

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 26, 1998
1:00 - 4:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall

Present: Victor Bloomfield (chair), Kent Bales, Carole Bland, Mary Dempsey, Gary Gardner, Virginia Gray, David Hamilton, Russell Hobbie, Michael Korth, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson

Absent: Gary Davis, M. Janice Hogan, Laura Coffin Koch, Leonard Kuhi, Marvin Marshak, Matthew Tirrell

Guests: President Mark Yudof

Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate), Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: Administrative work plans; status of policies; restructuring of the governance system; discussion with President Yudof (structure of Finance and Operations, faculty ambassadors, academic misconduct proceedings); the writing of policies]

1. Various Items

Professor Bloomfield convened the meeting at 1:00 and noted there were several items requiring attention. He turned first to Professor Morrison.

Professor Morrison reported he has been made aware of work plans for administrative units, work plans which are intended to identify where the 8% reductions are to come. The work plan for Finance and Operations, which he has seen, had no consultation on where money would be saved. One part of the plan is abolition of the faculty mortgage program; Professor Morrison said he did not know if that proposal had been approved. He said he did not have a fixed view on the subject, or whether that was a wise way to spend the University's money, but dropping it may have implications for faculty recruitment. The University has spent about \$5 million on the program in the last decade (because it offers mortgages below the prevailing rate).

Professor Bloomfield suggested this should be raised with President Yudof, and that it fits with the interest of the Committee in the cost-benefit analysis of regulations and policies.

Professor Bales reported that a subcommittee of Faculty Affairs will be meeting with Associate Vice President Lawrenz to develop an acceptable Conflict of Interest policy, and that a completed draft of a new sabbatical/professional development leave policy will be completed next week.

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Bloomfield reported that the Academic Misconduct policy has once again been withdrawn, this time because the Scientific and Scholarly Advisory Board wishes to review it.

Professor Hamilton reported that a considerable number of problems not previously appreciated have been identified in grants management, and that he will at a later meeting report on them.

2. Senate & Assembly Amendments on Governance

The Committee then had a lengthy discussion of the Senate debate and action on the constitutional and bylaw amendments to implement the recommendations of the task force on faculty consultation. Several points were made:

- Those who opposed the motion, after it had apparently received the support of FCC, expressed apologies for the appearance of having "blindsided" the Committee, but maintained that their concerns were legitimate, that they tried earlier to communicate their disagreement, and that the opposition only became clearly apparent very shortly before the meeting.
- If the Committee is to take seriously its responsibility for setting the agenda of meetings, it must at least understand where there is disagreement about an issue, and if appropriate should pull an item from an agenda rather than present it without knowing the division of opinion of the Committee.
- There is no need for the Committee, as a steering body, to be unanimous in its views; it has been divided before; it is a political body.
- Some in the AHC are concerned about the need for a direct and/or stronger link between the AHC faculty governance structure and the Senate governance structure, and do not believe that the recommendations of the task force report with respect to the AHC FCC are sufficient in this respect. There is a need for a governance system that is balanced with the administrative structure, and for the AHC FCC simply to report to this Committee would not make it correspondingly strong enough to deal with a strong AHC administration. On the other hand, if the AHC governance system is embodied in constitutional provisions in the AHC, it would be difficult for a different administration to get rid of it, irrespective of its links to the Senate structure. The intent of the task force was that there be clear links between AHC faculty governance and the Senate structure.
- There is no concern about the other recommendations of the task force; those have the full support of all. Some in other areas of the campus, particularly the arts, sciences, and engineering, may also believe that they do not have the consultative opportunities they need.
- The task force looked at the entire University, and included representatives from both FCC and the provostal FCCs. The task force heard a variety of views, and all agreed at the end that it would not make sense to have the provostal FCCs recognized in the bylaws, but also recognized that the AHC governance structure should not be eliminated. It is understandable that if the AHC structure is given more recognition, then other areas of the campus will also want recognition. If there are three provostal FCCs, there is no easy way to sort out their agendas from those of this Committee, and there was overlap between agendas when the three committees were functioning. When that

happens, the administration receives multiple views, and picks the one it likes the best.

- There must be near-consensus in this Committee when it brings bylaw and constitutional amendments, because of the required absolute majorities to pass them, and use of parliamentary procedure here would identify objections. Those who object could identify alternatives.
- There was no commonality among professional schools under the provostries, but there was in the arts, sciences, and engineering.
- The Committee must look forward, not back. There are three alternatives: try the amendments again, do something different, or say nothing, and leave the three provostal FCCs in place (two would be elected but have no one to consult with). (There was no support for the last alternative.)
- The governance structure was changed to mirror the administrative structure with three provosts; with the new structure, the structure should mirror the fact there is a senior vice president for the health sciences. The AHC structure has been effective, and to abolish the link to the AHC FCC is a step backwards. Professor Dempsey said there is no proposal to abolish the link between the faculty governance system and the AHC FCC, and that the task force report proposes multiple steps to strengthen that link.

It was agreed that Professors Bland, Hamilton, and perhaps others would develop language they would find acceptable; Professors Dempsey, Gray, and Hogan (who were on the task force) will do the same, and will review all the proposals and report to FCC at its March 12 meeting.

3. Various Items

The Committee next reviewed topics it wished to take up with President Yudof, including a legislative update, target audiences for faculty ambassadors, the resolution on cost-benefit analysis, the faculty role in policy development, a faculty hiring committee, the role of the General Counsel in academic misconduct proceedings, the structure of Finance and Operations, the capital campaign, the University Relations vice president, the role of the health sciences vice president, the role of the Vice President for Research, and student evaluations of teaching.

The FCC election ballots will be distributed next week, and due April 3; candidate statements and pictures will be distributed.

The Committee took up a long list of "issues pending" and concluded it would vote on what the disposition of each should be.

4. Discussion with President Yudof

Professor Bloomfield next welcomed the President to the meeting.

President Yudof began by commenting on the search for the Finance and Operations vice president and how he would structure the office during the interim. He noted the difficulty the University has had in finding someone who had all the skills necessary to fill the position, and said he intended to talk with

the Finance and Planning Committee and the regents before making any decision. There is an argument for having a chief financial officer who reports to the President and perhaps a vice president for administration to handle the other functions.

Professor Morrison observed that it would be a step forward to separate the operating units from the CFO, getting away from the conflict in having the financial officer also responsible for the budgets of operating units.

In response to questions, the President said he had no plans to change any reporting lines to the office of the Vice President for Research. He said that if, in a year, a faculty committee had advice to offer on changes, he would consider them at that point.

The Committee also held an off-the-record discussion of the University's relationship with NIH and the "exceptional status" and of high-performance computing.

The Committee then discussed with the President the faculty ambassadors program and which audiences should be targeted. President Yudof said the faculty, and Professor Marshak, have been "unbelievably effective" at the legislature, and that the possibilities for the program were unlimited. There appeared to be agreement that when faculty appear before groups, there should be an institutional message, but that most of the talks should be about what is of interest to the faculty member and the group--the topic is what will attract people. It will be important also for Twin Cities legislators to see that their constituents value the University. The President noted that many faculty participate in community enterprises; they should be identified, and those with an entree could perhaps talk about the University. This is an enterprise that will grow, he said.

The President commented, in response to a query from Professor Hamilton, that there is a risk that an issue will raise hackles; faculty will have to make judgments about what they say. By definition, faculty work may not follow conventional wisdom, the President said, and HE is not going to vet what they say. Occasionally a presentation may backfire.

Professor Bloomfield asked that Professor Bland identify the groups to be targeted and the faculty who would initially participate. Professor Gray expressed pleasant surprise at the large number of faculty who had agreed to participate.

The Committee then held a lengthy off-the-record discussion of faculty indemnification and the role of the General Counsel's office vis-a-vis faculty involved in academic misconduct proceedings. The President and the Committee were not of one mind; it was agreed that the Committee would provide to the President a written statement of its views, and in it would separate academic misconduct and indemnification.

Professor Bloomfield thanked the President for joining the meeting.

5. Policy Matters

Professor Bales reported that the Committee on Faculty Affairs is troubled by the Conflict of Interest policy, and itemized the concerns. He concluded that it is a "goofy policy," and suggested

jokingly that the University should hire someone to identify "goofy policies." He also said it was troubling to put as much as possible into one policy, in a day when computers can easily index documents, and that it would be better to have separate policies for different matters. To put as much as possible in one policy creates confusion.

The question of whether NIH actually "demands" certain things was also raised, as was the issue of "over-interpretation" on the part of the University.

Professor Bloomfield adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota