

Minutes*

**Joint Meeting
Senate Consultative Committee
Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Monday, August 31, 1998
1:00 – 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: (SCC) Sara Evans (chair), Carole Bland, Mary Dempsey, Stephen Gudeman, Virginia Gray, David Hamilton, M. Janice Hogan, Roberta Humphreys, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Korth, Leonard Kuhi, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Nathan Hunstad, Harvey Peterson, Matthew Tirrell
- Present: (SCFP) Stephen Gudeman (chair), Jean Bauer, Charles Campbell, Gerald Klement, Eric Kruse, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Jane Phillips, J. Peter Zetterberg
- Absent: none for a summer meeting
- Guests: Executive Vice President Robert Bruininks; Professors Carol Chomsky and Patricia Frazier
- Others: Steven Bosacker (Office of the Board of Regents), Vice President Carol Carrier (Human Resources), Ann Cieslak (Office of the Board of Regents), Tom Cook (Office of the Executive Vice President), Robert Fahnhorst (Employee Benefits), Georgina Stephens (Treasurer)

[In these minutes: biennial request (themes and items for which funding will be sought); libraries; compacts and the planning process; health care; policy on sexual harassment and consensual relations]

1. Announcements

- Professor Evans convened the meeting at 1:00 and began with announcements.
- President Yudof was sick and unable to attend the meeting.
 - The FCC retreat at Morris will be spent talking with faculty and administrators at Morris; FCC will also have 3 blocks of time when it will address issues of governance, the intellectual future of the University, and the agenda for the year.
 - The University is hosting a conference on retention of faculty of color, October 18-20, and Professor Evans encouraged FCC and Faculty Affairs committee members to attend.

* 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.

2. The Biennial Request

Professor Evans welcomed Executive Vice President Bruininks to the meeting and asked him to provide an update on the biennial request.

Dr. Bruininks said the work has been focussed on the University-wide themes of the presentations to be made, on how to make the case so that the public (and legislature) understand what the University is trying to accomplish and how important the legislative investment is. There have been several working groups involved; they have submitted reports and the administration is working with the groups on the dollar amounts and the case for the request. There will also be conversations with MnSCU to learn if there are common messages that can be delivered.

The broad themes of the request are as follows:

- competitive compensation for faculty and some other employee classes will be the lead item in the request. Based on informal information at hand, it appears the University made modest gains in salaries compared to its peers.
- strengthening undergraduate education, with a focus on seminars early in the student experience, will include increased advising, research opportunities, and so on. The principal idea is a vast expansion in the quality of the entry-level experience. Other universities have made these opportunities available to perhaps 20-40% of their incoming class; the University will ask for support to reach 100%.
- financing health education, which recognizes that there are serious systemic obstacles in health economics, especially for universities with academic health centers. The University will attempt to address these economic realities with multiple strategies. The proposal will also call for revitalization of the curriculum to accord with the new realities of community-based health care delivery.
- investments in the transfer of knowledge and technology transfer will improve the University's capacity to stimulate and enrich the community, and to do so promptly. This item has applications for many University units.
- improvement of University services, such as the libraries and technology infrastructure, will be the final theme. It will focus on core services on which other key academic initiatives depend.

In response to a query from Professor Morrison, Dr. Bruininks said that no grand total for the request has been settled on. That, and how the requested funds would be allocated, must be settled in September, and presented to the Regents in October. Professor Morrison suggested that an additional meeting of the Committee should be scheduled to review the request before it goes to the Regents.

Professors Campbell and Kuhi inquired about the request for new faculty positions. Dr. Bruininks said the plans call for seeking 100 new faculty positions, divided perhaps 50/50 between junior and senior appointments, and the positions would provide coverage for the freshmen seminars. It is not assumed the seminars will be mandated, but they will be AVAILABLE to all freshmen (and the ones being offered now fill up rapidly). How the new positions will be allocated has not been worked out; they

will not automatically be distributed on the basis of freshmen seminars to be offered, but will also be based on the college plans. Academic priorities and institutional critical measures will be part of the equation.

Professor Gudeman asked about the theme of funding for education of health professionals. This is prompted by the revolution in the support for the training of health professionals, Dr. Bruininks said. In the past, such education has been funded from other revenues (clinical income, federal support, grant funds, etc.), but those sources are under stress all over the country, and the University could face shortfalls of hundreds of millions of dollars. The proposal to the legislature would not fix all the problems of educating health professionals, but it is a necessary part; without a strong financial underpinning, health professional education faces a rocky future. There are problems both with the Medical School and with other post-baccalaureate health education programs, Professor Morrison observed; Professor Bland pointed out that the growing trend of moving students into community settings for training is also more expensive.

Mr. Pfutzenreuter explained that there will not only be a sizeable request for health professions education in the request, there will also be discussion in other parts of the request about the pressure on health professions that will not be part of the request, in order to inform the various committees in the legislature of the problems.

Professor Marshak asked about the tuition revenue assumptions that underlie the request. With the transition to semesters, there is uncertainty about the number of courses students will take per semester, and it is still unclear if the freshman seminars will meet liberal education or major requirements. There needs to be clarification of curricular matters. Dr. Bruininks agreed, and observed that there would likely be some drop-off in enrollment during the change to semesters. The University is also trying to get the message out to students that it is important to take a full load, and tuition banding is being considered to create an incentive to take full loads. If there is a wide range of freshman seminars, they must be linked to the core educational program; this will require broad discussion with the faculty; the topic will be before several Senate committees.

Dr. Zetterberg explained the reasons why tuition and enrollment drop, regardless of what the University does. One, students who could graduate, but typically stay on for awhile, WILL graduate before the change to semesters. Second, getting students to take 4-5 courses, rather than 3-4, is very difficult to do, and will take the effort of the entire University community; failure by students to take full loads represents a serious revenue threat to the University. Third, in evening programs, with quarters they were a 10-week commitment while with semesters they are a 15-week commitment and tuition is increased 50%. If part of a degree program, the change may not have too great an effect, but for casual course-takers, the impact on enrollment could be substantial.

Professor Kuhi said that financial aid staff must be convinced that 12 credits is not a full load to graduate in a timely manner even though it is the minimum number of credits considered as a full-time load for financial aid purposes. The same is true for advising, Dr. Bruininks said; there is a cultural dynamic that must be addressed. Professor Koch commented that the administration is working with advisers, but need back-up by the faculty and administration. Faculty need also change, Professor Evans observed; they must recognize that students will be taking more courses.

3. The Libraries

Dr. Bruininks reported that the task force on the future of the libraries appointed earlier in the year has presented a preliminary report and proposal for the biennial request. There will be substantial funding for the libraries in the request, attached to the efforts to improve undergraduate education; there will also be funds request for transition to the digital future of the library. He noted the pressures on library budgets, especially acquisitions, and that the libraries had faced cutbacks like other units. One possibility for additional funding will be the imposition of modest fees for private-university students, who use the University libraries heavily. Dr. Bruininks concluded that the University must provide stable funding to the libraries, rather than the patched-together budgets of recent years.

The report, he said, was a thoughtful one, and promised to provide copies to the Committee.

4. The Compacts

Dr. Bruininks said that progress on the compact process is being made; they are looking at what they have learned. It is an evolutionary process. It was agreed that time should be set aside at a meeting (the Finance and Planning Committee will meet jointly with FCC) to discuss the compacts and the process.

