

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday-Friday, August 26-27, 1999
Retreat
University of Minnesota, Crookston**

- Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Susan Brorson, Mary Dempsey, David Hamilton, Roberta Humphreys, Mary Jo Kane, Leonard Kuhi, Joseph Massey, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, V. Rama Murthy, Paula Rabinowitz, Jeff Ratliff-Crain
- Absent: Linda Brady, Richard Goldstein, Stephen Gudeman
- Guests: Executive Vice President Robert Bruininks; members of the Crookston faculty and administration, at various meetings
- Other: Vickie Courtney (University Senate) and Florence Funk (Office of the Executive Vice President) for some meetings

[In these minutes: Crookston campus matters; major upcoming agenda items for the Senate/committees; Committee business]

The Committee held a series of meetings on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning, with topics and actions as noted.

1. August 26, 4:00 p.m., with Executive Vice President Bruininks

The Committee discussed reactions to the comments that had been made at a 2-hour workshop on shared governance held immediately before this meeting. Issues discussed included how shared governance might be improved on the Crookston campus, the history and issues surrounding funding for the coordinate campuses, and general matters related to morale and decision-making on the campus.

2. August 26, 7:00 p.m., with Executive Vice President Bruininks

Professor Morrison made a number of announcements:

- Kate Stuckert, in the Senate office, has taken a position with Chief of Staff Tonya Brown, so it will be necessary to hire a replacement for her.
- The Senate meeting and State of the University address will be on September 30, beginning at 3:15.
- He reviewed the major agenda items that will be coming to the Committee from the several committees whose chairs are ex officio members of this Committee.

* 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.

From the Committee on Educational Policy:

- Academic calendars
- Distance education
- Guidelines for classroom expectations
- Student academic dishonesty (in cooperation with the task force appointed on this subject, chaired by Regents' Professor Tom Clayton)
- Student evaluations of instruction and the use of data
- Peer review of instruction
- A policy regarding credits and degrees
- First-year seminars for transfer students
- Connection of first-year seminars with CLE and the writing requirements

From the Committee on Faculty Affairs:

- A statement to be brought to the Senate to remind deans of their place in determining faculty workload
- A resolution regarding the retention of faculty lines when departments reject tenure candidates
- Resolution on faculty appointments
- Enforcement model for policy compliance
- Two-year waiting period for faculty retirement benefits
- Faculty retiree's bill of rights
- Review and approve procedures for the Intellectual Property policy.
- The effect of increasing faculty workloads on quality of service
- Development of a faculty handbook

From the Committee on Finance and Planning:

- Faculty salaries
- The capital budget
- Long-term debt and expiring debt
- Telephone rates; a new telephone system
- Status and progress of Enterprise Systems Project
- Parking spaces/rates, transportation issues
- Relocation of units
- Annual budget

From the Senate Research Committee:

- The enforcement model
- Procedures for policies that have been adopted
- NIH policies
- Items brought by Professor Hamilton related to grants management

With respect to the item titled "relocation" on the Finance and Planning Committee agenda, Dr. Bruininks explained that it is hoped that a number of academic goals can be accomplished at the same time there is considerable dislocation and relocation as a result of the various construction projects going on. These goals include bringing University College closer to the Minnesota Extension Service, bringing the humanities together in a district and an institute (in Nolte), consolidation of the offices having to do with multicultural affairs, and consolidation of international programs. Buildings will not be taken down

during the relocation period, but afterwards Norris Gymnasium is slated for demolition. Committee members suggested that the Science Classroom Building and Wesbrook Hall should also be demolished.

Professor Murthy commented that the presentation of the list of projects proposed for the capital request, presented to the Committee at its last meeting, included no information on the basis for the decisions or consultation with the Committee. Dr. Bruininks said that development of the capital request was a complex process, and that presumably there was consultation in the colleges about the projects. Professor Morrison responded that there may have been collegiate consultation, but the costs of new buildings (debt service and operation) are born by EVERYBODY. The administration approves projects and then imposes \$13 million in debt service which all must support--and then says that there is insufficient money for faculty salaries, TAs, and so on. There is never a discussion about whether the \$13 million in debt service should have been taken on in the first place.

3. August 27, 8:00 a.m.

Professor Morrison convened the meeting and introduced a number of items for discussion.

- A "simplified" Senate meeting, where all the meetings (except probably the Student Senate) are held simultaneously. The Committee endorsed this proposal.
- Election of the FCC chair: he noted that there had been requests to review the "lame duck" procedure. Committee members discussed a number of options, and agreed that a proposal should be brought back in the near future.
- Professor Morrison proposed that FCC sponsor lunches with Senators and with department heads, by geographic groupings, but that these lunches not be considered FCC meetings. He would attend, it would be hoped that FCC members from those areas would attend, and one additional FCC member not from the area would also be asked to attend. Minutes of major points of the discussion would be kept.
- The Committee needs to decide how to deal with athletic issues when they come to the governance system. Professor Morrison said he would speak with the President's Office before the next Committee meeting about the allegations on faculty giving grades that were not warranted. Professor Marshak urged that the Committee should defend the reputation of faculty: it must either protect the faculty or it must say that what was done was wrong. There is also need for faculty to know whom to call if they believe they are being subject to pressure concerning a student's grade.

With respect to the report forthcoming from the investigators, Professor Martin moved, and it was unanimously voted, that Professor Sara Evans be provided a copy of the report without redactions, and that she be asked to assure this Committee that the redacted report is not substantially different from the full report.

