

MINUTES\*

**JOINT MEETING OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS  
AND THE  
SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, May 26, 1994**

**3:15 - 5:30 p.m.**

**238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Faculty Affairs Committee: Carl Adams (chair), Carole Bland, Daniel Canafax, Ann Erickson, Daniel Feeney, Morris Kleiner, Richard McGehee, Dianne Mulvihill, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, James Stone, Yang Wang
- Research Committee: Albert Yonas (chair), John Basgen, Signe Betsinger, Eric Klinger, Jeylan Mortimer, Stephen Rich, WinAnn Schumi
- Regrets: Rose Brewer, Mary Dempsey, Audrey Grosch, Michael Sadowsky
- Absent: Carol Carrier, Liz Eull, Sara Evans, Roger Feldman, Judith Gaston, N. L. Gault, Allen Goldman, Phuong Phan, Roger Paschke, Anne Peterson, Tony Potami, Paul Sackett
- Guests: Mark Brenner

**1. Chair's Report**

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m. and briefly announced to the SCFA that he had written to President Hasselmo and FCC Chair Judy Garrard with respect to the SCFA's concerns about the Compensation Policy. He distributed copies of the letter and briefly reviewed it with the committee.

Professor Adams then welcomed members of the Research Committee to the meeting to discuss a number of issues related to both committees.

**2. Discussion of the Resolution on Research Climate**

Professor Yonas, chair of the Research Committee, introduced the first item which concerned a resolution on research climate. The issue, he said, was initiated out of a concern that faculty were not being allowed the time to conduct research necessary for receiving tenure or salary increases.

Upon review of the resolution, it was suggested that statistical figures produced by the National Institute of Health which demonstrate that faculty who are allowed 30% of their time for research and writing are much more likely to receive grants than those who are only given 20% of their time for such activities he appended to the proposal. All seemed to agree with this suggestion. After considerable discussion, the final statement of the resolution was amended as follows:

---

\*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.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that:

while recognizing that University research is inextricably interwoven with teaching and often with service, and that the distribution of effort expected of entire units need be replicated across all the unit's individual faculty members, it is nevertheless necessary ~~a rule of thumb~~ that workload structure in all such units must enable its **full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty** to devote, on average, ~~as much~~ sufficient time to research, scholarship, or creative activities within their normal work ~~week~~ efforts during their term of appointment ~~the academic year~~ as ~~would~~ reasonably necessary ~~be required~~ to sustain the quality of continuing contributions sufficient in the respective unit for tenure and promotion.

The authors of the resolution were asked to improve the language grammatically and forward it to the Faculty Consultative Committee with the recommendation that it be included on the next Faculty Senate agenda for action. A question was raised regarding the process that is followed when a resolution such as this one is approved by the Senate. Professor Adams responded that if it is approved, it will be forwarded to the President for information and response, if appropriate. Given this information, he further suggested that the resolution receive appropriate follow-up if it is endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

Other comments during the discussion included:

- a suggestion that the workload policies throughout the University be reviewed in relation to the content of the above resolution
- a recommendation that the resolution be presented to the Board of Regents, possibly within a larger document
- that the resolution should cause units and the administration to develop standards for the amount of time necessary for faculty to conduct sufficient research

**3. Discussion of Items Related to the Conflict of Interest Policy**

Associate Dean Mark Brenner joined the meeting to discuss the annual disclosure forms under the Conflict of Interest Policy. He recalled for members that the Board of Regents approved the Conflict of Interest Policy with an effective date of July 1, 1994. Annual disclosure forms for faculty on "A" appointments are anticipated to be distributed early this summer, if the content of the forms can be agreed upon. Faculty on "B" appointments will receive the forms around September 16. Both groups will have six weeks to complete and return the material. Dr. Brenner proceeded to explain the process that the disclosure forms have advanced through, and reviewed the forms as currently constructed with the committees. Dr. Brenner said that although the forms ask for descriptions of past activities, there is no grandfathering of disclosure for projects ending before July 1. One person recommended that information on the form stating that disclosure is only necessary for currently existing activities should be made more obvious.

Dr. Brenner pointed out that the 12 questions in the disclosure form will be added to a larger document which will be created once the Conflict of Commitment Policy is completed. Moreover, each disclosure form will be reviewed by one of several Conflict Review Committees (CRC). CRCs are currently outlined within the policy to oversee the appeal process. A potential problem could occur if a CRC reviewed a case as recommended by a dean and then was responsible for reviewing the case again on

appeal. A solution to this conflict would be to have the Public-Private Partnership Committee review the appeal. If that committee initially reviewed the case, an ad hoc committee would be established to review the appeal. The committees agreed to allow Dr. Brenner to pursue this change in the appeal process and to amend the language within the policy.

The joint meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. and the Faculty Affairs Committee was convened.

#### **4. Meeting With the President**

The following is a continuation of previous discussions on this subject.

Professor Bland reported that she had incorporated the committee's most recent recommendations into the draft document entitled "Meeting with Central administrators and SCFA Regarding Faculty Perceptions that Faculty and Administrators No Longer Hold Common Values." After reviewing the revised document, the following points were made:

- Differing incentives for administrators should be mentioned.
- The second bullet on p. 2 should read: "if there is a deeper problem of lack of common values or of divergent incentives guiding administrators' decisions and actions. . ."
- Senior administrators will probably only agree to one meeting on the issue, and some of the activities may not be received favorably (i.e., putting post-it notes on a board).
- The SCFA needs to come to some consensus of opinion on the process to be used [e.g. an affinity process (non-confrontational) vs. addressing specific problems].
- The FCC should be brought into the discussion to ascertain whether they support such an endeavor and if so, how they feel such a meeting should be approached.

The committee agreed with this final comment and Professors Feeney and Adams will bring this matter up with the FCC.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

- Kevin Gormley

University of Minnesota