Dr. Bruininks offered a number of observations about the process: there must be a way to deal with alignment of college/campus goals with University-wide goals and priorities; the compacts should not be seen as the strategic plan, but colleges must think long-term as well; five central units have also been asked to go through the process, with interesting results vis-à-vis University-wide goals; there needs to be more emphasis on goals and performance measures; interdisciplinary efforts need to be a more deliberate part of the process; consultation will be emphasized; outreach is a deliberate focus of some compacts and hardly mentioned in others; enrollment management and IMG need more attention; there is insufficient discussion of long-term academic staffing of the colleges; there must be better integration of academic support units in the process (e.g., Graduate School reviews); service units require more attention (housing, bookstores, etc.); the process needs to start earlier; there needs to be a better information evaluation capability; there was too much budgeting, then planning, then more budgeting – those processes need to run in parallel.

Professor Dempsey expressed concern about the lack of grass-roots participation by faculty. Dr. Bruininks said that faculty involvement had improved but agreed that it was variable. In one or two large units two years ago, consultation consisted of the provost talking to himself, Professor Morrison maintained; that situation persists, he said. Something more must take place.

When will the materials be available, Professor Morrison then asked? They are mostly ready now, Dr. Bruininks said. If the Committee is to provide any assistance or consultation on improving the process, Professor Morrison pointed out, it must see the compacts before any discussion. They will be provided. Professor Gudeman reported that the Committee on Finance and Planning will also be meeting with a number of the deans to talk about the process.

Professor Humphreys inquired why the compacts are being written every year, and why the process is being begun for next year when it has not been finished for last year. Dr. Bruininks explained that it coincides with the budget process, and that the colleges now have a baseline; he said he did not

expect it to be the same intensive process this year, because each year's compacts will be variations or refinements of the previous year's statement.

Professor Bland said that if the compacts are to be aimed at overall University directions, and if there was any impact, there needs to be an evaluation of the instructions that were given and whether the colleges followed them. Dr. Bruininks agreed.

Professor Evans thanked Dr. Bruininks for joining the meeting.

5. The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) Report

Professor Evans next commented on the AGB report, the background, and that the new report was open for comment until September 21. She said she hoped that faculty across the country would talk about it and comment. She said that FCC had an obligation to respond seriously, and that it would take up the report at its retreat.

6. Health Care

Professor Evans now welcomed Professor Richard McGehee to the meeting to discuss the work of the health plan task force.

Professor McGehee distributed a handout summarizing events and issues. The accomplishments of 1998 include:

- two new seats on the State Labor Management Committee
- inclusion of University providers in the 1999 State Health Plan (the low cost option), which helps the Academic Health Center
- University employee health plan usage experience separated from State plan usage
- "The door is ajar on this question: Can the University offer supplementary plans not available to State employees?" (this has not been permitted in the past; now it is "maybe").

The big question is whether the University should separate from the State plan. The issues include:

- Process: University control versus piggy-backing on State collective bargaining. Should the University separate, there would need to be a mechanism for identifying the health plan to be offered; there are difficult issues involved, and the University might get a better plan, but the task force is not in agreement on this point. The State has a lot of employees, so a lot of market power, and they can get a good plan.
- There are indications that there will be major improvements in the State plan beginning in January, 2000.

- The “catch 22” is that the University separation process must begin in Fall, 1998; the State outcome will not be decided until July, 1999 (the outcome of the collective bargaining process). This is true every year.

The task force recommends: (1) Do not commit to remaining with the State, no matter what; that would be folly, Professor McGehee said. (2) Do not commit to leaving the State plan; that would also be folly. (3) Keep the options open, by studying the possibilities for supplementary plans and for separating from the State.

Professor Morrison recalled that there were several faculty concerns about the health plan, including access to the University and out-of-area coverage. Nothing will change for 1999, but it could in 2000. He reported that for the first time in his experience, someone offered a P&A position turned it down because of the poor quality of the health plan.. Vice President Carrier commented that the State has a new interest in supplemental plans because they want the University to remain in; the leadership recognizes that they must do something for University employees.