- It was agreed that the present operation of this Committee vis-à-vis the Senate Consultative Committee was appropriate.

4. August 27, 10:00 a.m., with the Crookston Consultative Committee

Professor Morrison convened the meeting, welcomed everyone, and called for a round of introductions. He said that one purpose of the Committee's visit was to get to know the members of the UMC Consultative Committee, so they could get to know members of the FCC, and said that UMC Committee members should feel free to call FCC members with issues.

The discussion touched on a number of issues of concern to UMC, including adjunct faculty and others who hold "courtesy" faculty rank, who grants such rank (not the faculty), shared governance, workload policy (it is seen as not equitable), and increased use of interactive television for meetings, in order to save on travel time and expense. The role and performance of the UMC Consultative Committee was a concern.

FCC spent some time trying to ascertain the number of "faculty" and the use of faculty titles on the campus; it was finally agreed that Professor Morrison would be provided the information later. This matter was related to the question of who would be qualified to serve in any future faculty assembly, who would speak for the "faculty," and who was doing what kinds of work. The conduct of searches and the way in which appointments were made elicited spirited exchanges; FCC members expressed concern about the apparent use of what amount to long-term "temporary" appointments. There may have been a need for such appointments during the immediate period of the transition, but that is no longer a valid justification for such appointments, Professor Marshak maintained.

Topics that receive recurring attention on the campus include management styles, whether a visionary administration is willing to wait for the faculty, the substitution of capital for labor and the related matter of appropriate funding, and the transition from a two-year to a four-year institution with no increase in staff. The ability of Crookston faculty to meet research standards of the University was also questioned, given that they typically teach four 3-credit courses per term.

Professor Morrison observed that the joint subcommittee on academic appointments had made recommendations concerning designation of faculty status and other kinds of positions, and that presumably the outcome of the task force on academic appointments would have an impact on the process used at Crookston. He also said that the faculty would be in a stronger position if they went ahead with plans to establish a faculty assembly. He thanked the members of the Consultative Committee for joining the meeting.

5. August 27, 10:45 a.m., with the Academic Coordinating Committee

Professor Morrison now welcomed members of the Academic Coordinating Committee and again called for a round of introductions. The structure, role, and history of the committee was explained, including the information that it was not a governance but rather an administrative committee.

Issues touched upon in the conversation included the locus of decision about (re)location of a faculty position (the administration), the lack of any campus-wide academic planning group that includes faculty (there is faculty involvement within the centers), how center directors are appointed and the nature of their appointments (they are not all faculty, not all were appointed through the normal search process), the extent to which there is an overall plan to develop and strengthen the campus (there are benchmarks but it is not clear whether the administration will increase funding for the campus if the benchmarks are

achieved), how a new degree program would be established (through curriculum committees, the Campus Assembly, and then through the normal process to the Board of Regents), the number of sabbaticals taken by UMC faculty (not as many as most would desire, in part because the small size of programs makes it difficult for a faculty member to leave), and where the campus might be vis-à-vis technology and education in the next few years (the compact process will provide the means for addressing that question). The campus is not short on vision, it was said, and does wish to expand and offer new programs. Collaboration with University College and other institutions was considered.

Asked what FCC had heard in its discussions, Professor Morrison recalled that when there was a vote on collective bargaining two years ago (with a 16-16 tie at UMC), there was a major question of confidence. Based on what FCC had heard at this meeting, there remains a major question about the role of the faculty in the future of the campus; the expression of faculty views is a major concern. There is a University view about how faculty should participate in decision-making about academic directions and what personnel should be hired; concerns about this have been expressed. It is amazing that the campus can operate with 30-40 tenured or tenure-track faculty and 1200 students, he said, and supplementation of teaching is a concern.

It was noted that the campus is changing, with the establishment of a faculty forum, but it must also be recognized that the standards of the Twin Cities campus are not the same as those for UMC (e.g., teaching loads are very different). If there is a credible faculty governance structure that says these differences are acceptable, that would be OK, Professor Marshak said. Further, Professor Morrison pointed out, there used to be a footnote in the tenure code for UMC, that the UMC faculty wanted, allowing for certain differences; that footnote was removed (probably as an oversight) in the recent changes to the tenure code. That may not be helpful for UMC. Building a community of faculty support for the goals of the campus could be helpful, but he senses that that support is not as strong as it might be.

The role and morale of the P&A staff who perform faculty-like responsibilities was also addressed during the meeting, as well as faculty concerns about what those individuals do and how they perceive their jobs. The possibility of treating program development activity in the tenure review process was suggested, in order that time spent building programs could be considered in a tenure file. Professor Dempsey advised that the tenure code Section 7.12 departmental statement could be written to accommodate such work. FCC members expressed considerable skepticism about the rationale for hiring P&A staff ("temporary" appointments) for program development and leadership, rather than tenure-track faculty.

There must be recognition given to all of the changes and progress that have been made in the six years since the change to four-year degree programs, it was said, that the campus is doing well, and that it is being recognized for what it is doing. FCC members assented.

Professor Morrison thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.

6. August 27, 11:30 a.m., with Chancellor Donald Sargeant

The Committee met with Dr. Sargeant over lunch and heard his views about the state of the campus, the nature of faculty involvement in the decision-making process, and his perceptions of the difficulties the campus had faced as it had made the change from a 2-year to a 4-year campus.

Professor Morrison thanked Dr. Sargeant for the warm hospitality that he and his colleagues had extended during the Committee's visit to the campus.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota