

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, 2000**  
**1:00 – 3:00**  
**Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Roberta Humphreys (chair pro tem), Wilbert Ahern, Muriel Bebeau, Linda Brady, Susan Brorson, Mary Dempsey, Richard Goldstein, Marti Hope Gonzales, Stephen Gudeman, Mary Jo Kane, Leonard Kuhi, Joseph Massey, Judith Martin, Paula Rabinowitz, Charles Speaks

Regrets: Fred Morrison, Les Drewes, David Hamilton, Marvin Marshak, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Billie Wahlstrom

Absent: V. Rama Murthy

Guests: President Mark Yudof

Other: Maureen Smith (Institutional Relations)

[In these minutes: Discussion with the President about the bonding bill, implementation of Senate reports and actions, faculty salaries, and faculty retention practices; Committee discussion of faculty salaries, retention, relationships with the legislature/legislators, and CLA workload policy. AAUP salary data are appended to these minutes.]

**1. Discussion with President Yudof**

Professor Humphreys convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed the President. She explained that both Professors Morrison and Hamilton were out of town so she had been asked to serve as chair. Before turning to the President, she introduced the new members of the Committee: Professor Muriel Bebeau (newly elected from the Twin Cities), Professor Marti Gonzales (incoming vice chair of the Senate), and Professor Bert Ahern from Morris, incoming chair of the Committee on Educational Policy).

The President began by reviewing the bonding bill. For the University it contained good news and bad news: the good news is that the University received most of the major facilities it requested; the bad news is that instead of paying 33% of the costs, it must pay 43%. That, he said, is unacceptable for the long-term. For now, however, the University is on a good trajectory and the next renovations will probably be in the knoll area of the East Bank.

The President and the Committee then discussed tuition and how the change to semesters affected tuition income.

---

\* 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.

It is time to begin work on the next budget, the President observed; the University will “shoot higher” next time, he said. The legislature likes the path the University is on. The major item in the next request will be compensation.

The President also provided an update on athletic matters. He expressed the hope that the NCAA will not await the outcome of the federal investigation but would complete its review of the University’s report and sanctions and reach a conclusion later this summer.

Professor Humphreys inquired about the administrative responses to the Student Academic Integrity and the Sexual Misconduct reports. The President said the Student Academic Integrity report was a very good one that the administration will implement. Professor Morrison is talking with Vice President Brown about the Sexual Misconduct recommendations; some can be implemented immediately while in other cases it may be that even more can be done. In those instances the subject will be put back in the governance system for further consideration.

Professor Humphreys then drew the attention of the President to a list of items that have been approved by the Senate or Assembly but that have not been acted on by the administration. The President apologized for the delay; there has been a problem in his office in acting on them. He said there is no problem with the vast majority of the items and it is just a matter of getting them out of the offices that need to review them. He asked that the staff to the Committee work with Vice President Brown to move them along.

Professor Humphreys turned next to the subject of faculty salaries, a subject on which Professor Morrison has pushed all year. She said that she brings a slightly different perspective to the issue. One always sees the list of Top 30 research universities and Minnesota’s rank in that group; this is the list that legislators and the public sees as well. One reaction to the fact that Minnesota ranks 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> is “that’s OK, we’re holding our own.” Professor Humphreys said she believed the problem to be broader, and provided copies of a list of salaries at other institutions drawn from ACADEME (the list is appended to these minutes). The compensation issue is much broader than just the Top 30; the institutions with which Minnesota competes is much larger than the Top 30. Many of these institutions are state universities; the California schools are doing very well as are many of the small public schools and the private liberal arts colleges. This list could be useful in educating legislators and the Regents, she said.

For example, she pointed out that the average full professor salaries at Carleton are \$79,600 and at Macalester are \$80,100. By comparison, in English the average full professor's salary is \$70,000.

The President said he had no problem using this list but said he did not believe it would be a great epiphany for either legislators or Regents; he would, however, put it before them. Of the top 25 universities, all but three are private, he noted; the University must stay on the message that it competes with the private institutions as well as the publics.

The University needs to work harder with legislators on this issue, he said. There is sometimes a failure to appreciate the fact that faculty are not JUST teachers, a failure to appreciate the relationship between good facilities and a good faculty (that is, good facilities without good faculty are not very worthwhile), and this is a very egalitarian state, where legislators tend to be more concerned about people making low salaries. Legislators tend not to be upset when they see the list of schools where faculty make much higher salaries; they DO get worried when programs are endangered or faculty leave. This is

all part of a trend to treat education as a private rather than a public good; faculty are seen as employees and the only ones who benefit from the University are the students who are here. One sees this manifested in the decline in the percentage of state funds to research universities.

Professor Humphreys related that she has made comments to her own legislator on this subject. Legislators see the average faculty salary of \$89,500, which looks pretty good. That number, however, includes salaries from Law and the Carlson School and engineering; what are the salaries in CLA? She proposes using the expanded list as one way to answer legislative concerns about "exorbitant" faculty salaries; they need to see the salaries in the context of the wider academic community.

Professor Kane said that other issues come up as well, such as that faculty "don't work" in the summer and they have tenure. The President is right, however, to emphasize what the University does for the state. One silver lining to the tenure battle was that there was a concerted effort by the faculty to get across to the whole state the message about what it means to have the University here. That message must again be gotten out.

The President agreed and said this should be the topic of conversation over the summer. He noted that except for the California schools, not many other public institutions have done particularly well at the hands of state legislatures. Some see the universities ONLY in terms of economic development and are willing to increase funding on that basis, but the money goes to engineering and not the liberal arts. He said he would like to seek 15% salary increases, net of inflation, and would like to get the legislature to perhaps buy into a plan to award 15% salary increases above inflation over two years. These 3% and 4% increases, he observed, only keep the University from falling farther behind.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is retention policy, Professor Humphreys told the President. She said that she has been told, all the time she has been at the University, that in order to have a decent salary she has to get a job offer from somewhere else. She acknowledged that this is not University POLICY but it is the culture of the place. As a result, there are morale problems among the faculty who feel they are doing a very good job, much more than minimally required, but who never get rewarded. If there is to be a change in the culture away from encouraging people to look elsewhere for a job offer--even if they have no intention of leaving--the University must reward people for doing a good job. That is nearly impossible with low salary increases.

Much of this is decided within departments, the President pointed out. But the problem, he agreed, is not enough money. He also agreed that there should be pre-emptive strikes before people receive offers from other institutions.

It is not just that one is rewarded by leaving or by obtaining offers, Professor Gonzales commented; one is PUNISHED for a continued commitment to the University. If faculty decide that this is the place where they want to spend the rest of their career they are punished financially.

Professor Speaks offered another point on the issues of morale and retention: in the past, the President or Vice President siphoned off funds for use in retention cases; now all the money goes to the college and department. When a department has 9 or 10 or 12 faculty, there are funds for 3% salary increases, and it faces one or two retention cases, there is DEFINITELY a morale problem because much of the salary money has to go to the retention cases. Professor Humphreys agreed, and reported that she had recently learned that in one college the dean had, until this year, retained funds for retention cases;

those funds came from everyone since they were retained centrally in the college. This year, however, the department must come up with 50% of the funds and must also pay other retention expenses in the same way they must fund part of start-up costs. In a second case, the department had to come up with MORE than 50% of the money for the retention salary offer.

This is a problem, the President agreed. The money, however, is in the colleges. One could recast the question, he pointed out: do the faculty want the colleges or the President/Vice President to make the retention decisions? The problem is not enough money, but the central administration could withhold funds for retention, which would mean that everyone would have less money.

At this point the President excused himself. Professor Humphreys thanked him for joining the meeting.

Professor Gudeman suggested that the issue is more complicated and that one cannot just focus on departments. Other public universities are in about the same situation as Minnesota in terms of funding from the state; that funding for all of them has been falling over time. This social factor the University cannot control. But, he said, the faculty need to understand better why Minnesota's salaries are lower than at other institutions; what is the University spending its money on? What percentage should be spent on salaries? What are benchmarks? Another issue is that Minnesota is a small state in terms of population. Has anyone calculated the per-capita support for the University? Would that number would be relatively high.

All of these things have an impact on salaries and constrain the University, Professor Gudeman said. He added that he did not believe numerical arguments--being 26<sup>th</sup> in salaries when the University wants to be 15<sup>th</sup> -- are very persuasive in themselves; it is stories and achievements and students who have an effect. The University needs to do a better job in putting together its arguments.

Professor Rabinowitz inquired if it would be useful to have legislators come to the University, or have faculty go to the legislature "by the hundreds" and run seminars, rather than just sending administrative representatives to St. Paul. The needs of the University are filtered through administrators; legislators don't have a sense of what faculty do. Is there a way for the faculty, or the faculty governance system, to invite legislators to a day at the University or for the faculty to have a day at the legislature? Professor Humphreys said that her legislator has told her that they want to hear faculty explain what they do, not hear a budget request.

Professor Rabinowitz asked why faculty at the University, who have done research on everything, do not appear before the legislature. They do testify before committees and subcommittees, Professor Martin explained, on specific subjects.

Professor Kane wondered if the University's representatives to the legislature are making the wrong arguments or if they are crafting the arguments in the wrong way. Salaries are a problem for the STATE, not just the University, she maintained. Alternatively, she agreed with Professor Gudeman, the issue could be the DISTRIBUTION of funds within the University. The faculty need a strategy to figure out how to address these questions, she concluded.

Professor Rabinowitz recalled that the President had said he did not want to talk about how the University helps make better citizens but rather instrumental arguments. If those are the arguments for

the University, many in the liberal arts have wasted their careers, she said, and if those are the arguments made on its behalf the University will lose. Professor Humphreys said the view of the University as doing more applied work than emphasizing the core has been true as long as she has been here.

Professor Gudeman said it is also important that the Regents come to visit classes and so on, which is something this Committee could organize. Arguments about what the University does for the state may fall on deaf ears, he said. Abstract arguments are only part of the story; the faculty should be aggressive in carrying the University's message to the state.

Professor Bebeau said that one of the most effective tools the faculty used during the tenure battle were letters to the editor, individual stories that describe what faculty do. Those are what legislators want to know, Professor Humphreys responded. The most important thing individual faculty can do is cultivate relationships with legislators, Professor Kuhi added; legislators will remember faculty constituents even after they have repeatedly heard arguments about salaries at 15<sup>th</sup> versus 26<sup>th</sup> and the University as economic engine of the state.

Professor Martin inquired of Professor Kuhi about the turn-around for the California universities. She recalled that they were beat up on twenty years ago. There is a new governor and legislature, Professor Kuhi said. The Minnesota legislature seems not to understand the principle that it must repair damage when times are good. The California schools received salary increases of 13-14% for three years because the legislature recognized it needed to make up for past problems.

About five years ago a small group of faculty was commissioned to write a white paper on what would happen if the University were privatized, Professor Martin recalled. Now that state support has declined from 50% to 31% of the University's budget privatization is a live issue. If the University could raise the necessary money, why would it need the legislature? In addition, Professor Kuhi pointed out, private universities receive a significant amount of public funds.

Professor Ahern agreed that the faculty need to tell more stories but said that FCC could have a more direct impact by affecting decisions made at the University. The Committee needs to look at the allocation of funds. He also observed that 25 or 30 years ago most members of the legislature were University graduates; when the DFL obtained majorities in the legislature, a major group consisted of members of the teachers' union—who were NOT University graduates.

Regents' Professor Goldstein suggested that faculty going to the legislature to lobby for salary increases is not effective because it is seen as self-serving; he agreed that talking about what they do can be. He said that the reason other organizations or groups obtain funding is because they have external advocates; having another group argue on your behalf is more effective. Second, the point about the allocation of funds is important and he said he would guarantee the Committee on Faculty Affairs would find out about allocation. He said it is possible that some data from other institutions might be obtained as well.

Professor Massey expressed concern about the AAUP salary data distributed by Professor Humphreys. He said he doubted the \$89,500 average salary; there are so many ways that faculty are paid at the University that the numbers are very difficult to calculate. The data come from whatever the University provides the AAUP, Professor Humphreys said. The actual number is probably lower than the

one reported by the AAUP, Professor Massey maintained. Professor Kane said that the faculty need to see modes and medians as well as means; the average is highly susceptible to extremes.

Professor Humphreys said she would like to see the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Committee on Finance and Planning obtain the data, and in particular college salary data. Professor Speaks promised that he and Professor Goldstein would do so but he said he was doubtful about whether such information could be obtained at the departmental level. Professor Goldstein related that department heads in IT always knew where they stood vis-à-vis their Big Ten peers, but the Committee in the course of conversation concluded that asking departments to gather data would be impracticable.

Professor Goldstein also recalled that President Keller talked about preventive retention. David Berg, who headed Management Planning and Information Services before he retired, obtained data from the Big Ten on salaries by department and how University departments stood. In combination with a rating system that was developed, the President gave out funds to departments that needed them. Presumably if Mr. Berg could obtain the data, so could Dr. Zetterberg.

Professor Humphreys asked that the two committees also consider the retention issue. She reiterated that when the dean reserved funds for retention the burden fell on everyone in the college; when retention falls to the department, one case can decimate salary funds. Retentions can affect large departments as well, Professor Rabinowitz said; in one case, after retention cases a department had \$25,000 in salary increases to spread over 40 people.

This is a college issue, Professor Speaks maintained, along with tuition attribution. The administration has said that IMG stops at the college level, but some have chosen to apply it to departments in retention cases. Nothing central administration has said requires that. Professor Humphreys said she is bothered by the fact that decentralization sounds good but then one is told the issues are no longer for faculty governance because they now are college matters. In many colleges, there is no effective faculty governance.

The Committee then talked about the need for faculty to be at the table when decisions are made about the budget in order that they can emphasize the need to improve salaries. That will happen with the Budget Management Task Force (now termed the Budget Management Advisory Committee), Professor Gudeman observed; when the University plans the biennial request, faculty will be part of the process. The faculty need to emphasize salaries and also say "no more buildings!" Professor Martin added. Faculty cannot participate in legislative decisions, it was pointed out, but the most important table for them to be at, Professor Goldstein repeated, is the one when University decisions about allocation are made.

Why not bring legislators to campus and sign them up for courses, inquired Professor Rabinowitz? Or do something like the Mini Med School, Professor Bebeau suggested: have them spend time in classes, in labs, in planning a grant, with students, in proportion to the amount of time faculty spend on the activities. Another possibility would be a video on the subject, such as one done for the Gateway Center and one being prepared by the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. Professor Bebeau observed that legislators know about the teaching; they are less knowledgeable about other faculty work.

Professor Humphreys suggested that Professor Morrison could bring up these suggestions with the President.

Professor Humphreys then noted that this was her last FCC meeting and that she had taken advantage of the opportunity as chair to bring up issues that have bothered her over the last five years she has been involved in governance, specifically salaries and retention. She said she did not know how to change the culture on the matter of retention but reiterated that rewarding faculty who are doing well would do much to increase morale. One of the factors that prompts a chair to take action when a faculty member is getting outside offers is the worry that if the individual leaves, the department will lose the position. It would reduce pressure on chairs if they had an assurance they could keep a position if it became vacant because of a retention loss.

Professor Humphreys then turned to Professor Goldstein for an update on the CLA workload issue. She recalled that FCC had concluded this was not an issue for it to deal with, but it is sufficiently sensitive that she requested a report on what the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) is doing about it.

Professor Goldstein said he was not sure it was a SCFA issue, either, but that they had heard from Dean Rosenstone and a number of faculty. There is not a meeting of the minds on the issue. There is a serious problem about who makes decisions and how far down into the college decanal authority should run. He said he could not imagine the IT dean telling faculty their teaching load and that there appears to be very top-down control in CLA.

The concern of CLA faculty is that there is no PREDICTABLE time when they would have a lighter teaching load. All are expected to teach two classes per semester. There are ways to buy out or make arrangements not to do so in a particular term, but that is under the control of the dean.

The change to semesters complicated the issue. There was in CLA under quarters an uneven relationship between the number of credits for a course and the number of hours the course met; in some cases, 4-credit courses met 3 hours.

Professor Martin said that there is a concern about moving to a 4-credit module and there is a difference between what is good for faculty and for students. It was clear that as the University changed to semesters, if the predominant credit module was 4, students could graduate with 30 courses. A number of faculty did not believe that was enough exposure to the variety of the curriculum, which is why SCEP recommended a 3-credit module and 36 or 37 courses for graduation.

Professor Gudeman said he did not understand this argument, since this means the University is the only semester school that requires students to take about five courses per semester rather than four. And where students work 20-40 hours per week that makes no sense, Professor Rabinowitz added.

There is no doubt, Professor Speaks said, that there will be serious consideration given to moving many courses back to 4 credits. He said that he agreed with Professor Goldstein that teaching three courses at 4 credits each is the same workload as teaching four courses at 3 credits each. He noted that CLA had no workload policy before Dean Julia Davis was directed by Associate Vice President Anne Hopkins to develop one; workload was left up to the departments. Now the situation has become more difficult with IMG and with the change to semesters. If the policy is left to a department, tuition could drop--or IMG could be devolved to departments to avoid that possibility.

Professor Goldstein said he was aware that IMG and tuition were driving the decision by CLA. Dean Rosenstone believes that CLA will generate more tuition income if courses are primarily 4 credits. Professor Goldstein observed that his own children went to good schools and took four courses per semester and received a good education. It is not clear why the curriculum could not be repackaged so students could take four courses per semester.

Professor Speaks recalled that the University received advice from SCEP that the primary credit module should be three credits. It was based on a number of intelligent reasons but in the final analysis it may have been the wrong decision.

Professor Martin responded that employers want students trained to do something; liberal arts students are not trained that way, but instead are supposed to have breadth and flexibility. The lack of breadth and flexibility that would result from reducing the curriculum for undergraduates by one-third is what drove the argument for three-credit courses. This is finagling with the curriculum, she contended.