Professor Evans said there is need for an institutionalized faculty group to continuously monitor this issue and provide a voice, and, if appropriate, advise when a more dramatic move is necessary. The task force may be such a group. She said the recommendations of the task force seem wise, and while the first Senate meeting was set for mid-October in order to permit a vote on the health plan, such a vote may not now be necessary.

Professor Hamilton said that Professor McGehee had done a “spectacular” job, and pointed out that the task force was not composed only of faculty; it also included civil service, P&A, and unionized employees. One result is that the union employees have gained an understanding of what the faculty want.

Professor Bland agreed the task force should be retained, and asked to use the experience data to identify what the cost would be of separating from the State. Professor McGehee said they are looking at ways to get those costs, but the data are not solid without a bid. And bidding, he added, is a time-consuming and expensive process, both for the provider and the University,

The Committee then voted unanimously to continue the task force, to thank it for its work, and to accept its recommendations. A motion to require that it solicit bids for a separate plan failed. The Committee unanimously authorized the task force to make such studies it deems appropriate, including the solicitation of bids.

Professor Evans thanked Professor McGehee for his work, and that of the task force.

7. Policies on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relations

Professor Evans next welcomed Professor Carol Chomsky, representing the drafting committee, to the meeting to lead a discussion of revised policies on sexual harassment and on consensual relations.

Professor Chomsky reviewed the legislative history of the policies and noted that in the last year, the drafting committee had worked with about 25 drafts; a new version was passed by the Senate last year. The Senate was told, when the policy was presented, that the Regents would probably change it to put it in the form the Regents wanted.

The first Regents' redraft was more of a rewrite than the drafting committee had expected. They felt the changes had been substantive, but at every point where they said that the Senate language had a substantive point that needed to be included, the Regents' Office agreed to put it back in. It was in part an editing problem, and in some cases the language was clarified.

Professor Chomsky said it was her view that everything in the Senate policy was now included in the Regents' redraft and that the substance remains the same. She said the drafting committee had reviewed all the language changes and was satisfied with the result.

Professor Morrison noted, as had Professor Chomsky, that the "purpose" part of the language had been deleted, and said that if not included with the policy, it would not be read. Professor Chomsky said that the Senate language would be included in materials distributed by the EEO office. The language would not be on the web version, however, because it would not be part of the Regents' policy.

Committee members then deliberated about several of the specific language changes that had been made (comparing the Senate version and the Regents' redraft). Several objections were raised. The discussion also touched on whether or not the Senate Consultative Committee should use its authority to act on behalf of the Senate; Professor Morrison argued it should not, because these were substantive changes, and the power is granted to SCC for emergencies. This is not an emergency; a delay of one month would not make any difference.

Professor Morrison called for the Committee to be provided with a red-lined version of the policies, showing the changes from the language approved by the Senate and an explanation of why the changes were made. The intent of the changes must be known. Professor Evans inquired of Mr. Bosacker whether the changes were thought to be substantive or editorial; Mr. Bosacker said that his office would be glad to work with the Committee to be sure that the intent of the Senate was not changed. The changes made were felt to result in a clearer style, and were approved by the administration. He indicated there would be no problem with returning the policy to the Senate, and assured the Committee that the Regents did not feel a sense of urgency about adopting the policies.

This matter raises the issue of reformatting, Professor Morrison observed, something the faculty went through a year ago with the revisions to the tenure code. If there is to be reformatting, the committees must work with the staff so there are not changes after the fact. These changes have meaning, he maintained. Professor Dempsey agreed, saying the administration needed to get this process under control. Dr. Carrier said that there are discussions with the Regents' Office about how to approach the formatting issue earlier, and it will be addressed earlier with future policies.

It was agreed that the drafting committee would work with the Regents' Office to revise the policy, and that the SCC would receive a red-lined copy of the changes in the policy or a document comparing, section by section, the two versions, and once resolution had been reached, it would report the results to the Senate, either for action if changes were substantive or for information if they were not.

Professor Evans adjourned the meeting at 3:25.

-- Gary Engstrand