

MBO
8 F 1 n

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE NEWSLETTER

Vol. II, No. 1 - November, 1962

1. Purpose of the Newsletter.

This is the second year of the Newsletter and it might be useful to recall the statement of purpose that ran in the first number, for November, 1961.

"We of the Consultative Committee are concerned about the failure of the faculty to communicate ideas to us. We feel that with a President who is unusually interested in what the faculty thinks about University policies and problems and who is remarkably receptive to good ideas, the faculty individually and collectively is missing a bet in not passing on to us ideas which we can transmit to the President.

Without a doubt, failure of faculty to communicate with us has in some measure been the result of our failure to communicate adequately with faculty. We hope to remedy this situation by issuing a newsletter from time to time to inform you about our meetings with the President. Too, we would like to use the newsletter as a means for passing on to all the faculty ideas transmitted to us by individual faculty members and as a means for soliciting faculty reaction to questions and issues.

At this time, it might encourage the solicitation of ideas, if we point up the unique opportunity we have to inform the President of faculty views."

2. Functions of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)

The first Newsletter quoted from the Constitution of the University Senate on the scope of the FCC.

"The faculty Consultative Committee shall meet with the President at regular times to discuss matters of policy relating to instruction, research, personnel, service functions, and the budget. It shall be empowered to appoint subcommittees or employ other devices which it regards as appropriate in initiating and furthering communication between the faculty and the President. It shall report to the Senate at least once in each academic year."

At least one function has been added since the Senate Constitution first was adopted: the Consultative Committee is to make nominations for the (Senate) Committee on Senate Committees.

In sum, the purpose of the Consultative Committee is four-fold, as described in the report to the Senate accompanying the proposal for establishment of the Committee:

"(1) to establish and keep open a direct line of communication between the teaching and research faculty and the President as the head of the University administration; (2) to elicit from the faculty and to relay to the President the thought of the faculty on University problems; (3) to give the President

the committee's own best judgment on the problems and policies of the University; and (4) to report to the faculty from time to time in such ways as are most likely to create an informed and responsible faculty opinion on the problems of the University."

The Committee has found no difficulty in meeting with President Wilson and in truly communicating with him. One concern remains: will the faculty continue to use the Committee as a channel of communication with the central Administration?

3. Composition of the Committee.

Members of the Committee are elected by the faculty. If no member is elected from the St. Paul or Duluth campuses, the elected members must appoint one representative from each of those faculties. Also the Committee appoints members to fill out the terms of elected members who are unable to complete their terms of office. The current members are:

Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr.	(1958-61, 1961-64)
Robert H. Beck	(1957-60, 1960-63)
Sherwood O. Berg	(1960-63) <u>Secretary</u>
Harold C. Deutsch	(1962-65)
Robert L. Heller	(Duluth, 1962-63)
Will M. Myers	(1957-58, 1960-61, 1961-64)
A.O.C. Nier	(1962-65)
William G. Shepherd	(1959-62, 1962-65) designated by the President to be Chairman for 1962-63.

First Items of Business

1. Among the first actions of the Committee was to plan for meetings with the faculties on the St. Paul campus, at Duluth and at Morris. Highlights of these meetings will be reported in the Newsletter.

2. The Committee heard from Dean Crawford with respect to the Graduate Research Center (GRC). The FCC feels assured that the GRC will help speed research requests to Richard Elliott, Research Contract Coordinator in the Business Office. For example, the GRC will help to catch any incorrect procedure in the proposal budget and any other slip-ups, e.g., listing a graduate student as principal investigator. Inasmuch as carbon copies of research proposals will be filed with the GRC, the FCC agrees that the GRC will be extremely useful as an information center, relative to the total research effort of the University. The staff of the GRC intends to be of all possible aid to an individual investigator in preparation of a research request, if he desires such aid. The over-all performance of the GRC will be reviewed within a three-year period in consultation with the FCC and the General Research Advisory Committee... The faculty will be apprised of details.

University of Minnesota Coordinating Council

During the past summers the Board of Regents authorized the creation of the University of Minnesota Coordinating Council which will seek new avenues and better approaches to fund-raising, will advise the faculty on appropriate sources of funds, and will seek to assess faculty wishes to secure monies for the promotion of academic projects. President Wilson serves as Chairman. As the membership of the Council now stands, all major collegiate units of the University are represented. The Chairman and Secretary of the FCC are ex-officio voting members, with two other members of the FCC (Nier and Myers for 1962-63) as alternates.

Meeting with President Wilson

The FCC met with President Wilson for the first time this academic year on September 27. One of the first items discussed was the purpose and design of the Coordinating Council. Quite clearly the Council does not intend to interfere with already existing channels; with "well-trodden paths" faculty members have established in years past. But the Council needs to know of all fund-raising activities in order to minimize uncoordinated solicitations of the same donor.

By way of example, one or more faculty in the College of Medical Sciences or Education might propose a project requiring a special building or some other long-term commitments on the part of the University. As a first step leading to Council action, it would be necessary to obtain the judgment of the central administration on whether the commitments could be made and financed and whether the project promised well for the University. If the judgment favored the project, the interested faculty might wish to ask the Coordinating Council to develop plans for raising the funds.

A second example of Council action might relate to seeking support for an additional Hill Family Foundation Professor. If administrative approval were given, the Coordinating Council might be asked to advise whether the request should be initiated by department X or Y.

Vice-President Wenberg joined the conversations to point out that definitive ground-rules for the Coordinating Council still are evolving. In answer to a question about research requests made to such private agencies as the American Cancer Society or the American Heart Association, (requests for research funds directed to the Federal Government would be routed through the Graduate Research Center) Mr. Wenberg said that the typical request to either Association would not involve the Council.

Consideration of Budget Requests to Be Made in the Next Session of the Legislature

1. Faculty Salaries:

President Wilson wishes to continue to base his legislative requests on the recommendations of the President Eisenhower's Committee on Higher Education.

The latter Committee, in its report of 1957, assumed that academic salaries must double over a 10-year period, if colleges and universities were to be able to compete successfully in the open market. Such doubling over a decade presumably would result in "social comparability", permitting colleges and universities to attract and retain faculty. "Social comparability" does not imply that faculty salaries will be equal to those of comparably trained individuals employed outside academic institutions but, rather, that faculty salaries plus the intangible attractions of academic life will be equivalent to inducements "on the outside". Once social comparability has been achieved, further salary increases should reflect increases in cost of living, promotion in rank, or re-evaluation of social comparability.

Between 1957 and 1960 faculty salaries at the University of Minnesota increased about 20% and President Wilson hopes that an additional 80% can be achieved by 1968 or soon thereafter.

2. Fringe Benefits.

Any increased fringe benefits, such as in the areas of insurance and retirement or hospitalization and medical care, that are to be provided by the University, will come from what the Legislature might grant for increases in the item budgeted for faculty salary increases.

For anyone interested in recalling an explanation of the Mills Bill, Ray Archer, Director, Insurance and Retirement, offered the following explication:

"In brief, the Mills Bill is a legal device whereby the staff member participating in the Faculty Retirement Plan may request the University to reduce his salary by a certain number of dollars (subject to the 20% exclusion limit); the University uses this amount to pay the staff member's share of annuity premiums in the Faculty Retirement Plan. The advantage to the staff members is that currently such reduction in his salary would not be includable in Federal or State taxable income. (It must be immediately emphasized that this would result in higher taxable income to the staff member when annuity income payments began. In most cases, however, the individual at this point would be in a lower tax bracket and would enjoy more tax exemptions because he and his spouse are age 65 or over.)"

Mr. Archer offered the above last year. Since that time the faculty has received an "enlargement of option," as it were. The University now will deduct for alternative retirement plans. New staff members are advised to consult with the Office of Insurance and Retirement about options.

3. Additional Staff.

In his request of the legislature President Wilson hopes that he will be able to demonstrate that the University is a multi-purpose institution and that the ratio of numbers of staff to numbers of students must reflect that fact. For example, the Student Faculty ratios for medical sciences, veterinary medicine, dentistry and the Graduate School are conceived of as 6.3:1, for the several professional schools as 12.7:1 and for SLA, -- the General College

the College of Education and the Duluth and Morris Campuses as 19:1.

Using the S/F ratios noted above, and assuming an enrollment of at least 32,500 for 1963-64 and of 35,700 for 1964-65, the University would need some 240-250 new staff positions in 1963-64 and 205 additional new positions for 1964-65.

Consultative Committee Members

William G. Shepherd, Chairman
Sherwood O. Berg, Secretary
Cyrus O. Barnum, Jr.
Robert H. Beck
Harold C. Deutsch
Robert L. Heller
Will M. Myers
A. O.C. Nier