Professor Rabinowitz said the faculty were told the change to semesters would be workload neutral. People were thinking about courses. When it is convenient, the argument is made in terms of courses; when not, it is made in terms of credits. The faculty NEED a term when their load is reduced; everyone would be happy if they were guaranteed a light semester every three years. This should NOT, she added, be considered an internal college matter.

The practice in CLA, Professors Humphreys and Gonzales argued, is a violation of the institutional commitment that the change to semesters would be workload neutral. While the change at the institutional level might have been workload neutral, it was not within the colleges--and the burden has been put on the backs of the CLA faculty, Professor Gonzales maintained.

When the University left the quarter system, the number of course credits equaled the number of contact hours per week for only about 25% of the faculty; for 75% of the faculty, the number of contact hours per week was less than the number of course credits, Professor Speaks commented. So for those faculty who taught a four-credit course under quarters but only had three contact hours per week, there was an increase in workload after the conversion to semesters and the courses met the standard that the number of credits for each course must equal the number of contact hours per week. For those faculty who, under quarters, the number of course credits equaled the number of contact hours per week, there was a workload decrease as we moved to semesters. The change could NOT be workload neutral, Professor Speaks said, when some departments did not honor the relationship between course credits and instructional hours. With the change to semesters, departments were forced to confront that problem.

Professor Goldstein said he agreed with Professor Rabinowitz: there MUST be terms where the faculty teaching load is relatively light and that should be a guarantee to all, not just star faculty.

Professor Humphreys thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 2:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

AAUP Salary Data  
(\* = Top 30 research university)

Rockefeller University	129.8	
Harvard University	128.9	**
Stanford University	121.1	**
Princeton University	120.0	**
Yale University	119.0	**
University of Chicago	118.5	**
Caltech	118.4	**
New York University	116.1	**
Univ. Pennsylvania	114.8	**
Columbia University	113.4	**
M.I.T.	111.7	**
Northwestern	111.2	**
U.C. Berkeley	108.7	**
Duke University	108.0	**
Emory University	107.0	
Rutgers State Univ. Newark	106.7	
U. C. L. A.	106.1	**
Rice University	102.8	
Georgetown University	102.8	
Babson College (MA)	102.7	
Georgia Institute Tech	101.6	
Washington Univ. St. Louis	101.3	
University of Virginia	101.2	
University of Michigan	100.9	**
Notre Dame	100.8	
Boston College	100.5	

---

Vanderbilt University	99.8	
University of So. Calif.	99.7	
U. C. San Diego	99.7	**
Carnegie-Mellon	99.7	**
Rutgers - Camden	99.4	
Rutgers - New Brunswick	98.8	
Santa Clara Univ. (CA)	98.3	
St. Johns Univ. N.Y.	98.0	
N. Y. Inst. Tech	97.5	
Dartmouth	97.4	
Cornell Univ.	97.9	**
U.C. Irvine	96.8	
U. C. Santa Barbara	96.7	**
Georgia State Univ.	96.6	
Fordham University	95.2	

Wellesley College	95.4	
Swarthmore College	94.2	
UNC - Chapel Hill	93.8	**
Univ. Connecticut	93.5	
George Washington Univ.	93.4	
William and Mary	93.4	
Hofstra University	92.9	
Amherst College	92.8	
University of Rochester	92.8	
Temple University	92.5	
U. C. Riverside	92.2	
George Mason Univ.	92.1	
Univ. Delaware	91.9	
Barnard College	91.9	
Brown University	91.8	**
Univ. Illinois - Urbana	91.6	**
Villanova Univ.	91.6	
American Univ. (D.C.)	91.4	
U. C. Davis	91.3	
Colby College, Maine	91.2	
Colgate College	91.0	
U. C. Santa Cruz	90.8	
Southern Methodist Univ.	90.7	
Claremont - McKenna	90.5	
Johns Hopkins	90.0	**
Penn State University	89.9	**
Bowdoin College, Maine	89.8	
Smith College	89.8	
Wake Forest University	89.7	
Case Western Reserve	89.6	
University of Iowa	89.6	
UNIV. MINNESOTA - TC	89.5	**

Between the U of Minnesota and a cutoff of \$80K there are an additional 90 colleges and universities including:

University of Miami	86.8	
Indiana Univ.	85.0	
Purdue Univ.	86.9	**
Univ. of Maryland	88.8	
Tufts Univ.	89.3	
SUNY - Stony Brook	88.0	**
Ohio State	88.8	
Univ. of Pittsburgh	85.9	
Univ. Texas - Austin	89.4	**
Univ. of Richmond (Va)	86.7	

Faculty Consultative Committee  
May 18, 2000

11

Univ Wisconsin - Madison	84.5	**
University of Washington	80.6	**