realm the worst of Italian Renaissance politics.

But what if the future isn't a simple extension of the past? What if the forces that have descended on telecommunications, transportation, financial services, and most recently on health care, what if they next visit higher ed? What if all the institutions we now have can't survive? Under those conditions, people will have to think differently. Just maybe it will get to be self-serving to think about the institution as a whole. Just maybe faculty, who often see their highest loyalty not to the school but to their discipline or their department, will begin to care whether the University as a whole grows and is seen as a great institution.

**Footnote:** One of the questions that Professor Bognanno wants to address this coming year is what the state wants from a land-grant university. The University of Minnesota's mission is threefold: research, teaching, and service. Is this still applicable? Is this what

the citizens of this state want? These questions come up because there seems to be some problem explaining faculty work load at a land-grant institution. Are we at a point where we have to turn away from research to devote more time to classroom instruction in order to quell perceptions that University faculty don't work hard enough?

**Johnson:** Well, that question is at the heart of the argument about work load. Why, people want to know, is just a portion of the academic environment taken up with teaching?

But the concern runs deeper than that. People don't just want to know how much of this faculty member or that faculty member's time is devoted to research. They want to ask, well, what research? Who decides what's worth researching? And to whom is it valuable? Is it valuable simply to that faculty

**“I see the possibility, after these shortfalls, that the state may be making focused investment in research to be carried out by University professors.”**

member because of his or her interests? Is it in any way valuable to the University? Is it part of any kind of strategic thinking, in which all of this adds up to something? Does the state get anything out of it, other than holding on to a presumably talented professor?

As far as the governor is concerned, we should be investing more in research—provided we can be strategic about it. Should we not be able to use state funding to drive state interests? If the state's interest in answers converges with academic interest in research, then don't we have a much more powerful equation than we have now?

**Footnote:** How would that work? Do you see a mechanism for that?

**Johnson:** I see the possibility, after these shortfalls, that the state may be making focused investment in research to be carried out by University professors.

**Footnote:** Your assessment then is that the work-load issue is not simply about how much time faculty spend in the classroom.

**Johnson:** The productivity issue is more complex than that—which is not to say we couldn't profit from a fuller discussion of the explainable differences across our institutions and systems in the kind of preparation and work required of instructors. There is an unfortunate tendency to compare any time in the classroom, anywhere, by anybody, as equal.

On the other hand, we need more appreciation for the value of the teaching that does go on. Statistics are very clear that we will need more and more people prepared to be part of a work force whose training goes beyond high school but is different from a baccalaureate education. This is critical to the kind of economy that Americans expect to sustain, and it has nothing to do with how professors divide their time between teaching and research. It has everything to do with having high-quality training programs that are well matched to the capabilities of young people and people who need to be retrained, and that match the changes under way in the economy. The people who teach as part of that equation are critical players. Sometimes, unfortunately, we tend to think of them as the bottom of the hierarchy, but we'd all be better off thinking of our educational needs as a flat continuum.

**Footnote:** Does the Carlson administration have an overarching vision for higher education?

**Johnson:** There really is no official position at this point, and frankly, there may never be one. But you see elements of a working vision in several places. One is the governor's support for reorganizing governance. The governor insists on our having a more accountable arrangement than we have now. We have to look to fewer places to ask the fundamental questions about whether our institutions and systems are performing as we expect. That's what consolidating governance is all about. That doesn't mean creating a huge new bureaucracy. It doesn't mean

standardizing everything in sight to make it all look the same so government can understand it better. It is possible to concentrate governance and decentralize management responsibility at the same time—corporate examples of this abound.

It is not yet clear what part the University plays in this issue. One can argue that the University already has the most accountable governance arrangement around. Maybe no change is required. But obviously the consolidation of the rest of the postsecondary systems raises questions about the effect it will have on the University.

Another element of the governor's vision on higher education is his push to make it more responsive to its users. It's easy to be an exponent of that philosophically. It's much more difficult to figure out which dials you turn, which levers you pull to make that happen. What are the available incentives that would make institutions more responsive to the real needs and interests of students—without sacrificing the leadership role of setting standards and promoting values? Without turning things over to a crude philosophy of merchandising, of what sells?

Clearly the most powerful tool available to policymakers is financing. Given our tradition of supporting institutions and assisting students, what would be the performance results of reversing the

equation by supporting students and assisting institutions? Not guaranteeing any institution its life unless it succeeds in attracting and educating students? Minnesota is one of the most campus-dense states per capita measured against any similar state in the country. Given our chronic fiscal shortfalls, can we realistically expect to sustain that status? If we can expect that not many years down the road

**“For the University to do what the state needs socially, culturally, and economically, it has got to be a place you are not *entitled* to attend. It has to become a place that is elite... an elitism that anybody can earn but no one gets automatically.”**

we will find ourselves with fewer operating centers, how do we make decisions about which ones to close and which ones to keep open? By some committee? The legislature? By fiat? By lot? How do we do that?

The governor's vision also includes capitalizing on what technology makes increasingly

possible and affordable. If we are going to have fewer fully comprehensive campuses, we may still be in the position to serve people who classify themselves as place-bound with centers that rely on technology to bring in, through interactive television, the best in teaching we can provide. The technology is improving so much that it is not only plausible but attractive to consider organizing higher education systems that rely primarily on technology as a delivery system.

The governor strongly believes that higher education must see itself as the next great sector of reform. It would be wise to reflect on the experience of the phone companies, the hospitals, the neighborhood bank, and consider what fundamental policy issues an institution should reasonably contemplate, because those issues are likely to be arising soon.

There's a tendency to think that higher education works well, at least for people who are ready for it, and so it ought to be protected and supported. It is a mistake to think it is as good as it can be or that it is serving everybody well enough. ■

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

### IN THIS ISSUE

Interviewed: Curt Johnson,  
education aide to  
Governor Carlson

Next Footnote—September 30

26244

9/1

721

# FOOTNOTE

☐ October 5, 1992

☐ Volume 6, Number 4

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Erosion of public trust?

Negative news stories stir discussion of troubling issues

Four times in three months, between late May and late August, readers of the *Star Tribune* found stories of alleged misconduct by University faculty.

Three of those stories, about Medical School faculty, ran under the heading "Money vs. Mission at the University of Minnesota," a series that shows every sign of being ongoing. The fourth, involving a case of a quite different nature, was about a biology professor indicted by a federal grand jury on charges of manufacturing and conspiring to sell synthetic heroin.

Troubling issues raised by this negative publicity were the topic at the September 24 Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) meeting with President Nils Hasselmo. Everyone who spoke about the "Money vs. Mission" stories characterized them as biased and unfair, but the discussion went deeper as faculty members looked for underlying reasons for an apparent erosion of public trust in the University.

With state money in short supply, universities must look more and more to partnerships with private industry, Hasselmo said, but "these relationships are putting new stresses and strains on our universities." The principles are clear, he said—the integrity of the scholarly enterprise must not be violated—but the issues are complex.

Recent newspaper articles resulted because "a reporter has spent a full year looking in every nook and cranny" for evidence that money and mission are in conflict, Hasselmo said. The University has 2,500 principal investigators manag-

ing about 5,000 projects, he said, and the "Money vs. Mission" stories focused on three cases, none of which could fairly be called a scandal.

"In one sense it's rather amazing that he hasn't come up with anything more spectacular than this," Hasselmo said, adding quickly that he is not aware of any spectacular scandal waiting to be uncovered.

Any fair-minded person who looks at 2,500 investigators and three incidents would say "Things happen," said geography professor John Adams, but citizens may have other reasons for mistrust.

"In an earlier time the idea of protecting people in certain professions that were modestly compensated was viewed as a reasonable trade," Adams said. Postal workers, for example, once had low salaries and absolute job security. Now the salaries of postal workers—and college professors—are higher, and "people begin to get more uncomfortable about giving job protection and market-level salaries," he said. "We don't do a very good job of explaining to people why that's legitimate, maybe because we don't believe it ourselves."

Autonomy is another sensitive issue for the public, Adams said. "We want it both ways. We want the state to support us, and we also want the independence to do the job."

"You state it very well," Hasselmo said. "I'm certain that there are deeper underlying issues here." What may have been underneath the three "Money vs. Mission" stories about Medical School faculty, he said, was "the dual

suspicion of the health care field and higher education."

Suspicious are aroused whenever there is "some perception that there's a potential for enrichment," Hasselmo said. In the view of many newspaper reporters and taxpayers, University faculty members shouldn't become millionaires, even if their salaries aren't paid with tax dollars and their millions are the payoff for their own research discoveries. These attitudes may have been underlying the story of Dr. David Knighton and the drug Procuren.

Faculty entrepreneurship is both a strength and a danger for universities, Hasselmo said. Robert Zemsky, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, spoke at a deans' retreat in September about the need for universities to learn to manage their assets—which is to say, the time and effort of their faculty—and take more care in the way they deploy the public's money.

"We have to encourage entrepreneurship among the faculty, but where is the boundary between entrepreneurship and becoming totally amorphous in programmatic terms?" Hasselmo said. "We can't assume that, just because somebody can go out and get a grant, that's automatically a good thing."

Academic freedom is the freedom to explore politically unpopular ideas, Hasselmo said. "It isn't the freedom to do what you please when you're employed by an institution."

The faculty work load committee discussed this question, said

Karen Seashore Louis of educational policy and administration. "Can faculty members choose to do research on whatever they want to do, even though it has absolutely nothing to do with the mission of the unit?"

The public perception is that "when we are pressed we become arrogant and circle the wagons," Louis said. "We say, 'You must trust us.'" (Two other faculty members in not-for-attribution interviews expressed this same concern, that the University was responding to criticism by saying "Trust us" and the public wasn't buying it.)

"If we decide to make all of our investigations ignoring the public, we will end up being told by somebody outside" what to do, Louis said. "We really need to create a posture that we will bring in the public to consider these issues with us."

Irwin Rubenstein of plant biology made a similar point. The "Money vs. Mission" stories may have been unfair, he said, but "I think the reporter is putting his finger on an important issue." Corporate money and other private money for research does create pressures and potential conflicts of interest. "It behooves us as an institution to have a dialog on that. You would love to have present at that dialog legislators, the press, faculty, administrators. We are grappling with a difficult issue, and we need to educate each other."

Paul Holm, a chemistry faculty member from Crookston, said the discussion reminded him of a story he heard on the radio on the way to the Twin Cities, about how New York City police officers were up in arms over the idea of a citizen review committee. "Admittedly, we've got an enterprise that's very special. So do the police officers, so do the lawyers," he said. "We've got to go back to the customer and say, OK, come in, take a look at what we've got."

"If we could show everybody in the state of Minnesota everything that goes on at the University, we would be very well off," President Hasselmo said earlier in September at a meeting with news reporters.

At that meeting, reporters questioned why the University said no disciplinary action had been taken against psychiatry professor Barry Garfinkel when problems were found in a drug study he was leading. "Two years ago people said there had been no discipline. Now it turns out that he was docked a month's pay," said reporter Pat Sweeney from the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. "Something obviously was discipline but it was called *not* discipline," said Greg Pinney from the *Star Tribune*. "Is there anything that protects us from changing the definitions of our words?"

It comes down to a technical definition of discipline, Hasselmo said. The settlement with Garfinkel was a negotiated agreement and included confidentiality. "It was renegotiated when it was decided

that it was in the best interests of both parties for it to be made public.

"I'm trying to send a strong message that I don't like confidential settlements in a case like this," Hasselmo told the reporters. "If we can let it all hang out, I much prefer this. I can assure you that the last thing we want to do is mislead anybody."

In reviewing the three "Money vs. Mission" cases with the FCC, Hasselmo said the Garfinkel research project "was terminated because its quality was not acceptable." Whether the action taken is called disciplinary or not is a technicality, he said. "You can question whether there should have been a negotiated settlement."

In the Knighton case, "a faculty member has an equity position in a commercial activity," Hasselmo said. "The University reviewed this with extraordinary care and brought in external reviewers. The judgment was made to go ahead despite the pitfalls. It was not an unreasonable

**"We want it both ways.  
We want the state  
to support us, and we also  
want the independence  
to do the job."**

judgment. A knowledgeable person could have made a different one."

In the case of ALG, Hasselmo said, the drug seems to be effective in preventing rejection in organ-transplant patients. "I'm not sure I fully understand why it hasn't been possible to place it in the hands of a pharmaceutical company," he said. "The University got into production mode, and there was sloppy paperwork. The University itself through an audit identified those problems. The follow-up on the audit was not as crisp or quick as it could have been."

Hasselmo did not talk about the case of John Wood, the tenured biology professor charged with manufacturing a large quantity of "designer" heroin and conspiring to

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 4  
October 5, 1992

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquires to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

sell it through an international drug ring. University people who have commented on that case agree that if Wood is guilty as charged, he should not be on the faculty, and in fact he has resigned.

Conviction of a criminal felony should preclude someone from serving on the faculty, said Dean David Brown of the Medical School. "How can that individual be a role model for students?"

**A** new policy on academic misconduct, drawn up by associate vice president Mark Brenner with extensive faculty consultation, was approved by the regents in September. Brenner said the new policy is stronger than the old one, explicitly protects whistle blowers, and is fair to both complainants and respondents.

The Medical School was the first academic unit in the University to establish guidelines for investigating alleged misconduct, Dean Brown said in an interview. "I pleaded with the University for several years to put something in place." Brown said he chaired the committee that wrote the interim guidelines and "worked long and hard with Mark Brenner" on the new policy.

"I've had to deal with these cases, and they're tough," Brown said. "Invariably every single one of them has to be modified to some degree or tailored for individual circumstances.

"These are always difficult matters. We have tried in the past to deal effectively and fairly with the cases that had to be considered. I believe, even in retrospect, that the outcomes have been reasonable and appropriate and thorough."

The negative publicity has been painful for him and for the Medical School faculty, Brown said. "It gives an inappropriate perception of the specific issues, and even more important it ignores the extraordinary accomplishments that are not being reported. I do care profoundly about public opinion. When things are out of kilter, it hurts." ■

—Maureen Smith

## THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Mario Bognanno  
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

*Faculty members are intelligent and highly educated people who feel qualified to have opinions not only on matters affecting them personally and their departments, but also on matters pertaining to the institution as a whole. They also feel entitled to know about events and forces on decisions that are affecting the institution. Therefore, reasonable involvement of faculty and communication with them are critical in the decision-making process of any college or university.*

**A** former mentor of mine, Howard Bowen, and his coauthor, Jack Shuster, wrote those words, and I find them quite fitting. Like previous chairs of the Faculty Consultative Committee, I am committed to being accountable to the University community, particularly faculty, by opening communication channels, including the liberal distribution of University Senate minutes.

Hundreds of us are actors in the University's governance system. Fifteen senate committees and six committees of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly report through the Consultative Committee en route to their respective bodies. In addition, many subcommittees and task forces are formed on an ad hoc basis.

Broad participation and going through committees to bring items to the senate for action are our ways to build consensus through information—the essence of participatory governance.

Good sources of information about governance issues are minutes of standing committees, such as the Faculty Consultative, Educational Policy, and Finance and Planning committees. Not long ago a colleague wrote, "The FCC and SCC minutes are some of the most useful material I read all week." Another wrote, "I have discovered myself reading in their entirety the SCEP and SCFP minutes, becoming caught up in the business,

discussion, and negotiations."

Mailing lists for committees were recently expanded to include senate members and academic department heads. Your name could be added too. I invite you to send an E-mail note to this address: "garye@mailbox.mail.umn.edu" if you want minutes of the above-mentioned committees. You may receive minutes of other senate and assembly committees by calling Linda Inman at 624-9369.

**I**nformation and communication may also help solve the accountability problem featured in this issue. Our new academic misconduct policy streamlines an administrative procedure for getting at the facts underlying misconduct allegations. Further, our conflict-of-interest policy may soon come under review. Perhaps we can come up with an even better procedure for getting at the facts required to adequately regulate conflicting interests.

What more should the University do? We have about 2,500 principal investigators (PIs) managing approximately 5,000 research projects. When the methods of PIs associated with several projects are questioned, does this mean we have a systemic problem? How tightly should we monitor one another's research? Do we post a monitor in every office or lab?

President Hasselmo seems to be the one held publicly accountable for acts of faculty misconduct (proven and unproven), breakdowns in implementing policy-driven procedures, and poor decision making. Critically, our public image is tarnished whenever the University's standards of scientific inquiry are questioned.

But the president cannot be expected to know how we carry out our research. Some accountability ought to "trickle down"—to us, the faculty, and to college-level administrators. As Univer-

continued on next page



## □ LETTERS

### Faculty drive research

sity citizens, we, the faculty, should continuously remind ourselves that our actions may affect the reputation of the entire academic community.

Some college-level administrators may not be in touch with their faculty, knowing little about their research interests and agendas. Noting this, a colleague recently said that the chair, director, or dean involved with faculty research ought to be a "walk-around" administrator. The communicating type. A person interested in faculty research, who occasionally visits labs or offices, and, yes, who dines with faculty at the Campus Club. I hope these simple, perhaps old-fashioned ideas are still valued by our academic culture. ■

In your interview with Curt Johnson, I am struck with how far Johnson misses the mark in defining a true university when he seems to equate quality with state "strategies," whatever the latter term means. He precludes any possibility of our achieving first-rank status in posing the question, "Is it valuable [research] to that faculty member simply because of his or her interests?" and answering it in the negative when it urgently requires a yes answer.

If, on the other hand, he sees our role as Minnesota A & M, then he is on the right track.

I have no problem with a convergence of academic and state interest, but research in great universi-

ties is driven by faculty not state interests. Yet it is remarkable how often that research benefits society, and sometimes even the state, although those benefits are sometimes subtle. And training programs? Does he mean training the mind? And accountability to whom? More politicians?

When Mr. Johnson realizes how far this poor struggling behemoth of an institution has slipped from academic excellence in the past dozen years, he may wish to rethink the reforms that he and the governor so avidly propose. First we need the respect of our peers. That we have only in ambivalent form. Talk to people in academe. You'll be saddened.

**Don Gillmor**  
*Professor, Journalism and  
Mass Communication*

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

### IN THIS ISSUE

**Faculty Accountability  
Letters: Minnesota A & M?**

**Next Footnote—October 19**

400531220  
PENELOPE S KROSCH  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455

# FOOTNOTE

□ October 28, 1992

□ Volume 6, Number 5

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Working paper

### Workload Task Force issues its report and recommendations

The University is a step closer to an established process for determining and evaluating faculty workload. But not everybody's happy about that fact.

In September, the Faculty Workload Task Force submitted its report to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and the administration; the report is now circulating among departments for response and comments, some of which were aired at an open forum on faculty work load held October 22.

The report reflects pressure from inside and outside the University to formulate a uniform policy for all departments. In turn, that pressure reflects broad social and economic trends not specifically related to the University. As the report states: "Demands for teaching, research, and service output are generally growing while available resources fail to keep pace with inflation." The report also cites the general economic climate and state budget constraints as further reasons why "the general public is demanding more accountability from tax-supported institutions."

"The impetus for the report comes from both outside and inside the faculty," says Carl Adams, chair of the Department of Information and Decision Sciences, who chaired the task force. "The outside is constituents and their representatives in the legislature [asking University officials], What are the methods of directing and guiding faculty activities? What are the means of assuring that our valuation of what faculty ought to be working on is communicated effectively?"

"Internally, all of us as colleagues or sometimes as administra-

tors have experienced situations where individuals are behaving in ways that don't seem totally appropriate."

Despite public concern about this issue, University faculty actually work longer hours than their colleagues at other Minnesota public institutions of higher learning and spend more time in the classroom than faculty at comparable public research institutions elsewhere in the country. A work load statement issued last year showed that in 1990 faculty at public research institutions work an average of 52 hours per week, as opposed to 46 hours per week at public comprehensive universities and 40 hours per week at public two-year institutions.

A 1978 survey of University faculty indicated that the average work load is 59 hours per week, with 50 percent of their time in teaching, 25 percent in research, and 25 percent in service. The average teaching time by faculty at other research institutions is only 43 percent. It should also be noted that since 1978, student-contact hours are up at the University, so in all likelihood the number of hours spent teaching has gone up.

In compiling the report, the task force met with university-based experts on how to determine and report work load. Additionally, the task force collected data from public universities in other states, including Florida, Texas, Kentucky, and Virginia, that have laws or regulations governing faculty activity. While such legislative oversight is still rare—it wouldn't be accurate to call it a trend—it is, in Adams's words, "an issue" in many states.

"If you look at things like the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, there are lots of articles about it, as well as faculty-bashing in the popular press. Where does this concern come from? Lots of areas. The economy is not very good and higher education is a major public expenditure; people are concerned that allocations be used efficiently. It's also very easy for legislators to think they can work their way out of budget constraints by making faculty work harder." Beyond that,

**"The basic tenet of the report is that everybody—including members of the task force—has a professional responsibility to decide what it is they should be doing and to judge whether those activities are appropriate."**

Adams cites concerns about whether American higher education will continue to be "the envy of the world."

The task force was convened in July at the direction of the FCC and the central administration. Response from faculty has included some sharply negative comments.

"It is clear that some of our colleagues feel very, very strongly that any outside input to the discussion of faculty activity is inappropriate and undermines the professional nature of their activities," Adams says. "These people feel that the only valid assessment of faculty is on the basis of their accomplishments within the tripartite mission of the University."

*Workload Report, continued*

Another, less prominent concern, he reports, is the suspicion that efforts to formulate a work load policy are really part of a central administration desire to exert greater control over individual faculty members.

"I can understand their suspicion," he says, "but it wasn't our intent to be read in this way. We were not thinking of this as an attempt to strengthen central administration. We see it more as an important responsibility of a professional group to have a mechanism that oversees professional standards."

After reviewing data from other universities and states, as well as consulting with colleagues, the task force found that effective oversight of work load requires two critical components. One is to establish sound administrative practices and procedures to ensure that work load expectations are set

"clearly and properly" for faculty. The other is to make available hard data on faculty achievements and accomplishments.

Creating these components, according to the report, will do a number of important things. It will help clarify variations in the missions of different units and departments and help develop a consensus on the University's mission. It will help individual faculty adjust their work in light of the University's priorities. It would help correct abuses, and improve the University's ability to explain how faculty activities relate to the school's three missions. This last is particularly important for dealing with legislators and members of the general public.

The report also enumerates a number of principles as guidelines in developing a "clear understanding between each faculty member and the appropriate University department/college/unit regarding expected work load."

The report sets forth these principles:

—Just as units vary in their contributions to the University's three missions, the proportions of time individual faculty members devote to each of those missions also varies. Efficiency and specialization within units also dictate individual variations among faculty.

—Each faculty member should be expected to conduct some work that supports each of the three missions. During an individual's career, the proportion of time devoted to each mission will vary, as with nontenured faculty who must devote additional time to research in order to achieve tenure.

—Faculty members should also be expected to take part in administration and governance.

—At a research university, teaching should be understood to include training in research methods; much of this training occurs most effectively in one-to-one mentoring relationships.

—Faculty must be responsible for establishing their own work schedule and should expect to work a minimum of 40 hours per week.

—For purposes of pay and promotion, faculty should be judged on "the significance and magnitude of their accomplishments rather than on how hard they work."

**"We were not thinking of this as an attempt to strengthen central administration. We see it more as an important responsibility of a professional group to have a mechanism that oversees professional standards."**

—As a group, the faculty in a given unit must meet the work load level assigned to that unit.

—Recognizing that much faculty activity takes place off site, faculty members should be aware of the need to make themselves available to students, colleagues, administrators, and the public.

—Both individual faculty and the institution as a whole are responsible for making sure that faculty members remain current in their field and the University's overall mission as well as the mission of their academic unit.

—Faculty members and their administrators must develop and share a common understanding of faculty work load responsibilities.

—A balance must be struck between academic freedom and the recognition that individual faculty members are not, therefore, free to pursue whatever interests them or to ignore work load issues.

**B**ecause of the size and diversity of the University, no uniform work load requirement can be applied to all faculty members. But the report outlines a process by which individual faculty and their unit administrators can determine appropriate work load expectations. If task force recommendations are followed, this process would be developed in the following way:

—Once the principles of faculty work load and a process of determining work load are adopted by the Faculty Senate and approved by

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 5  
October 28, 1992

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquire to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

## Why talk about work load?

central administration, the senior vice president for academic affairs would work with the deans and the vice chancellors of each campus to develop work load principles in keeping with the specific mission of each unit.

—Once those principles are elaborated, the regular faculty consultative process would be used to develop college and campus work load principles, after which proposals would be sent back to the senior vice president for academic affairs for approval.

—When all the principles are reviewed and approved, unit administrators will meet with individual faculty members to develop a mutual understanding of the individual's expected work load.

"The basic tenet of the report," argues Adams, "is that everybody—including members of the task force—has a professional responsibility to decide what it is they should be doing and to judge whether those activities are appropriate. At the same time, there is the possibility of abuse, and the faculty as a whole must be concerned about maintaining its credibility with society at large. One way to do that is to formulate standards and also processes for identifying and rectifying abuses." ■

—Richard Broderick

*Carl Adams, chair of the Department of Information and Decision Sciences, chaired the Faculty Workload Task Force.*

I wish I had a dollar for every time in the last few months that someone has referred to faculty work load as a sensitive subject. Of course the subject is sensitive—maybe even explosive—from the perspective of the faculty. These days work load discussions seem to emanate from a premise that faculty aren't working hard enough or at least aren't working on the right things. Most faculty members, however, are justifiably proud of their role in developing a higher education system that is the envy of the world. To faculty, any critical questioning of work load seems inappropriate.

Faculty views notwithstanding, circumstances dictate broad interest in work load. Many states are being pressed to reduce expenditures; for most states that means significantly reducing support for higher education. But reducing access to or diminishing the quality of higher education may jeopardize future economic performance. One solution to this dilemma is to increase productivity in higher education—a change that would maintain or even improve quality and access with less overall expenditure.

What's at stake when faculty work load is questioned is society's commitment to the professional role of faculty.

Most faculty believe that society has entrusted them with the responsibility to create, develop, organize, disseminate, and apply knowledge for the common good. Faculty invest considerable time and money preparing themselves to act in this professional role, and most exercise it responsibly and well. As with every profession, though, some faculty do not act responsibly. Faculty also are expected both to shape and reflect society's values by relating their

energies to society's highest priorities. This is sometimes difficult to do.

The faculty must ensure that its members exercise professional prerogatives in ways that respond to society's values and do not abuse professional standards. If we fail to meet this responsibility, we could lose society's commitment to our current professional model. In recent years, society has modified its relationship with professionals in law, medicine, and even religion. Unfortunately, several states have already moved to determine, through legislation and compliance reporting, what publicly supported faculty activities should be.

The Faculty Workload Task Force was asked to address within a very short time frame some of the concerns noted above. We saw our charge as proactive: to propose both processes and principles that would help faculty execute their professional prerogatives.

At the heart of our proposal is a process for jointly determining what activities are expected of faculty. Effective communication among faculty and appropriate administrators offers the promise of clarifying the match between faculty efforts and society's priorities. We developed a set of general principles for determining faculty activity. Since the University has considerable diversity, we presumed that some areas would want to provide additional principles consistent with the general ones but that refine the guidelines for their faculty. The principles at all levels, we believe, are expressions of professional group standards.

Virtually all the processes and principles we propose relate to faculty activities, the major input to our university system. Some faculty believe that it is inappropriate to discuss faculty responsibilities in input terms: they feel that only outputs are relevant.

Our proposal clearly indicates that pay and promotion are appropriately based on performance, not

## Here's your chance to speak up

activity. Still we see merit in addressing activity for several reasons. Performance is not easy to judge, especially in cases where faculty are abusing professional prerogatives. Also, there is a general correlation between activity and performance. Finally, for those outside the profession, activity measures build a sense of understanding that is not as easily achieved from performance measures.

To involve the faculty in the development of this proposal, we consulted with many faculty during the drafting process and held a special information meeting with the Faculty Senate. It is essential that any policies or processes related to faculty work load adopted at the University must be supported by a broad majority of the faculty. Please do not hesitate to make your views known. ■

—Carl Adams

If you'd like to get the regents' attention about any topic concerning the University, you'll have your chance during an open forum November 12 from 9:30 a.m. to noon in Cowles Auditorium in the Humphrey Institute on the West Bank.

An agenda will be prepared, and speakers will be limited to five minutes each. As the announcement states, "This may seem like a brief time, but past experience has shown that careful planning and

cooperation can produce an adequate and concise statement."

If you want to be a speaker, contact the regents office at the address and phone below. Give your name, address, phone number, focus of your remarks, and your position or background. The deadline for submitting your information is November 5.

Write or call the regents office at 220 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis 55455, phone 612-625-6300. ■

## Volunteers needed as conflict advocates

Volunteers from the faculty and academic professional staff are needed to act as advocates for their University colleagues facing employment conflicts.

Advocates provide assistance and support for people in a formal hearing—one of the methods used to resolve employment conflicts at the University.

To volunteer or to inquire, contact the Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy and Grievance Advisory Program at 612-627-4032.

The program, sponsored by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, is directed by Maurine Venters. Offices are in Dinkytown in the University Technology Center, 1313 Fifth Street S.E., Minneapolis. ■

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

### IN THIS ISSUE

Getting out ahead of  
the work load issue

Next Footnote—November 16

# FOOTNOTE

□ December 9, 1992

□ Volume 6, Number 6

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Money for school

### The U's legislative request is ready. Are the funds?

The ink is hardly dry on the University's 1993-95 legislative request, but already administrators are steeling themselves for the possibility of further cuts in state funding. The University may experience a shortfall of up to \$52 million over the next two years, according to President Hasselmo, in which case he predicts that as many as 900 more jobs may be on the line—to add to the 1,000 state-funded jobs eliminated in response to last year's cuts—and students will face more tuition increases.

Overall, the University is asking for only an 8.4 percent increase in state funding over the coming biennium. University officials believe that seeking a larger increase in appropriations would not necessarily result in more funding. As it was, the governor's finance office asked agencies to submit a "flat-budget" request in draft form. Instead, the University responded with a proposal that highlights a modest increase and includes tables showing how various combinations of cuts or flat-budget appropriations would raise tuition or reduce staff.

"Essentially, the state asked us to present a flat budget and said, 'Tell us how you are going to use the money.'" says Jim Infante, senior vice president for academic affairs. "We said, 'Thank you for your suggestion. Here's the minimum of what we need.'"

Infante says that during the current biennium, "we have retrenched 25 percent of all that can be retrenched.

"We closed Waseca," he says. "That represents \$1.7 million in

faculty salaries. In a moment of desperation, the University of Minnesota cannot shut down its English department."

The University's requested increase totals about \$74 million, most of it to cover inflation and salary increases tied to inflation. Having sufficient funds on hand to provide raises is the top priority. Although administrators do not feel that the University has lost ground in its ability to attract top faculty members, many fear that another salary freeze would erode that competitive position.

In addition to inflationary increases, the University also wants \$13 million for deferred maintenance—the second highest priority

**The University's request totals about \$74 million, most of it to cover inflationary increases. Providing raises is the top priority.**

after raises—\$1.2 million for a children, youth, and family initiative; \$8 million for Lake Superior water research; and \$2 million for distance learning.

Money for deferred maintenance is critical, officials contend, because the school has already accumulated a backlog of \$300 million and is adding another \$20 million to \$25 million a year.

Infante, a member of the administration team that prepared the request, points out that, adjusting for inflation, the last round of cuts

in state funding represents a \$57 million loss for fiscal year 1993, or about 12 percent of the total yearly budget. While that cut hurt almost all units of the University, the most critical loss, he says, was to infrastructure, which includes maintenance.

To make matters worse, by fiscal year (FY) 1995, the University will need an additional \$9 million for new facilities coming on stream—the biological sciences building and the art museum. Without that extra funding, Infante says, "we are in deep trouble.

"As a result of the cuts we have already sustained," he says, "there has been a reduction in the number of people supported by state funds; there has been a blunting of the reallocation process since most of the reallocation involved state funds; and we are faced with problems in infrastructure and facilities."

The decline in state funding relative to other sources of revenue has changed the makeup of academic staff. In terms of the total number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions supported by state funds, there are almost 400 fewer today than 15 years ago.

That doesn't necessarily mean there are fewer employees, however, than a year ago. Last year, as the University was cutting back state-funded positions, it was adding 975 head-count jobs supported by nonstate funding. State funding now represents less than 30 percent of the University's total budget.

As a result, University departments increasingly rely on soft funding and research grants. That means hiring more research assistants and postdoctoral students, fewer teaching assistants and full-time faculty. The change, however, appears to be temporary. In future years, research money is likely to shrink along with state funding.

Work on the biennial request began last summer with a November 1 deadline for issuing a document. But efforts kicked into high gear when the University learned that the governor wanted a draft proposal by September 15. That meant the team responsible for putting the request together had to have a draft ready to present to the regents in September, a month earlier than anticipated.

The unprecedented request

seems designed to give the state's finance team a few extra weeks to prepare its own budget proposal for the legislative session that begins in January.

This year, too, the governor has asked recipients of state funding to relate their requests to the goals laid out in "Minnesota Milestones," a report released in draft form in June by the state planning department. Three of the investment initiatives in the University's request—for a children, youth, and family initiative, Lake Superior research, and distance learning—were recommended for funding by the governor.

In its last biennial request, the University—sensitive to the state's shortfall the previous legislative session—did not ask for increased state funding. Despite that restraint, and despite the fact that the University was already carrying out a \$60 million internal reallocation, \$43 million was slashed from its base funding.

To cover those cuts, the University was forced to eliminate about 1,000 positions (or 720 FTE jobs), raise tuition, freeze salaries for a year, and cut some programs.

The fate of the University's current request depends mostly on factors beyond its control. The biggest of these, of course, is the size of the budget shortfall facing the state in the coming biennium. Until recently, estimates of the deficit have been about \$850 million, although one highly respected member of the legislature, Senator Gene Merriam, projected a much larger shortfall—perhaps as much as \$1.5 billion.

In the last two weeks, however, things have begun to look less dire, as state revenues continue to run ahead of expectations, and as sentiment grows that the economy may, at long last, be pulling out of the recession that has dogged it since the spring of 1990. Some experts now estimate the deficit at about \$350 million to \$400 million. Even so, the University could face tough sledding trying to convince the legislature to increase funding.

"This is probably the most

modest legislative request that's been made during my time here," says David Berg, assistant to the president. "The point is, there's no reason to get unrealistic expectations out on the table."

Minnesota faces few options for covering the difference between revenues and outlays. The first, of course, is to raise taxes—never politically popular and even less so in the midst of a sluggish economy. Another is to cut spending—again. Another is to dip into the state's reserve fund.

"There are a lot of things contributing to the deficit," says Donna Peterson, the University's legislative lobbyist. "We have a new

**"We closed Waseca. That represents \$1.7 million in faculty salaries. In a moment of desperation, the University of Minnesota cannot shut down its English department."**

growth in the number of young people in the state. That requires larger outlays for K-12 education, which is funded on a per-student formula. A big share of the state's human services budget goes to nursing homes, and the population of older people is also growing at a time when the cost for nursing home care is rising." The same is true, she observes, for medical assistance costs.

"The state has not necessarily added new programs," she says, "but the demands placed upon current programs are growing. Some of those programs are mandated by the federal government, some not."

Another factor affecting the biennial request will be the composition of key legislative committees. Committee assignments will not be given until January, but already one thing is clear: turnover caused by resignations and the election of new legislators means that the University will be dealing

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 6  
December 9, 1992

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of Footnote's publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquires to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.



with many unfamiliar faces.

"But even looking past the committees, it's important to remember that it's the legislature as a whole that controls the higher education budget," says Peterson. "Obviously, it is important that committee members understand our needs and can explain them to other legislators, but we have to get the message out to a much wider group as well."

Of late, that message has not always been positive, a fact that could have unforeseen consequences on the legislative request. In recent months, the University has been buffeted by bad publicity, most notably the ongoing problems surrounding the ALG transplant drug program. How this bad press will play out this winter is anybody's guess. Already the state's economic woes have increased demands for "accountability" from public institutions. Such demands also pressure the University to devise some kind of process for evaluating faculty work load.

Says Peterson, "No one article or issue seems to be the one that explodes. If anything, it's more a matter of a repeated message that something is wrong."

"There's no question that any accountability issues hurt our credibility and force us to shift our energies toward getting out information about what has transpired and the response to the problems," says Robert Erickson, senior vice president for finance and operations.

"I think we are dealing with a two-faceted issue," he says. "I know from my discussions with legislators that they realize we are working hard to make the University more efficient, and putting in systems for getting information so we can do a better job of oversight.

"On the other side of things, each time some question is raised in the press, legislators are going to question how far along we are in implementing those new systems."

Peterson believes, however, that there is still a reservoir of good

feeling toward the University at the legislature. Some of that is the afterglow of reallocation: the University gets high marks for trying to put its house in order even before the state began running deficits. Many legislators are also aware of how last year's cuts hurt and might look elsewhere first to find savings.

Ultimately, though, higher education issues will undoubtedly take a back seat to what legislators see as more pressing priorities—health care and health insurance coverage for all Minnesotans, the environment, and public safety.

### State funding now is less than 30 percent of the University's total budget.

There is much more concern about the health of K-12 in Minnesota than about the well-being of higher education—and that could make it difficult for the University to press its case for increased funding.

And if it can't, that will mean another round of cuts following hard on the heels of the reductions of the past couple of years. "We have already pared things very close, perhaps even past the point where we should have," says Erickson. "I don't see much capacity to cut a lot more." ■

—Richard Broderick

## What 'abuses'?

*This letter, written to Carl Adams, chair of the Faculty Workload Task Force, is printed here with the author's permission.*

I know you have much to do, and many places to go; but, will you take the time to inform me (or, better, publish the answer somewhere so that we all might know it) regarding one small concern in the work load issue?

What, exactly, are the "abuses" everyone mentions, but no one specifies? Mr. Broderick acknowledges them in *Footnote*; Mr. Purple accepts their possibility in the *Daily*; you find them in *Brief*, and elsewhere. OK. But, what the hell are they?

Who, and/or what, are we going to get, or fix, or correct?

This may be important to know.

**Mike Bennett**  
*Rhetoric*  
*Twin Cities campus*

## □ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Irwin Rubenstein  
Chair, Senate Finance and Planning  
Committee

Our committee, on behalf of the faculty, students, and staff of this University, will need to face and answer many difficult questions in the near future. Given the state's financial condition and the relatively low priority given to higher education by our governor and the state legislature, we should not expect, in my opinion, much additional support from our state in the coming biennium. In fact, we may have to cut our budget by at least 2 percent. I would suggest that this University can no longer continue to meet the long list of state needs that it now does. "We can no longer do more with less."

These assumptions raise many questions and issues. Where can we find the resources to remain a high-quality research university? I can suggest three ways.

The first is to reduce our administrative costs by increasing our efficiency. So far our attempts to reduce costs have caused considerable stress on our loyal staff. I hope that future efforts to reduce costs will be more successful and sensitive to the needs of faculty and staff alike.

The second is to increase our nonstate revenues—for example, the tuition our students pay. This is about as popular as raising taxes, but may be necessary to bridge the way to a smaller university that can retain its quality for the education of undergraduates and the training of our country's future scholars and researchers.

The third way is to reduce the size of the University by reducing the number of faculty—the ulti-

mate determinant of the cost of this University.

Reducing the number of faculty will have many effects. Fewer faculty means that there will be fewer academic programs, larger classes, fewer staff, and possibly fewer students. Our state will be a big loser, since each faculty member, on average, brings in \$110,000 in nonstate funds—about twice the average faculty salary.

But, a reduced number of faculty will free up resources for better support of what we choose to keep doing, for salary increases to keep our present faculty and staff at this University, and for resources to begin to attack our \$300 million of deferred maintenance.

These difficult choices involve all of us—faculty, staff, and students. The administration needs to be sure that early, adequate, and meaningful consultation has taken place before decisions are almost final. ■

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

Legislative request:  
priorities and realities

Next Footnote—January 6

400531220  
PENELOPE S KROSCHE  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455

# FOOTNOTE

□ January 13, 1993

□ Volume 6, Number 7

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Rating the brass, part II

### The U moves to include faculty in administrator reviews

Slowly, cautiously, given the complex and even delicate nature of the subject, the University of Minnesota is inching toward a comprehensive system in which the views and perceptions of faculty members will be included in the performance evaluation of deans, department heads, and other top-level administrators.

At the moment, there is no consistent form of review and performance evaluation for these administrators. Each year, president Nils Hasselmo undergoes an exhaustive performance review that includes feedback from faculty, staff, regents, and interested parties outside the University community. Yet some department heads or chairs are never reviewed; others receive feedback solely from the unit's consultative body.

Central administration has embraced the idea of regular performance evaluations of administrators that include input from faculty and others. Last year, the University carried out a pilot evaluation system with all academic administrators on the Twin Cities campus from the dean's level up. The system was developed by Carole Bland, a professor in family practice and community health, and was based on a year and a half of research.

Now, an FCC subcommittee is about to recommend its guidelines for the review and evaluation of academic administrators. Chaired by Amos Deinard, an associate professor in pediatrics, the committee has already submitted a draft report on its recommendations to the FCC and is now preparing final recommendations to submit to Vice President Infante.

"If the provost comes back to the subcommittee and says he likes our recommendations and now would like some assistance putting them into practice, we may make further recommendations," says Deinard. "To date, we have only been asked to make general recommendations—to comment on the process, not on how it would work in detail."

One thing Deinard and other FCC members take pains to emphasize is that their support for faculty input in administrator evaluations is not motivated by an "us versus them" mentality. Fear that such a perception might take hold was fueled by an article in the *Minnesota Daily* entitled "Faculty targets 'old boys' clubs."

In a letter to the editor of the paper, FCC chair Mario Bognanno tried to correct misperceptions the *Daily* article may have created—and to prevent any artificial rift to develop between the faculty and administrators:

"The Faculty Consultative Committee and, for that matter, most of the faculty with whom I speak, believe that the faculty's role in the U's system of governance satisfies our need for 'empowerment.' Further, the 'us against them' dichotomy does not describe the faculty and administration relationship. A better description is suggested by the word 'we.'

"In fact, the faculty and University administration are in pursuit of many common goals. Faculty want to produce top-quality academic teaching, research, and services in their classrooms, clinics, labs, libraries, studios, and offices; University administration wants

these very same things. We are not in opposing we-they camps. However, communications between faculty and administration can be improved, and the two groups should work more closely together to achieve these common goals.

"Many of us, including administrators, believe that quality improvements can be made through faculty participation in key areas...[A]t the department and college level, faculty and academic administrators work closely together. Thus, faculty may be able to add important information about the performances these administrators are turning in. The Faculty Consultative Committee is looking for a way that faculty might be able to contribute to the administrator evaluation process. The administration is cooperating with us, and when we come up with an idea we will pass it on to the administration..."

Says Bognanno, "We're not intruding on a prerogative. We're not. That's why we will pass along ideas as suggestions rather than as a matter of senate policy. From my point of view, I don't think we should beat people over the head with this thing. If the administration thinks what we come up with is a good idea, they will adopt it or some variation. Or they can ignore it. How they go about evaluating administrators is in a sense up to the administration and the regents. We can make recommendations, but this is not an area where we should be making policy."

