

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, April 6, 2000  
1:00 – 2:30  
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: David Hamilton (chair pro tem), Susan Brorson, Mary Dempsey, Richard Goldstein, Stephen Gudeman, Roberta Humphreys, Mary Jo Kane, Leonard Kuhi, Joseph Massey, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Paula Rabinowitz

Regrets: Fred Morrison, Linda Brady, Les Drewes, V. Rama Murthy, Jeff Ratliff-Crain

Absent: none

Guests: Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Bruininks; Vice Provost Robert Jones

Other: Deb Cran (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost); Maureen Smith (Institutional Relations)

[In these minutes: discussion with Dr. Bruininks; tenure code interpretation; report from the Senate Research Committee]

**1. Discussion with Executive Vice President Bruininks**

Professor Hamilton convened the meeting at 1:00, explained that Professor Morrison was out of town, and welcomed Executive Vice President Bruininks. Because a number of the issues before the Committee involved personnel and other sensitive subjects, he asked for and received a motion to close the meeting. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

During the 75-minute discussion with Dr. Bruininks the following topics were discussed:

- Legislative issues and the outcome of the University's capital request.
- The policy on emeriti faculty (which will appear on the Senate docket for action).
- The tuition remission proposal from the Committee on Faculty Affairs; at the request of Dr. Bruininks, the Committee voted to change the item from action to information in order that there could be further study by the administration of the fiscal impact of the proposal.
- The workload policy in the College of Liberal Arts. After vigorous discussion, it was agreed that Dr. Bruininks would meet with all of the parties involved and try to reach some agreement. Three questions raised were whether there had been sufficient communication within CLA,

---

\* 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.

whether there was an adequately-functioning governance structure in CLA, and whether it was appropriate for this Committee to take up an issue that appears to be affecting only one college.

- Department and unit balances.
- The role of the University in the economy of the state.

Professor Hamilton thanked Dr. Bruininks for meeting with the Committee; the Committee then voted to open the meeting.

## **2. Tenure Code Interpretation**

Professor Hamilton turned next to Professor Dempsey, chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, who introduced for information a proposed amendment to an Interpretation of the tenure code. The intent of the new Interpretation is to clarify that if the statement required by Section 7.12 of the code is changed by the faculty of a unit to reflect new criteria for promotion and tenure, probationary faculty may choose to be judged either by the revised 7.12 statement or the one under which they were initially hired. The change would not apply to tenured associate professors being considered for promotion to full professor because they presumably would have had the opportunity to discuss and approve any changes in the 7.12 statement.

The Committee raised no questions with respect to the proposed change. The Committee did ask that Professor Dempsey and the Tenure Subcommittee look at the language of the interpretation in light of whatever the actual language of the tenure code may be.

## **3. Report from the Senate Research Committee**

Professor Kuhl now reported on recent issues before the Senate Research Committee. It considered the effectiveness of the process for reviewing the use of human subjects in research and concluded that the office for administering the process seems inadequately staffed. It looked at NTS rates that seem to be so unfair to departments, and will continue to examine the issue. These charges should be covered by indirect cost rates but departments do not receive money for the charges and cannot charge the costs to grants. This suggests a need to look again at indirect cost rates and what is contained in them. The Research Committee also heard about the sessions on education in the responsible conduct of research.

Professor Hamilton thanked Professor Kuhl and adjourned the meeting at 2:35.

-- Gary Engstrand