"The overriding purpose of review and evaluation," says Deinard, "should be constructive criticism for the purposes of helping the person under review learn how

*Rating the Brass, continued*

he or she is managing the unit, and to give the supervisor an idea of how an administrator is performing."

Such information would help prevent crises, says Judith Garrard, a professor in the School of Public Health who served on the Deinard subcommittee.

"It seems that deans and department heads go along until they reach some crisis or confrontation that comes as a big surprise," she says. "Ongoing feedback would lead to modifications and midcourse corrections in the management of departments and colleagues that would be beneficial to administrators. Think of it as an investment in those administrators."

"If you want to evaluate performance of academic administrators, the faculty ought to be tapped into it," says Bognanno. "I think there is a general consensus that faculty have the information based upon their work with deans and depart-

ment chairs. This information ought to be central to what any administrator would want to have in job performance review.

"In Morrill Hall when we talk about evaluating a dean, what we're talking about is whether quality of instruction has improved, whether research has improved, whether the dean has cultivated professional relationships with faculty. If this is the kind of information we want, then the faculty are an ideal source."

That kind of input is particularly important right now, he believes, because of the number of new administrators working at the University.

"This is a period of tremendous change," he says. "There are a lot of new deans and a lot of new administrators. I think central administration needs information on how these folks are doing and that this information ought not be denied these individuals. If they are moving down the wrong path, it will be an opportunity to make a midcourse change in direction.

"Only a fraction of our administrators are in a position to have five-year reviews," he says. "If we are really serious about total quality management at this university, it seems that faculty ought to be working hand-in-glove with administrators. And to the extent that is not happening, the central administration ought to know about it."

**B**eyond the utilitarian arguments for faculty participation, advocates also offer a principled argument on its behalf.

Faculty consultation on this matter, Garrard contends, is merely part of a trend in which faculty members are increasingly expected to take responsibility for governance.

"There is a general decentralization taking place from the central administration on down," she observes. "We are expected to be more accountable for what we do individually and collectively, and in order to do that I think the faculty needs to exercise more ownership in the University. As stakeholders in a cultural environment of total quality management, it just seems logical that faculty should be consulted on issues like administrator performance."

**S**o, if everybody (or at least almost everybody) is for it, just what would faculty participation in performance evaluation of administrators look like?

The Deinard subcommittee made its preliminary report to the FCC early in December. Along with it was a draft proposal setting out a detailed plan of reviews that would cover all the differing terms of appointment found in administrative positions. Some FCC members felt the proposal too complex.

"We need to rework the plan," says Garrard. "We set out to design a very simple policy but the nature of the beast we were trying to work with made that very difficult. Department heads at the University are appointed in a variety of ways—some in rotating chairs, others for five years, others virtually for life or at the pleasure of the dean. For our committee to meddle in telling different academic units how long their department heads should serve or with what authority and responsibilities was beyond the scope of our assignment.

"We were trying to take into account the complexity of this. I regard what we did as no more than a draft. It is not a fait accompli.

"Essentially, we are looking at this [process] recognizing that there are inherent differences between units and that the frequency of reviews would differ," says Deinard. "But we are agreed that reviews should be conducted on all administrators in the 93XX class. We should not have people in that class—as we now do—who can say, 'I have never had a review.'

"One component of the review and evaluation has to include information from subordinates," says Deinard. "For deans and department heads, one source of that input should be from a representative group of faculty. That input should be anonymous. There should be a standardization of questions to which the faculty are asked to respond, with a recognition that there would be unit-specific questions."

Some administrators have argued that a comprehensive performance evaluation employing input from faculty would be too costly, too

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 7  
January 13, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquire to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

unwieldy, and too complex to work. Better to have no system than one that will not be used or, at best, used improperly.

Karen Seashore Louis, head of the Department of Educational Policy and Administration and an FCC member, disagrees. She is a staunch supporter of the need for—and the practicality of—performance evaluations that canvass a broad enough base of faculty to be statistically reliable.

"If the evaluations are done like Nils Hasselmo's annual review, then the process would be too cumbersome," she says. "That's

**"Reviews should be conducted on all administrators in the 93XX class. We should not have people in that class—as we now do—who can say, 'I have never had a review.'"**

why it's important to have a system that is simple or it won't happen."

Louis bases her argument on her own background in survey research. For several years she was associate director of the Center for Survey Research at the University of Massachusetts. She has also worked with a private social science research institution.

Instruments to obtain reliable information from faculty already exist, she says, and only need to be modified to the University's needs. They needn't be much different from the performance evaluation surveys used at the research institution where she worked or from similar instruments widely used throughout the private sector.

"It's very simple to design a good survey," she says. "And it's very easy to design a decent short survey that would supply good feedback about the performance of an administrator. Many such surveys are designed for use in settings where employees have a great deal of autonomy and whose concerns are similar to those of faculty."

Furthermore, she believes that the evaluations should include input from nonacademic staff as

well as faculty, especially given current concerns about quality at the University. "If you are trying to run an institution on a quality basis, it's very hard to do without having some view of how subordinates perceive their administrators.

"That should not be the only criterion in judging an administrator's performance, of course; administrators often have to do things that aren't 'popular.' On the other hand, if a significant percentage of subordinates are distressed with an administrator, that's a subject that ought to be explored. It's very easy for administrators to ignore signals that all is not well."

And not just administrators but the institution as a whole, she argues. In academia, where faculty have wide latitude to act independently, performance of an academic unit may or may not accurately reflect the performance of its administrators.

"It's easy in this kind of environment to confuse the performance of a unit with the performance of an administrator," she says. "It's quite possible to have a high-performing unit and a low-performing administrator. Faculty can be productive despite a poor administrator. That's why it is particularly important to hear from faculty about deans and department heads."

As with any proposed change in administrative processes—particularly those that touch upon questions of governance and the balance of relative power between faculty and administration—the very idea that administrator evaluations should include faculty input raises hackles. But the momentum for some form of faculty participation is strong.

"Sure, there's some resistance," says Bognanno. "That's only natural. But the leadership of the University is cooperating with the initiative and appear eager to hear what we have to say about a method through which faculty might share a voice in evaluations." ■

—Richard Broderick

## Rating paychecks

While the University is moving toward a plan to involve faculty in administrative performance reviews, work is also under way on involvement in another matter altogether—faculty compensation.

Last year, an FCC subcommittee came up with a series of proposals on when and how faculty input would be sought in the process of determining compensation packages for their colleagues. On May 21, 1992, the Faculty Senate approved the recommendations and passed them along to central administration for review and revision.

The policies approved by the senate are both specific and emphatic. Faculty "must assist" in developing the procedures for making salary decisions for colleagues in their department or budgetary unit—whichever is smaller. Together with their administrator, faculty are given the lead role in formulating guidelines for the process of determining annual salaries, as well as for the annual review of each faculty member.

The policy states: "The format for making salary decisions must assure that salary determinations are carried out in a consultative manner, and that faculty members within the unit have the opportunity to participate in the salary discussion determination process as a committee of the whole or through the salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members." The policy also mandates annual performance reviews of faculty with their unit administrators and periodic in-depth evaluations.

As revised by the central administration, the policy retains much of the language about annual and in-depth performance reviews and acknowledges the need for faculty consultation of some kind in salary determination, but the revision eliminates all language making such involvement mandatory. The new wording: "The faculty must be given the opportunity, through normal faculty consultative processes, to participate in preparing the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which annual

*continued on next page*

**Rating paychecks, continued**

salary increases are determined within the department."

The revisions have caused concern and a certain amount of confusion among faculty members. Some have voiced the sentiment that the revised version is substantially the same as the original, only couched in less specific terminology. Others have argued that central administration has all but vetoed meaningful faculty participation in the review process. Meanwhile, the revised policy is under review by the senate.

"There is a change in the level at which faculty members would be involved," says Carol Carrier, associate vice president for human resources.

"We feel it is important for faculty to have a voice in establishing procedures for a review. However, the administration feels it is the responsibility of department heads and deans to make final decisions on individual faculty members, and therefore we did not want to mandate that faculty be involved in setting salaries for their colleagues. That seemed to be the case with the policy passed by the senate."

The revised version of the policy is now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

—Richard Broderick

## Call for nominations

November 17, the University Senate approved a motion merging the Twin Cities faculty and nonrepresented Duluth (UMD) campus faculty for purposes of Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) elections. Nominations are now being accepted for new Twin Cities/nonrepresented UMD faculty positions on the SCC, the executive committee of the University Senate.

The SCC oversees the work of the University Senate and its committees, and its members meet regularly with the president and other officials to discuss and give advice on the many vital issues affecting the University. Twin Cities members of the consultative committee also serve as the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee. SCC members do not represent specific constituencies, but serve the total University community.

Nominees should have a broad perspective on University affairs, an interest in major policy and budgeting issues, some experience in University or college governance, and a readiness to help shape the University's agenda. Service on the consultative committee involves a substantial time commitment.

Terms last three years.

**Nominations, citing the nominee's qualifications, may come from any college and are due January 14.** Contact Linda Inman of the Senate Office at 612-625-0310, fax 612-626-1609. The address is 427 Morrill, 100 Church St SE, Minneapolis MN 55455-0110.

Twin Cities nonrepresented UMD faculty whose terms continue beyond June 1993 are Mario Bognanno (management), Judith Garrard (public health), Karen Seashore Louis (education), Toni McNaron (CLA), and Shirley Zimmerman (human ecology). Members whose terms expire in June, and who are eligible for re-election, are John Adams (CLA), Amos Deinard (Medical School), and Benjamin Liu (IT).

Nominating committee members are chair Richard Goldstein (625-5552), Iris Charvat (625-3199), W. Andrew Collins (624-1551), Richard Eisenberg (218-726-8512), Lael Gatewood (625-4909), and John Sullivan (624-4305). (Unless otherwise noted, area code for these numbers is 612.)

The Crookston and Morris campuses conduct separate elections. ■

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

Reviewing administrators and setting salaries—tasks for faculty?

Serials  
U of M Libs./1AJE4646  
OMWL

Next Footnote—February 10

# FOOTNOTE

□ February 10, 1993

□ Volume 6, Number 8

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Nils Hasselmo on the governor's budget proposal

**Editor's note:** *The biennial budget proposed by Governor Carlson would cut \$27 million from the University's funding and increase the percentage of instructional costs covered by tuition to 45 percent by 1995. The budget also would eliminate state subsidies for certain master's degree programs at the University deemed "practitioner oriented." These include M.A.'s offered by several departments.*

On February 1, President Nils Hasselmo testified before the Ways and Means Committee of the Minnesota House of Representatives about the impact of the governor's budget proposal.

**Mr. Chairman,** members of the committee:

Thanks for this opportunity to speak to you about our budget situation.

First let me say that I understand the difficulties the governor and you face in allocating scarce tax dollars to many worthy activities.

We who work at the University of Minnesota have been trying very hard over the past several years—as in the more distant past—to be part of the solution to the state's economic problems. We enter into the discussions of the 1993-95 budget in the same spirit.

Our evaluation of the governor's budget is a very preliminary one. We're in discussion with the finance department concerning several issues.

The proposal must inevitably be seen against the backdrop of what we've experienced, and what we

undertook to do, during the past several years.

In fact, we are at a point where it is necessary for the state and the University of Minnesota to renegotiate our contract. The contract entered into in 1987—and reaffirmed in 1989—expires this year, in 1993. It involved quality improvements; enrollment; federal, corporate, and private support for research; state support; tuition; and other matters.

Are we to reaffirm the contract? Or, are we to negotiate a different contract?

The governor's budget raises questions that have a bearing on some fundamentals of our contract.

Within the time available today, I can only suggest a few issues I will be looking forward to an opportunity to review our contract in more detail with you, as appropriate, and of course especially with your colleagues on the Education Committee.

Let me say it again: The governor's budget raises questions that have to do with the basic contract between the state and the University of Minnesota.

**Point #1.** I believe the governor and the legislature want quality education at the University of Minnesota—manifested—among other measures—in higher retention and graduation rates.

In 1991, we adopted a Restructuring and Reallocation Plan that shifts \$58 million of our existing state-appropriated dollars, about 13 percent of the then state-appropriated dollars, into programs with heavy student demand, and

where quality improvements were especially important. (I say "heavy student demand" even after we reduced our undergraduate population in the Twin Cities by 6,000 FTE students by agreement with the 1987 Legislature.)

In spite of the fact that our state-appropriated dollars were reduced by \$43 million in the 1991-93 biennium—we lost 1,000 positions—we are now more than halfway through that \$58 million restructuring and reallocation.

The improvements have been substantial and *are already showing up in improved retention and graduation of students.*

The governor's budget proposal, which cuts another \$47.6 million from our instructional appropriation for the biennium, raises serious questions concerning our ability to continue the quality improvements.

**Point #2.** The governor's budget proposes significant tuition increases.

During the 1991-93 biennium, we raised tuition by 9 percent and 14 percent respectively. Our students now pay 40.7 percent of the cost of instruction. The Governor's budget proposes that an even higher percentage of the cost of instruction be borne by the students—as a *matter of policy.*

This could be offset by significant improvements in financial aid for students whose families' incomes are less than \$45,000.

Low-income students now do not fully use the financial aid available. There is evidence that the "sticker shock" of high tuition is a factor in deterring them from even applying. What will another signifi-



*Hasselmo, continued*

cant tuition increase do to their access?

What will happen to reciprocity? Wisconsin students would be coming here for two thirds the tuition Minnesota students would pay here—or in Wisconsin.

Will we be forced to recruit nationally for "paying" students to finance the education of diminished numbers of Minnesota students?

These questions must be answered. They imply a new kind of contract between the state and the University of Minnesota.

**Point #3.** The governor's budget removes all state funding from practitioner-oriented master's programs.

Four years ago, the so-called "MSPAN Report," commissioned by the legislature through the HECB [Higher Education Coordinating Board], pointed out specifically the need to expand access to such practitioner-oriented programs.

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 8  
February 10, 1993

*Managing Editor:* Richard Broderick  
*Copy Editor:* Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Minnesota Milestones, the section on "learning," states: "Lifelong education will be valued as the key to individual and community economic success." (emphasis added.)

With projected tuition increases ranging from 81.1 percent for the master's in social work to 488.6 percent for the master's in nursing, are we really addressing the right way the issue of "community economic success" through lifelong learning?

A drastic change in the state's contract with the University of Minnesota is implied.

**Point #4.** The governor has proposed a pay freeze for the first year of the 1993-95 biennium.

The faculty and staff of the University of Minnesota had a pay freeze in the first year of the 1991-93 biennium! I believe they were the only group of public employees who had such a pay freeze.

**"During the 1991-93 biennium, we raised tuition by 9 percent and 14 percent respectively. Our students now pay 40.7 percent of the cost of instruction. The governor's budget proposes that an even higher percentage of the cost of instruction be borne by the students—as a matter of policy."**

In the second year of the 1991-93 biennium we reallocated existing funds for an average 5 percent increase, after all other public employees had received increases in both years. (We negotiate with the same unions as the state, and we're required by law to pay our civil service salaries comparable to those of state employees.)

We're probably under as strong competitive pressure for talent as is anybody. We led with a pay freeze last biennium. We'll wait and see this time!

The salaries we can pay determine in certain ways the kind of University we will be.

What's going to be the state's

contract with the University of Minnesota.

**Point #5.** Is this budget a step toward restructuring higher education in Minnesota?

Is restructuring necessary? Yes. Is restructuring under way? Yes.

The University of Minnesota has restructured and reallocated more in the past two to three years than in any comparable period in its history!

We will continue to restructure and reallocate.

Just one example. We have just established an unprecedented Twin Cities Educational Partnership to offer new, applied, employment-directed bachelor's degrees in cooperation with the community colleges, technical colleges, and state universities. A major new initiative—to serve the state's economy even better through new collaboration.

We are seeking through a new, radical phase of our strategic planning to find new ways, even more cost-effective ways, to serve the state even better through teaching, research, and outreach.

We even now receive only 28 percent of our funding from Minnesota tax dollars. We already employ 16,000 people, two thirds of our faculty and staff, on funds other than Minnesota tax dollars.

We believe we can do even better in the future.

We need to discuss this restructuring, the educational and economic advantages of different approaches, as part of our contract.

At this stage, I would ask:

—Don't pull the rug out from under us by adopting a punitive budget.

—Don't cut the all-important state investment, the 28 percent, at a time when it is paying unprecedented dividends.

—Don't undermine further the morale of our students, faculty, and staff at a time when they're all straining to do even better.

I will be looking forward to further discussion of those issues with the finance department and with you and other legislators.

We need to decide what the contract between the state and its land-grant University should be. ■

# FCC puts review policy on Senate docket

The FCC has placed the following proposal on faculty involvement in performance evaluation of administrators on the docket of the February 18 Senate meeting. The proposal was formulated by an FCC subcommittee headed by Amos Deinard, an associate professor of pediatrics.

## Recommendations to the provost regarding policy and evaluation of academic administrators—

On January 29, 1992, E.F. Infante, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, issued an academic personnel policy dealing with the review and evaluation of academic administrators. The policy, developed to ensure consistency in the performance reviews of administrators across the University, was reviewed and approved by faculty and academic professional and administrative governance committees, deans, and vice presidents. The Provost intended the policy to apply to all academic administrators (93xx classes) and to be followed in conducting the annual reviews during the 1991-92 academic year and thereafter.

This policy was reviewed by the Faculty Consultative Committee, which adopted the following recommendations to the Provost for revision of the policy. The FCC recognizes that because of inherent differences between units, the process and/or the frequency of review may differ among units of the University.

1. The policy should apply to all in the 93xx class.

2. Reviews and evaluations should be performed—annually

—in more detailed fashion periodically (e.g., every 3 years) for those on annual (K), limited (L), or fixed-term (J) appointments.

3. Every annual and periodic review and evaluation of an academic administrator should include, as one component, information from subordinates or persons with whom the person being reviewed generally interacts in the conduct of the unit's business. Timely notice of the review shall be given to the unit concerned.

Faculty should routinely participate in the review and evaluation of academic administrators in order to provide, on a regular basis, con-

structive information to the administrator being reviewed about the management of the unit, and to the administrator's superior about the administrator's job performance.

4. Every annual and periodic review and evaluation of deans, directors, and department heads and chairs should include, as one component, information from a representative (or randomly drawn) sample of peer faculty or from the entire faculty, particularly in the case of small departments.

5. Faculty evaluators should be guaranteed anonymity.

6. The questions to which faculty evaluators are asked to respond should be uniform across units and levels (with the addition of relevant unit-specific questions) to introduce an element of fairness and comparability across units and levels.

7. The more periodic, detailed reviews should include, where relevant, evaluations from individuals outside the University whose names are agreed upon by the administrator conducting the review and evaluation and the individual being reviewed and evaluated. ■

## THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Mario F. Bognanno  
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Bognanno submitted the following article as a letter to the editor of the *Minnesota Daily*, but it was not published.

The *Daily's* December 4, 1992, story titled "Faculty targets 'old boys' clubs" is a decent attempt at expressing a number of complex ideas. In fact, this title relates to only one aspect of a complicated problem the Faculty Consultative Committee is working on—namely, to figure out how faculty can best have input into the annual evaluations of academic administrators.

However, I find bothersome the first two paragraphs, which read as follows:

Faculty members are demanding empowerment.

It's us against them, faculty against administrators, they say. And they're complaining that current policies only create "old boys" clubs that reinforce the schism.

These remarks are off the mark, attenuating the whole story.

The Faculty Consultative Committee and, for that matter, most of the faculty with whom I speak, believe that the faculty's role in the U's system of governance satisfies our need for "empowerment." Further, the "us against them" dichotomy does not describe the faculty and administration relationship. A better description is suggested by the word "we." Lastly,

there is no "schism," let alone one that is being reinforced by "old boy"-isms.

In fact, the faculty and University administration are in pursuit of many common goals. Faculty want to produce top quality academic teaching, research, and services in their classrooms, clinics, labs, libraries, studios, and offices; University administration wants these very same things. We are not in opposing we-they camps. However, communication between faculty and administration can be improved, and the two groups should work more closely together to achieve these common goals.

Many of us, including administrators, believe that quality improvement can be made through faculty participation in key areas. Consider the following examples.

*continued on next page*

*Chair's report, continued*

First, faculty and administration have recently agreed on workload principles—a faculty-driven initiative, endorsing *inter alia* the idea that academic professions ought to be free to responsibly self-regulate.

Second, faculty and administration believe that faculty ought to participate in the annual salary reviews of peers. No individual or outside group has better information than peers within a department regarding the identification of effective performers: teachers and/or researchers. As informed profes-

sionals—scholars—faculty regularly make recommendations regarding who to hire, tenure, and promote. Thus, faculty are well suited and positioned to make recommendations about merit raises. Indeed, last year the Faculty Senate enacted a policy calling for faculty participation in salary reviews. Currently, the faculty and administration are working together to refine the Senate's earlier action.

Lastly, at the department and college level, faculty and academic administrators work closely together. Thus, faculty may be able to add important information about

the performances these administrators are turning in. The Faculty Consultative Committee is looking for a way that faculty might be able to contribute to the administrator evaluation process. The administration is cooperating with us, and when we come up with an idea we will pass it on to the administration as a suggestion, rather than as a matter of Senate policy.

These examples of faculty-administration interactions are of the "we," not the "us against them," variety. ■

## Call for nominations

The Senate Committee on Committees needs your help now with nominating faculty, academic professional staff, and students to serve on Senate and Assembly committees beginning July 1.

The University of Minnesota has a well-established tradition of active faculty governance. In order to maintain that tradition during these difficult economic times, we need individuals having an interest in the broader University community and willing to commit time and energy to committee work.

Please assist us in identifying individuals who would make good committee participants on any of

the following committees (self-nominations are welcome):

All-University Honors  
Computing & Information Systems  
Council on Liberal Education  
Disabilities Issues  
Educational Policy  
Equal Employment Opportunity for Women  
Facilities Management  
Faculty Affairs  
Finance and Planning  
Intercollegiate Athletics

Judicial  
Library  
Research  
Social Concerns  
Student Affairs  
Student Behavior  
Support Services

The deadline for nominations is February 26. Please mail or phone them to Linda Inman, Senate Office, 427 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110 phone: 612-625-9369 fax: 612-626-1609. e-mail: Senate@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

Nils Hasselmo on  
governor's budget proposal

Next Footnote—February 25

400531220  
PENELOPE S KROSCHE  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455

# FOOTNOTE

☐ March 5, 1993

☐ Volume 6, Number 9

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## Training about sexual harassment Faculty say it's worthwhile, but question it as mandatory

Last year the Minnesota Legislature, as part of the Omnibus Crime Bill, directed the state's post-secondary schools to present mandatory training about sexual harassment and sexual violence to all faculty, staff, and students. Among University faculty, although there is agreement on the ends, there is plenty of critique of the means.

The University's first step in complying with the law is an extensive report of what currently exists (physical measures to promote campus safety, course inventory, training resources already devoted to the topics), along with a proposal for extending and strengthening those activities. Preparing the report fell to a six-member group that included Janet Spector, assistant provost and chair of the Commission on Women. Spector presented the group's findings and proposed plan to various administrative groups during fall quarter.

Speaking to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) December 17, Spector said the legislation was "an effort to reduce the incidence of violence" by providing "better information about the causes and effects of sexual harassment and how it affects work and educational experience."

The University's proposal envisions a total of about three hours of training over time, through lots of different methods tailored to audiences. The approach starts at the top, with the University's leadership structure. It will be up to the deans to decide how to deliver the message within their colleges.

Only weeks before the FCC

meeting, five departments in the College of Liberal Arts on the Twin Cities campus had been required to attend a presentation on sexual harassment. That meeting, part of an out-of-court settlement of a sex discrimination suit against one of the departments, caused an uproar among CLA faculty.

The training proposed under the new plan begins this summer, Spector stressed, and its content and form are still to be determined. "Any training we do has to be very sensitive to the audience because in any room, including this one, you have people on all sides of this issue," Spector said.

"It's really important that faculty and staff approach this matter in a positive manner," said Ettore "Jim" Infante, senior vice president for academic affairs, who attended the FCC meeting expressly for this presentation. "I really hope that we're going to try to offer a program that is one, sensible; two, sensitive; and three, that's going to make us a better community because of the attitude we take toward it."

Discussion at the FCC meeting ranged widely; comments were echoed and amplified in subsequent interviews with faculty members.

History professor Jim Tracy believes the fundamental issue for faculty accused of sexual harassment is in the language surrounding its definition in the University's policy: "Sexual harassment can be as blatant as rape or as subtle as a look." "It seems to me," says Tracy, "that sexual harassment can be something that happens to you if you *think* it happens—it's not

necessarily visible to another person.... That's a problem."

Also a problem: the statute's stipulation that training be mandatory. "One of the reasons that the University is a peculiar place is because of the whole tradition of academic freedom," Tracy says. "Professors—and students too—are encouraged to cultivate intellectual independence and not to march in lockstep." Being told what they must learn about and how they must learn it "kind of goes against the grain," he says.

"I think the phrase 'academic freedom' is misused and overused," says geography chair John Adams. "It pertains to inquiry and teaching; it doesn't pertain to taking liberty with your job responsibilities."

Adams can readily picture how departments might conduct this training: sexual harassment might be the topic of a regularly scheduled faculty meeting; departments might pair up for a special session; a video could be checked out. Still, he is critical of the legislature's approach.

"The goal is worthy—the goal is essential—but the idea of commanding people to attend in an environment where things don't get done that way is likely to get people's backs up and they'll object to a procedure rather than to a worthy goal, which is unfortunate.

"My difficulty is not that I don't think it's a good idea, but that I don't know how you can do it."

The University, unlike other large, complicated organizations, has two characteristics that make it difficult to get things done, Adams says: a weak leadership role at the unit level, and no established

training function.

Department chairs and deans have little direct managerial control over their colleagues, he says, because the terms of appointment often are short (three years for chairs in CLA) and the tradition is one of substantial authority for professors.

"You hire people, you tenure people, you set them free to do their jobs. Faculty really don't have bosses, any more than legislators have bosses."

Mandatory training about sexual harassment could become like other specified yet unpoliced issues concerning faculty. Regents policy, for instance, governs how long a class meets per week per credit. Yet, Adams says, "professors do what they're gonna do—there's no cop."

The University also lacks a structure for faculty development, he says. "We don't seem to have good vehicles for bringing people

into the University and letting them know that they work for the University...and the state...and the people of Minnesota. They get irritated when you tell them that. [Faculty will say] their job is to be a physicist, or an English professor. Their colleagues, the students in their classes are who they work for and to whom they owe their allegiance."

If there's no structure for creating a common understanding of purpose among faculty, Adams says, that means there's no structure for training in other areas, such as improving teaching or developing administrative skills.

"There's a whole range of things like this that we hope faculty do, yet we have no way to help if they do poorly, or reward if they do well. We just sit back and watch 3,300 people and hope that they do a good job. Once in a while they get indicted. Once in a while they become regents' professors.

And in between are just a lot of people doing their jobs."

The bill for the University's proposed plan comes to \$330,000, largely to hire a coordinator and acquire new materials. That figure doesn't take into account time spent by those attending the training.

"I did worry that no funds were attached to this," says Judy Garrard, professor in the Institute for Health Services Research. Garrard studies how health care regulations are implemented, and she has seen how lack of cash constrains action. "Something's got to give. It's unrealistic to lay these requirements on us without providing resources. Either [legislators] are not serious, or they think we have the resources, which we don't."

Karen Seashore Louis, chair of educational policy and administration, has received training on sexual harassment through a training program for new department heads. In small groups, she and her peers learned about University policies and procedures and, through case presentations, had a chance to discuss "gray areas." "It was a very useful session," she says.

Like John Adams of geography, she doesn't see such training as a threat to academic freedom. "Aca-

demical freedom doesn't mean you can do anything, it means you can think anything."

The legislative mandate may not be the best strategy to reach everyone, Louis says, but "we ought to do it as well as we can" and "treat it with respect.

"I'm fully confident that our offices can do this," she says. "I'm just convinced, even though some of us might find it a poor policy, that we will use it as an opportunity to learn about regulations and procedures. I don't think they're well understood."

Since July 1990, the person responsible for dealing with sexual harassment complaints and for providing training has been Anne Truax, who for 20 years was a faculty member in women's studies.

The University's policy on sexual harassment was drafted as a temporary measure in 1981. Revised and made permanent in 1984, the current policy is a strong one, Truax says, and puts Minnesota among the leaders in colleges and universities.

Court settlements further strengthen the policy; in fact, a 1984 decision in Hennepin County is one of the most compelling legal precedents. In the case, brought by a female student against a male instructor in a technical institute, the court fined the three male administrators who heard the woman's story and did not help more than they fined the harasser. "We warn all our administrators that they could be personally fined for mishandling such cases," Truax says.

Since the equal opportunity and affirmative action office began keeping records in 1984, it has decided some 1,100 cases, she says. More than half of them involve sexual harassment; in 95 percent of these, women accuse men. Truax also fields roughly 200 inquiries a year, of which 150 turn into formal complaints. At any given time she is investigating 50 to 75 cases.

"Sexual harassment covers the whole spectrum from very impersonal, relatively innocuous forms all the way through rape," she says. "Being here, I have a healthy

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 9  
March 5, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editors: Pamela LaVigne,  
Nancy Rowe

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of Footnote's publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

understanding that this behavior is distributed across the whole population of the University. No one is immune from it."

Her work is changing, Truax says, from a focus on two individuals to a much broader perspective on how sexual harassment affects the work unit. "What is the aftermath of a sexual harassment case, when both people want to go back to the same place and everybody knows? How will [the accused] be treated? It's not just the people in the complaint and their supervisors who are affected. We're looking now a lot more at organizational management and stress control."

**H**aving prepared its proposal (accepted by the Higher Education Coordinating Board and passed on to the legislature), the University's next step is to decide the training content and format, a process that's in the hands of Jane Ollenburger.

A sociology professor and associate dean in the College of Liberal Arts on the Duluth campus, Ollenburger is on the Twin Cities

campus this year as an American Council on Education (ACE) Fellow, associated with the president's office. Given her scholarly interest in the sociology of women, she was

**"It won't be up to us to say No, a department can't do something. It is up to us to say, These are the formats, this is the content, these are the issues to be addressed."**

chosen to oversee the next phase of this project. A co-coordinator from student affairs is yet to be named.

Ollenburger is forming a committee that will review training materials and make recommendations about content and formats. She anticipates a group of 15 to 20 people, to be announced early this month.

The committee, she stresses, will be a forum ("other than my voice mail") for people interested in this project. "We want to hear from

everybody who wants to have input," she says. Working groups, focusing on faculty, administrators, students, coordinate campuses, and staff, also will be formed.

"We want something that's well thought out and going to be in place throughout the training process," Ollenburger says. "It won't be up to us to say 'No, a department can't do something.' It is up to us to say, 'These are the formats, this is the content, these are the issues to be addressed.'"

And when all is decided, will this training be mandatory for faculty? Ollenburger pauses and collects her words carefully before answering.

"The law is ambiguous. It says mandatory, it doesn't say how. The way I see it as a coordinator is, the University will take every positive effort possible to make sure that every faculty member, student, and staff member shall attend the training." ■

—**Pamela LaVigne**

## □ LETTERS

### 'Expedience is far more vital than eloquence...'

**A**s Opinions and Letters editor of the *Minnesota Daily*, I would like to clarify a point about "The Chair's Report," by Mario Bognanno, in the Feb. 10 *Footnote*.

At the beginning of the article, it is mentioned that Mr. Bognanno submitted the same article to me, and that it was not printed. This is true. I received Mr. Bognanno's piece in early February. For whatever reason, I did not receive a copy sent in mid-December. As Mr. Bognanno's article was in response to a Dec. 4 *Daily* article, and the *Daily* is a daily newspaper, it was extremely outdated, for my purposes, by the time I received it. Had I received it in early January, I would have published the piece.

As the son of two professors, and the brother of two professors, I am somewhat familiar with the academic calendar. The newspaper calendar passes much more quickly. Expedience is far more vital than eloquence in responding to a newspaper story. When I do not receive pieces, or when they are outdated, I cannot use them.

I don't think anyone could make a case that I resist criticism of the *Daily* on the Letters and Opinions pages. I am told by people as diverse as Ian Maitland, of the Carlson School of Management, and Gary Schiff of the Association of Gay, Lesbian, Bi Students and Their Friends that my work is appreciated. I encourage faculty to write letters and opinion pieces, and I will strive to continue to represent as best I can all parts of the University.

I suggest that all who submit pieces to me call a few days later to be sure that I received their works.

Obviously, I do not guarantee publication of anything from anyone, but I do try to present all views as fairly as I can.

One other suggestion—newspaper writing is vastly different from academic writing. To avoid severe editing, I suggest keeping pieces under four typed, double-spaced pages. For the fastest delivery, my e-mail address is:

Conley@edit.mndly.umn.edu

—**John Conley**

## Senate approves grievance policy

Despite some heated debate, the University Senate on February 18 overwhelmingly approved the grievance policy recommended by the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC). The policy now goes to the administration for approval. From there, it will be presented to the regents for the final okay.

The new policy, viewed as highly innovative by its SCC authors, would cover the review and resolution of all employment grievances filed by University employees, including faculty, academic professionals, administrative staff, civil service employees, and student employees. It does not, however, cover cases involving sexual harassment, tenure, suspension or removal of a faculty member, or academic freedom. It also does not extend to employees at the University of Minnesota Hospital and Clinic, nor to employees in bargaining units represented by unions.

At the same time, the senate also approved the establishment of a special committee to develop a student academic complaint policy.

The policy would be administered by a University grievance officer appointed by the president

after consultation with a grievance advisory committee composed of representatives of faculty, students, civil service employees, and administrators. The officer will report to the senior vice president of academic affairs. Among other things, the grievance officer would determine whether a complaint is covered by the new policy, oversee the grievance procedures, and mediate complaints when asked to by parties to a dispute.

Complaints deemed within the jurisdiction of the policy will then go through a process with up to five phases, beginning with an informal meeting, and ending with binding arbitration.

In adopting the policy, the senate added only one amendment. In the original proposal: parties to a dispute would not be allowed to involve advocates on their own behalf in the first phase of the process, the informal hearing. But some senators maintained that advocates should be allowed to participate at all phases of the grievance process. The full senate agreed.

"We do have situations of extreme power differentials—for

example, between students and faculty members, or junior faculty members and their deans," argued law professor Fred Morrison. "It is also my experience in handling these kind of [grievance procedures] that by the time the parties are engaged in a formal dispute resolution process, they are firmly set into their positions."

Morrison also pointed out that outside advocates can actually help settle disputes more quickly by offering a sympathetic sounding board to disputants on questions of whether a proposed settlement is equitable or not.

The senate vote culminates a year of discussion and committee work on a new, comprehensive employment grievance policy. FCC chair Mario Bognanno characterizes senate approval as the most significant benchmark on the way to final adoption of a policy forged out of the consultative process.

"I think this was our biggest hurdle," he says. "Now it's up to the administration and the regents." ■

—Richard Broderick

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

Sexual harassment training  
Grievance procedures revamped

Next Footnote—March 31

400531220  
PENELOPE S KROSCH  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455



# FOOTNOTE

□ April 13, 1993

□ Volume 6, Number 10

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## A sea change for Sea Grant? Fixing the process for talking about a move to Duluth

After more than a year of rumors, a controversial proposal to move the Minnesota Sea Grant director's office to Duluth is now ready for discussion.

"It has not been done, and there was no intention to do it, without faculty consultation," says Anne Petersen, vice president for research.

The proposal was pulled from the April regents' docket, where Petersen says it was placed through a misunderstanding, in order to allow for the appropriate consultation. Petersen said in late March that she would meet first with the Sea Grant staff, the Research Advisory Committee, and "one other group of faculty who have written me about the issues."

In the University governance system, the proposal will go first to the Senate Research Committee and then the Faculty Consultative Committee. "This is apparently not an item that requires Senate approval, but I'd like to discuss the issues with them," she says.

Minnesota Sea Grant, a state-wide program, supports research, extension, and education programs related to Lake Superior and Minnesota's water resources. It is part of the national Sea Grant program, which supports programs in 29 coastal and Great Lakes states.

From the beginning, Minnesota Sea Grant has had a presence in both the Twin Cities and Duluth, and Duluth-area politicians have said the director's office belonged in Duluth. "Ever since we received Sea Grant funding, Duluth has wanted

more visibility in the program," Petersen says. The push to move the director's office began long before Petersen arrived at the University in March 1992, and top administrators have said they support the idea in principal.

George Spangler, professor of fisheries and wildlife who was acting director of Sea Grant until Petersen asked him to step down, says he believes the move is motivated by politics. "Duluth legisla-

**"The only factor that got this all bungled up was early paranoia."  
—Anne Petersen**

tors have for years wanted to see the program sited in Duluth," he says. "My understanding is that Congressman Jim Oberstar's office has been very much interested, and Regent Tom Reagan was an aide to Oberstar."

How does Petersen respond to the charge that the proposal is driven by politics? "It looks to me as if it's all politics, from the Twin Cities and Duluth, and I think that's unfortunate," she says. Political considerations may need to be taken into account, she acknowledges, but she would not recommend a move if she didn't think it made sense academically.

The goal is to strengthen water research at the University and organize it so that "the whole is greater than the sum of the parts,"

Petersen says. "We can't do that without integrating our resources on both campuses."

Spangler says Petersen told him in a letter that "my commitment to keeping the program on the Twin Cities campus would be an impediment to my effectiveness in administering the program.

"I have told her I'm not committed to keeping the program on the Twin Cities campus. I am committed to doing what I believe to be in the best interests of the program," Spangler says. Steve Laursen, extension educator and associate professor in the Minnesota Extension Service, is now acting director of Sea Grant.

Spangler and his staff weren't consulted about the proposed move to Duluth but learned about it from the news media, he says. "I was aware of tentative discussions on this issue," he said in an October 21 letter to President Nils Hasselmo, but "I was genuinely shocked at the announcement in Duluth last week that there are formal legislative proposals linking the University's budget, the Lake Superior Research Institute, and a prospective move of the Sea Grant director's office to Duluth."

Petersen says she didn't want to make a formal proposal until she was convinced that a Duluth-centered program would be on sound scientific footing. "Until I felt comfortable making the proposal for a move, I didn't think it made sense to consult," she says.

"The only factor that got this all bungled up was early paranoia,"

*Sea Grant, continued*

Petersen says. "I shared my thoughts on the issues with anyone who asked me. The only person who expressed any concern about the issues until recently was George Spangler. He did not express these concerns in our meetings, but only in memos."

The reason she is ready to make a recommendation now, Petersen says, is that she has seen the pool of candidates for director of the Lake Superior Research Institute, and "I am now persuaded that we have a good chance of recruiting strong leadership in the area of water research on the Duluth campus. That would make Duluth a feasible site for the director's office."

Most of the University's water researchers are on the Twin Cities campus, Spangler and Petersen agree. Part of the director's job is to "hobnob with the researchers,"

Spangler says, and that's easier to do from a Twin Cities base.

Duluth does have many water researchers, Petersen says. "More importantly, Sea Grant is a state-based program, not a campus- or even University-based program. In

**"I'm not committed to keeping the program on the Twin Cities campus. I am committed to doing what I believe to be in the best interests of the program."**

**—George Spangler**

states with more than one research university, they have sometimes formed a consortium with the director's office on neutral territory."

A secondary issue is that the national Sea Grant people have criticized the Minnesota program in the past for focusing too narrowly on Lake Superior, Spangler says. "They have encouraged us to address larger problems."

Centering the program in Duluth wouldn't necessarily mean increasing the focus on Lake Superior, Spangler says, but linking Sea Grant and the Lake Superior Research Institute might.

Naming the same person director of the Lake Superior Research Institute (LSRI) and Sea Grant is one possibility, Petersen says, and it was discussed in the search committee for the LSRI director, but she is not committed to it. "I would have preferred to take these actions sequentially: first hire the LRSI director and then make a decision about Sea Grant. My initial thought was that it would make sense to discuss the issue with final candidates.

"Now events are proceeding more simultaneously," she says. Both Laursen, the acting director, and Steven Eisenreich, director of the Gray Freshwater Biological Institute and chair of the Sea Grant Research Advisory Committee, recommended "that we speed the decision process," Petersen says.

"We have notified all candidates that the Sea Grant role could be included in the responsibilities. But I don't have a strong feeling that that is the appropriate way to arrange this." In any case, she says, both Sea Grant and the LSRI will continue to report to her.

Although a plan for consulting on the proposed move now seems to be on track, nobody is happy about the process up until now. "The process has not been terrific," Petersen says. "I had a strategy that was foiled" by all the politics and rumors, she says.

"The process has been just dreadful. People have been making promises without consultation," Spangler says. "I appreciate that things are done for political reasons. That's appropriate in a participatory democracy. I believe that can be done in a forthright fashion. I just find it terribly distressing that the University could not debate this issue in an open and forthright fashion."

Whether or not people can set aside the painful history, at least a process for consulting on the issue has now been established and the first meetings have been scheduled.

**—Maureen Smith**

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 10  
April 13, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Copy Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

## □ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Mario F. Bognanno  
*Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee*

# Taking stock: Actions in a busy year

We are nearly two thirds of the way through the academic year, hence it is timely to provide you with a brief update of the business that has been occupying the Senate's attention.

At the November 17, 1992, meeting of the University and Faculty Senates, your elected representatives adopted these measures:

- Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information Technology, a planning document for the University;

- Constitutional and bylaw changes permitting non-bargaining-unit members of the Duluth faculty to participate more fully in University's governance system

- Report of the Faculty Workload Task Force, which mainly states guiding principles that should be followed by the faculty in their allocation of effort. This measure was taken up by the Faculty Senate in recognition of the faculty's need for responsible self-regulation.

The December 10, 1992, meeting of the Faculty Senate began where the November 1992 meetings left off. Senators took these actions:

- Revised the University's Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct

- Changed the Tenure Regulations, permitting new faculty parents, holding probationary appointments, to "stop the tenure clock"

At the February 18, 1993, meetings of the University and Faculty Senates, a plethora of additional foundation measures were established, affecting the way faculty have input into the teaching, research, and service rewards system, how faculty governance committees should be involved in

administrative searches, and the mechanisms through which faculty should be allowed to have input into the performance evaluations of administrators—from department chair to president.

At these meetings two additional measures were passed: one designed to close the loop connecting a Senate action with a University response—often "legislation" has been lost—the other, substituting a new streamlined and more progressive grievance procedure for the current one.

Here is a list of the initiatives adopted at the Senate's February 18, 1993, meeting:

- Revised Faculty Compensation Policy, spelling out how faculty may participate in the salary-setting process

- Protocol for Senate Committee Involvement in Central Administrator Searches, spelling out how faculty/student governance committees will be involved in searches for top-level University administrators

- A resolution, Review and Evaluation of Academic Administrators, which communicates to the vice president for academic affairs how the current evaluation policy may be amended to allow for faculty participation

- Protocol for Administration Response to Senate Actions, laying out a procedure to assist the Senate and administration in tracking legislative initiatives and to ensure a timely response

- Revised University of Minnesota Grievance Procedure, setting out a new method for easy, expedient, fair, and final resolution of employment-based grievances—except for those related to academic

freedom and tenure.

I anticipate that during the next quarter the Senate will be acting on motions brought by these Senate committees: educational policy, financial affairs, financial planning, social concerns, computing and information systems, athletics, and the committee on committees. In the meantime, the FCC continues to consult with the administration in areas of administrative and faculty accountability, the biennial budget, strategic planning, and supercomputing.

As you know, this has not been a particularly easy year. Nevertheless, the governance system and consultative procedures have served us fairly well, but only because so many of you have been willing to work to improve our general welfare by finding solutions to the troubling issues facing the University of Minnesota.

For your efforts, I thank you. ■

## Managerial accountability is also faculty responsibility

*This piece was written by Judy Garrard, professor of public health and a member of the Faculty Consultative Committee.*

The faculty, as well as President Hasselmo and the central and college administrations, are responsible for managerial accountability. In an effort to decentralize the administration of the University, Hasselmo has emphasized that he is committed to managerial accountability. Recent actions taken by the University and Faculty Senates emphasize not only the need, but also the mechanisms, whereby faculty can hold themselves and their unit administrators accountable for the management of their academic environments.

As the Senate actions described by Mike Bognanno, Senate Consultative Committee chair, elsewhere in this issue are implemented by the University administration, faculty

will find that they have the authority as well as the responsibility for participating in the management of their academic environment, especially in the areas of student advising, teaching, faculty work load, academic misconduct, faculty compensation, and evaluation of academic administrators. Collectively, these Senate actions represent fundamental changes in how the University is managed.

Undoubtedly, these new actions will result in greater demand on faculty time. However, the minimal amount of effort these activities will require—individually and collectively within a unit—will be repaid handsomely by an institution that runs more smoothly and with higher morale. Faculty are often in a far better position than a department head, dean, vice president or president, to know what is happening within their own academic units. Thus faculty, not the

president or his appointees (or theirs), must actively participate in safeguarding the integrity of the decisions and the actions taken within their own academic environments. In a public institution that depends on the good will of the public and state support for a substantial part of its budget, the appearance and reality of accountability and good management are essential to the institution's long-term health. The price for not participating in such activities might be that faculty, indirectly, can be held accountable for failures in the system, because they have *not* exercised managerial responsibility.

Collectively, faculty must take responsibility for managerial accountability within the academy, and recent actions by the University and Faculty Senates provide additional mechanisms for making this possible. ■

---

### FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

#### IN THIS ISSUE

Move Sea Grant to Duluth?  
FCC action summary

Next Footnote—May 15

400531220  
PENELOPE S KROSCHE  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455

# FOOTNOTE

☐ June 7, 1993

☐ Volume 6, Number 11

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

## New and improved grieving Grievance procedure just adopted is a significant advance

It took two years to hammer it out, but all parties agree the new grievance procedure—drafted by the University grievance policy review committee and revised by the Senate—represents several advantages, not the least of which is simplicity.

Not only does the new procedure cut 28 pages of instructions to 15 pages, it also pulls together different policies governing four University groups—faculty, professional academic staff (P&A), civil service, and student employees—into one system: one grievance officer, one grievance advisory committee, one University grievance board, and a single hearing officers panel.

"The possibility of everyone having access to the grievance officer in a kind of 'one-stop shopping' is definitely a benefit," says Mary Easterling, vice chair of the Civil Service Committee and a member of the review committee that drafted the new procedure.

"In the old civil service rules," she points out, "a member of the civil service committee would coordinate grievances. Depending on who was being grieved against, it could be quite confusing. Sometimes employees lost the opportunity to grieve because they missed the deadline in the right forum. Now the grievance officer will be administering the program for all four groups. There's no question who to go to with a grievance."

Similarly, rules about who administered grievances, deadlines, and other procedural matters differed for faculty, P&A, even between nonacademic student employees and those in academic

employment.

The new system eliminates those differences. Except for certain specific categories of grievances like sexual harassment or academic freedom, the new procedures cover all employees not represented by unionized bargaining units.

The new structure is this: The grievance officer, appointed by the president after consultation with a grievance advisory committee including representatives of faculty, students, P&A staff, and administrators, will administer the system, which also includes a grievance board and a hearing officers panel, again representing the four employee groups covered.

Briefly, the new procedure works like this: For all but the specifically excluded categories of disputes or employees, a grievance has to be initiated with a written statement filed with the grievance officer within 30 work days of the action or knowledge of the action being grieved.

Four phases of proceedings follow, each step more formal than the last; a grievance may be settled at any step. Phase I consists of an informal discussion chaired by the grievance officer between the grievant and the respondent. If matters are not resolved there, a phase II meeting will take place involving the grievant and the supervisor of the respondent. Phase III consists of a panel hearing that provides an internal evidentiary hearing. The hearing panel will consist of one member of the grievance board chosen by the grievant, one designated by the vice president of the unit in which the

grievant is employed, and a trained hearing officer from the hearing officers panel.

If the phase III decision favors the grievant, the University has to implement it unless the senior vice president of Academic Affairs delivers a written notice within 10 work days disputing the outcome, in which case the grievance moves into phase IV, binding arbitration conducted by a neutral mediator from the state's Bureau of Mediation Services. If a phase III decision favors the University, the grievant can request arbitration or choose to take the case to court. But a grievance cannot go through phase IV and then be pursued in a lawsuit.

At each step of the way, grievants can be represented by an advocate, even in phase I meetings. Accepting this change in the draft version of the procedures was key to Senate approval in February.

Of all the advantages represented by the new procedure, Mike Bognanno, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, believes that "depoliticizing" the way grievances are handled may be one of the most important.

"The system will eliminate politics," Bognanno says, "because it provides due process, fairness, and finality to keep these matters on a professional plane." In the past, he says, "people have always questioned the fairness of many grievance procedures."

Proponents of the new procedures cite other advantages, for example, having a trained employee representative as chair of phase III hearings. Earlier procedures also

*Grievance procedure, continued*

had no clear provision over how to resolve disputes over access to documents; the new procedure clearly defines when and how such disputes will be handled. Uniform time limits for filing and responding to grievances will also cut down on confusion.

The new procedure is also lauded by many for its beefed-up advocacy program, which may include training of grievance advocates.

Advocates are not new in University grievance procedures, but until now a system has existed only for students engaged in nonacademic employment. Experience there indicates that not only does having trained advocates strengthen the perception of fairness within the grievance system, the advocates may, paradoxically, speed the process along, nudging grievants toward accepting perfectly fair settlements that

might, in the heat of anger, hurt, or humiliation, be rejected on emotional grounds.

"From my point of view, the advocates definitely assist more than they detract from the procedure," says Susan Treinen, director of the Student Employment Center. "You have better resolution when the person who's grieving is represented by an advocate. It's very hard to represent yourself, even from the first step. Issues tend to be defined much earlier on when there is an advocate assisting the process."

Proposals on exactly how the advocate system works are now being mulled over by the four groups covered by the new procedure. As with other elements of the procedure, an effective system will have to integrate the needs and individual cultures of the different University communities affected by the policy.

"Our concern," says Earl Nolting, director of counseling in Continuing Education and Extension and chair of the academic staff advisory committee, "is that we have coordination among the different communities, that there is real collaboration. There are different traditions in how advocates are trained, how they are used—even how they are paid. But the grievance committee felt that a strong advocate function would be important to the overall system."

Nolting sees the advocacy system developed over the past 20 years in student employment as a good working model for how advocates will work within the new procedure. "But to make it work will mean training and a common understanding of the advocate's role."

**A**s the product of the University governance system, the grievance procedure reflects compromise and consensus. That means that virtually all the groups covered by the policy have had to give some things up while receiving benefits in return. For the professional academic staff, the new procedure represents three distinct areas of compromise. That means, in Nolting's words, "giving up what

we had, which was familiar," and accepting the uncertainty change always entails.

The P&A staff is also giving up complete control of the two areas where they handled their own grievances: nonrenewal of probationary professional appointments and early termination of permanent appointments. "We have broadened the scope of grievances, but we are less in control of the process," says Nolting.

Lastly, the P&A staff must wait and see how "concerned or informed" hearing officers, panelists,

**"You have better resolution when the person who's grieving is represented by an advocate. Issues are defined much earlier on."**

and advocates will be on the issues and traditions dear to professional staff.

The party that has yielded most in the new procedure is probably central administration in its dealings with faculty and professional staff. There, the due process, impartiality, and binding arbitration built into the new procedure redress a traditional imbalance of clout.

"The central administration definitely gave up some of its prerogative within this procedure," observes Mary Easterling. "The old system with professional staff and faculty was not seen as impartial and was much more subject to being tried in two places—here, and in the courts."

Under the new system, the likelihood that a grievance will end up in court is greatly reduced—the advantage the administration gains in return for whatever leverage it has given up. As Bognanno points out, the new procedure also has built-in incentives for the parties to reach a settlement.

"If an employee does not accept a phase III decision," he says, "he or she may choose to go to arbitration. But, you have to pay one half the cost of arbitration. That represents a disincentive to pursue frivolous claims." ■

—Richard Broderick

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 11  
June 7, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

# FCC endorses recommendations of supercomputer task force

The Faculty Consultative Committee has endorsed the recommendations of the task force on supercomputing, which presented its report May 4 to Nils Hasselmo and FCC chair Mike Bognanno.

The task force, appointed March 4, was given the responsibility to answer questions about the impact of a proposal to sell the University's interest in the Minnesota Supercomputer Center (MSC) to the University Foundation.

A report by the Legislative Auditor about MSC operations led to the informal proposal by the center's chair. Specifically, the task force looked at how such a sale would affect the quantity and quality of service, receipt of fair value for past public investment, representation of the University's interests, and accountability by the University to the state.

On all those counts the task force determined that sale of the center to the foundation would not be in the best interests of all parties involved. In fact, in its report, the task force states that during two months of hearings, interviews, and other research, "it found not a single individual who unambiguously supported the proposed sale, nor could it find any evidence that the sale would benefit the University."

In carrying out its work, the task force reported that it found evidence of long-time problems plaguing the relationship between the University and the center stemming from "divergent missions being pursued" by faculty and the center's management.

"Despite the original intent to establish the center for the benefit of the University's academic mission, top center management has apparently placed University interests at a low priority," the report says. "Policies and attitudes of the center's management toward University researchers have reportedly discouraged initiatives to develop major research programs and to establish outreach from the University to private industry. The

University computing community is frustrated by what it sees as a long-standing general lack of cooperation and understanding by the management of the center of the distinct needs of supercomputing in an academic environment."

The task force, co-chaired by Thomas Burk, from the Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems, and Irwin Rubenstein, chair of the Senate

**"One of our purposes is to maintain the public/private partnership. In no way can supercomputing at the University be enhanced if the private parties pull out."**

Committee on Finance and Planning and an FCC member, proposed the following recommendations to the FCC and Nils Hasselmo:

1. The University should not sell its interest in the center to the University of Minnesota Foundation. It should, instead, strengthen the relationship with the center.

2. A joint institute/center Steering Committee responsible to the center board of directors and the University board of regents for defining and overseeing Institute/center interaction should be formed immediately. (The center is the for-profit company established to sell supercomputer services to commercial users; the institute is the academic supercomputing research entity for University users.)

3. The president of the University should recommend to the board of regents individuals to replace the two senior vice presidents on the center board of directors. These individuals should be interested in and knowledgeable about academic supercomputing.

4. The center must be held accountable to the University by

requiring that it annually provide a full confidential disclosure of its financial and programmatic activities to the chair and vice chair of the board of regents and to any other individual regents who might request it.

5. The Legislative Auditor must be invited to complete his full financial audit of the center.

6. The president of the University should insist that an external review of the management performance of the president of the center be completed by September 1, 1993. Members of the review team should be from outside the University and center and should include experts in the management of large organizations or businesses, individuals knowledgeable of the needs of academic supercomputing users, and experts in advanced supercomputing technologies.

"My sense is that the president takes this very seriously and will act on these recommendations. That's the level we'd like to see things happen," says Rubenstein.

"One of our purposes is to maintain the public/private partnership," says FCC chair Bognanno. "We want the University to continue to play a role. We also want private parties involved. In no way can supercomputing at the University be enhanced if the private parties pull out.

"Supercomputing is important to scholarship on this campus," says Bognanno. "We need the private component to maintain the effort. Instead of severing the relationship [between the University and the center] we want to strengthen it."

At its May 20 meeting, the FCC also unanimously adopted a resolution about the supercomputer issue designed to underscore support for the subcommittee report in the face of perceived displeasure from central administration for its recommendations. In addition, the resolution emphasizes the importance of faculty access to high-speed computing and signals the faculty's willingness to work with the administration and board of direc-



# Health benefits threatened by state proposals

*Richard McGehee, chair of the health care subcommittee, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, submitted this alert.*

**Y**ou may be about to lose even more of your health benefits.

The outcome of negotiations now under way between state management and the labor unions representing state employees will determine your benefits, since University employees are covered by the same health benefits as state employees.

First, the good news. Although state management proposes reduced benefits, presumably labor unions will bargain for fewer reductions, so the final outcome may be better than that described here.

Now the bad news:

□ It appears that Medica will withdraw the "Medica Choice Select" option and replace it with a new product called "Medica Premier," which has a "gatekeeper," referral network, and NO out-of-network coverage. For those of you now covered by Medica Choice Select, these changes are even worse than those that occurred when Blue Cross/Blue Shield Aware Gold was replaced by the State Health Plan.

□ In case you thought you might escape to the State Health Plan, that also presents problems. The State

proposes to reduce coverage in this plan by introducing a gatekeeper and by increasing deductibles and copays. Now, the State Health Plan allows for "self-referral"—you can go to any network physician, whether for primary care or specialist care, simply by making an appointment. Under the proposed changes, however, you will have to designate a primary care physician or clinic—your gatekeeper—and you will have access to specialists only through referral by your gatekeeper.

The gatekeeper concept sounds simply like good medical practice until you investigate how it works. There is a contract between the primary care clinic and the insurance company, which typically provides financial disincentives for the primary care physician making referrals to specialists. These contracts are notoriously difficult to uncover, and they certainly won't appear in the materials distributed during open enrollment.

□ Just in case those of you covered by Group Health are heaving a sigh of relief that you will not be affected by these changes, take note: the state proposes an across-the-board increase in employee contribution. This means that everyone, including employees choosing Group Health, will see a

decrease in take-home pay.

There are many details, too numerous to delve into in this article, but almost all of them are more bad news. If all the state proposals are adopted, the net effect is that everyone will pay more in employee contribution and many will receive less in benefits. Individuals most affected will be those for whom personal choice of physicians is a major consideration and who enrolled either in Medica Choice or in the State Health Plan on that basis.

**W**hat can you do to influence the outcome? Probably not much, but everything helps. First, if you know someone in state government or someone active in the unions, you might try applying some personal political pressure. Second, some of us in faculty governance are trying to impress upon University administrators that such dramatic changes in health benefits are detrimental to all employees and should be taken very seriously. We believe that the University should use its political influence to try to affect the outcome of these negotiations. If you agree, you could speak with your favorite administrator on this matter. ■

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

Grievance procedure  
Supercomputing  
Health benefits

Next Footnote—July

400531220  
ASSOC PROF PENELOPE J KROSCHE  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455

# FOOTNOTE

September 15, 1993

Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Volume 6, Number 12

## Balancing a three-legged stool FCC agenda tackles consulting, compensation, morale

*Judith Garrard, professor of public health in the Institute for Health Services Research, is incoming chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee. This interview was conducted in August.*

**Footnote:** What are the major issues facing you and the Faculty Consultative Committee in the year ahead?

**Garrard:** Faculty morale is a problem—the feeling of being underappreciated. This applies to all employees, by the way. We all underwent a salary freeze, and here's a second one in three years. I can understand the reasons for reallocation and retrenchment, but this has got to have a strong impact on those units being retrenched.

**Footnote:** What are your main goals in the coming year?

**Garrard:** My goal for next year involves efforts to improve faculty morale and, in particular, to involve faculty in strategic planning. If no salary increase and restructuring and reallocation are short-term effects, then strategic planning is a long-term effect. Faculty must be involved in it.

Certainly the prerogative of the faculty is to determine what is taught and how we teach it. So strategic planning as regards students—whether undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate, whether they are located on campus or they experience our efforts through outreach—must involve faculty. We also need a strong faculty voice in faculty development. By that I mean career development.

**Footnote:** Talk of strategic planning has been going on a long

time. Do you expect to see some real results this year?

**Garrard:** I think decisions are being made that will affect our future. Whether we call it strategic planning or whatever, there has to be a strong faculty voice. Some of the areas that fall under strategic planning, like the choice of teaching content and research, are exclusively faculty concerns. Other areas, like the organization and structure of the academy, cannot be left exclusively to professional

**“The University is like a three-legged stool made up of faculty governance, student governance, and deans and directors. In impact on the president and the administration, the faculty leg is shorter than the other two.”**

managers. The academy cannot survive if it turns into a corporate entity with an academic flavor.

**Footnote:** Let's return to the issue of faculty morale. Can you talk in greater depth about the causes of the problem? Is it just a matter of salaries?

**Garrard:** No, the issue is not just salary, and to think it is just salary is a very simplistic way of thinking about it.

**Footnote:** Might there be some advantage to framing the issue exclusively in those terms?

**Garrard:** Certainly. Then it is possible to think that if salary

issues are settled, morale problems will go away.

But the question goes far beyond salary. I think the University is under siege and I think there is a lack of a feeling of community among faculty. There is a sense of who will come to the defense of the faculty? There's a feeling of walking on eggshells. That sense of caution could eventually lead to reluctance to take chances in research and teaching.

The elements that make a great university are expertise and creativity, and creativity has to do with taking chances. In universities all over America, much of that is being threatened. And in this University, we have experienced two years of being placed on the defensive by society.

**Footnote:** In what ways are faculty being placed on the defensive?

**Garrard:** I don't want to identify all the sources of that. Let's just say there is the feeling that all faculty are painted by the same brush when an abuse comes to light. And what good things go on around here seem to be overlooked. For every story about good outcomes we seem to have three or four stories about charges of abuse or malfeasance. Here I hold the media partially culpable. We all know that bad news makes better news than good news. There also seems to be a sense in the general public that because we work here we must know about everything happening here. The truth is that most faculty members hear revelations of wrongdoing on the evening news.

It's also important to point out that universities around the country

*FCC agenda, continued*

are in a tremendous state of transition. It's hard to separate out what is happening at the University [of Minnesota] and what is happening at all major universities. Budget cuts and restrictions are going on at all major universities. Research funds are drying up, which makes it much more difficult to get grants that support research that supports students. And because of budget cuts we can't get as many good students as we need and want.

**Footnote:** Could you comment on the recent spate of articles criticizing the University administration?

**Garrard:** I think there should be one team in central administration and that team should be led by Nils Hasselmo. There ought to be a coordinated effort by top administrators to provide leadership to the University. The president specifically should show strong leadership on that team.

**Footnote:** What is your assess-

ment of the University's management team?

**Garrard:** To the extent that there has been miscommunication within the administration, it ought to be corrected. Problems should be identified and responded to instead of left to take care of themselves. Nils should show leadership, with a strong, aggressive, and at times confrontative style when dealing with both administrators and faculty. I think one of the president's primary tasks is to represent and defend the University and not necessarily individuals within the University. I think in some areas he's done that in an excellent way; in others, his compassion for individuals has taken precedence over the University as a whole.

**Footnote:** Has President Hasselmo lost the confidence of the faculty?

**Garrard:** There are 3,200 faculty members. I talk, at most, to 20 or 30 a day, and often the same faculty. I don't know what all the faculty feel. I think the morale in the Medical School is very low. They have been hit pretty hard by all the events breaking in the newspapers. Change is happening perhaps both too fast and not fast enough for this to be corrected in the short run. Change is scary when it does happen, and under the conditions these faculty are living with, it's scary if it doesn't happen. Either way it is going to take a while for faculty, and especially Medical School faculty, to feel comfortable. They look to leadership for that, and from the Medical School's perspective, the only leader who has *not* changed is Nils Hasselmo. Our faculty in other schools are demoralized to the extent that all of us are painted with the same brush by the scandals in the Medical School, the problems with the Supercomputer Center, and other things. I'd say we are all feeling pretty dismayed by these events.

That, coupled with lack of raises, increases in parking costs, potential changes in health care benefits—all of this contributes to decreasing faculty morale.

Is Nils Hasselmo the problem? I think the jury is still out, and the faculty will decide.

**Footnote:** Is it possible to be

president of the University of Minnesota if the faculty does not have confidence in you?

**Garrard:** If we look to history we see the answer is no. But we are not at that point yet for this president. But I think the window of opportunity is closing fast.

**"Deciding the organization and structure of the academy cannot be left exclusively to professional managers. The academy cannot survive if it turns into a corporate entity with an academic flavor."**

**Footnote:** Do you have specific suggestions for President Hasselmo?

**Garrard:** Yes. Set a faculty compensation policy so that faculty salary does not come last in the allocation of state funds. Address faculty morale problems by looking at problems of communication both within and outside the University. Are you for openness and fairness and spelling out the rules so they are all applied equally to everybody?

With respect to the Supercomputer Center, the faculty task force specifically recommended an audit. That was the faculty speaking with one voice. I would again urge that he do that: have an audit.

With respect to the health care package, there ought to be a concentrated effort by the administration to become a partner at the table where decisions are being made about the benefits package.

I would also strongly urge President Hasselmo to implement the policy of evaluation of administrators by faculty in every academic unit. The administration has a policy and there is a Senate resolution about that policy but I don't believe it is being implemented throughout the University.

**Footnote:** What do you believe is the proper role of the faculty governance system in running the University?

**Garrard:** I perceive the system as one leg of a three-legged stool made up of faculty governance, student governance, and deans and directors. In terms of impact on the

## FOOTNOTE

Volume 6, Number 12  
September 15, 1993

Managing Editor: Richard Broderick  
Production Editor: Pamela LaVigne

*Footnote* is a publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform the faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the University Relations office in Duluth.

*Footnote* is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of *Footnote's* publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page. Send letters or inquiries to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110, (612) 624-7889.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

president and the administration, I think the faculty leg of that stool is shorter than the other two, and I am concerned about that. I will say that for me and my predecessors as chair, Nils Hasselmo has been very open with us in meeting with us, talking with us, responding to our requests for information, discussing matters. But in terms of acting on some of the policies and resolutions passed by the Senate or urged by Senate committees, there is not as high a rate of acceptance on the part of the administration.

We now have in place a process for tracking Senate action to see whether the administration acts on them within 90 days or to find out why not. I think that is an appropriate follow-up system.

I recognize that every policy we recommend will not have 100 percent success. But I think there needs to be an improvement in the proportion of successes we do have.

**Footnote:** What do you intend to do to lengthen the faculty leg of the stool?

**Garrard:** I'm going to try to strengthen communication among senators so when they come into the Senate they are better informed. I'm going to continue to support the committee structure within the Senate; a lot of the work we do as a Faculty Senate is done by committees. I and the vice chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee will continue to meet with the president and vice president every

other week—and more often if needed—just as the chair and vice chair did last year and the year before.

I think a lot of the influence the chair of the FCC has is on a day-to-day basis, often behind the scenes. For example, we have discussed the need for ways to increase communication between the president and the faculty. President Hasselmo has responded very positively to that need in his efforts to meet with faculty within each of the academic units. I hope he has time to continue those meetings during fall quarter.

**Footnote:** What are the primary legislative faculty issues in the coming year?

**Garrard:** Certainly an examination of the governance system itself—for which we have a task force under way. Then the salary compensation policy. Next the health sciences reorganization; that is an issue the entire University faces. If we are creating a separate campus, in concept if not geography, then it is logical that such a model could be applied to other clusters or units elsewhere in the University.

Then there is a general issue of the presentation of the University as a desirable place to work and get an education. My goal is to have the faculty governance system involved very strongly in resolving these issues. ■

## □ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By Judith Garrard  
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

As 1993-94 chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, I want to take this first opportunity to describe some of the issues the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has been working on, then summarize some of the issues we will be addressing in the coming year.

During the summer, FCC meets as needed, and need arose twice, once in July and again in August. On July 22, we met in a closed-door session with faculty from the Department of Physiology to hear concerns about the audit last spring in that department, concerns about the faculty morale problem in their department and in the University as a whole, and questions about communication between faculty and the administration. The session was closed because personnel issues of a sensitive nature were discussed.

Some of the questions raised, however, are of interest to the University community, specifically questions about audits of an academic unit and how the process works. We invited Patrick Spellacy, director of audits, to join us for the second half of the meeting, which was not closed. He described different types of audits, the process of doing an audit, and different kinds of actions that could be taken as a result of an audit. Details of his remarks are recorded in the FCC minutes, which can be read through the Gopher Internet.

A second FCC meeting on August 16, with President Hasselmo and Senior Vice President Infante, was to discuss progress in strategic planning. Of particular interest to faculty is the concept they introduced of "clusters" of colleges or academic units for purposes of future planning. The clusters are still being defined, but will suggest perhaps different alignments of faculty groups for planning purposes. President Hasselmo also made a statement

### A few suggestions for the coming year

Here are some ideas mentioned by new FCC chair Judith Garrard:

- Set a faculty compensation policy so that faculty salary does not come last in the allocation of state funds.
- Address faculty morale problems by looking at problems of communication both within and outside the University. Are you for openness and fairness and spelling out the rules so they are all applied equally to everybody?
- With respect to the Supercomputer Center, the faculty task force specifically recommended an audit. That was the faculty speaking with one voice. Have an audit.
- With respect to the health-care package, make a concentrated effort to become a partner at the table where decisions are being made about the benefits package.
- Implement the policy of evaluation of administrators by faculty in every academic unit.

*Chair's Report, continued*

about the importance of academic integrity in response to published questions about the Garfinkel trial.

Two major issues that FCC will be dealing with in the 1993-94 academic year are strategic planning and reorganization of the health sciences. Strategic planning focuses on 1995 and beyond, but decisions made in that context will undoubtedly influence some of the decisions that must be made in the coming months. Faculty consultation will be of vital importance in this planning process.

Here are some of the other issues that FCC will be examining this year:

- Twin Cities Higher Education Partnership
- Task force on faculty governance
- Compensation policy for faculty
- Implementing the new grievance policy and procedure
- Implementation/follow-up of the task force on supercomputing
- Public/private partnerships
- Review of sabbatical leave policies
- Internal consulting

There will be a special University Senate meeting October 4 for President Hasselmo's State of the University address. The speech will be from 4 to 5 p.m., including time for questions; a reception follows. The meeting will be held in the Humphrey Center atrium. All faculty are invited.

A word about faculty consultation. To me, consultation is what happens *before* a final decision is made; providing information is what happens *afterwards*. If a decision has been made, then the

participate in consultation on strategic planning. If faculty do not take advantage of this consultation process to inform the administration—whether the department head, dean, vice president, or president—of our thoughts on strategic planning, then we have no basis for complaining afterwards. Certainly the FCC will be attending closely to this matter; faculty also have the opportunity and a responsibility to do so.

You are encouraged to contact the administration and your faculty governance representatives by telephone, fax, or e-mail. FCC and SCC members are listed on page 8 of the *Student Staff Directory*. Of particular importance are the University senators within each academic unit; their names are also given on pages 7-8. Please feel free to contact any of us about your concerns, whether or not they are on the list of specific issues the FCC and the SCC are discussing.

I am looking forward to working with the FCC as chair in the months ahead. I have appreciated the opportunity for "on-the-job training" as vice chair last year. Thanks to Mario Bognanno, 1992-93 FCC chair, I have some inkling of what I will be getting into. On behalf of the FCC, let me welcome you back to the University. ■

---

### Mark Your Calendar

University Senate meeting  
President Hasselmo's  
State of the University address  
**October 4**  
4 to 5 p.m.  
Humphrey Center atrium

---

opportunity for consultation has been lost. One of our roles as the FCC is to consult with the administration on matters that pertain to the faculty; as the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), we consult on issues that affect faculty and students.

In the coming months, faculty, students, and staff throughout the University will be asked to partici-

---

## FOOTNOTE

University of Minnesota  
6 Morrill Hall  
100 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

### IN THIS ISSUE

FCC agenda for the year  
Strategic planning

### Next Footnote—October

This publication is available in alternative formats. Please call 624-6868.

400531220  
ASSOC PROF PENELOPE J KROSCH  
LIBRARY-COLL & PRESERVATION  
10 WA LIB  
MINNEAPOLIS MN  
55455