

Minutes*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Thursday, March 16, 1995
3:15 - 5:00 p.m.
238 Morrill Hall

Present: Daniel Feeney (chair), Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Carol Chomsky, Matthew Curry, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Kinley Larntz, Richard McGehee, Diane Mulvihill, Anne Sales, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, James Stone

Regrets: Daniel Canafax, Roger Paschke

Absent: Rose Brewer, Judith Gaston, Willard Manning, Ken Roering, Michael Sadowsky, W. Donald Spring, Yang Wang

Guests: Halil Dundar, Darwin Hendel, Jane Whiteside (Academic Affairs)

[In these minutes are discussions on critical measures and development of a faculty advocacy office.]

1. INTRODUCTION

The new SCFA member, Matthew Curry, introduced himself to the committee.

2. CHAIR'S REPORT

May 4 Meeting: Professor Feeney said that Senior Vice President Infante will be attending the May 4 SCFA meeting to continue discussion on the Tenure Code issues. The committee will also develop a final opinion on the Professional Commitment Policy at this meeting in cooperation with the Interim Dean of the Graduate School, Mark Brenner.

Items to be addressed at the April 20 University Senate meeting:

Sexual Harassment Policy: This policy received a mixed response from FCC according to Dr. Feeney. This item will be on the docket for information. FCC along with SCFA were not especially supportive of "forbidding" relationships between subordinates and superiors.

Research Resolution: Professor Feeney said that slight changes were made to the resolution by FCC.

Tenure Concerns: Mary Dempsey and Dr. Feeney will be presenting this item for discussion.

Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement: Professor Feeney presented the latest proposed draft of the statement to the committee. He recommended that the members of the committee review the document for discussion later in the meeting. This item may be on the upcoming Senate docket as well.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at 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.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The committee unanimously approved the agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The March 2 minutes were approved as amended. The March 16 minutes were approved unanimously.

5. DISCUSSION OF CRITICAL MEASURES AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

Darwin Hendel introduced Jane Whiteside and Halil Dundar, and explained their contributions to the development of the critical measures. Dr. Whiteside has been addressing the measures related to faculty and staff satisfaction and development and Minnesota residents' satisfaction with the University. Dr. Dundar has been in charge of determining the measures for research, scholarship, and artistic accomplishments. Dr. Hendel said that the measures will be brought to the Board of Regents in June and July.

Dr. Hendel added that several measures have been altered. The measure on "responsiveness to compelling state needs" has been moved from the current set of measures (Phase II) to Phase III. In addition, the measure for Technology has been separated from Facilities.

Other points made by Dr. Hendel:

- The University plans to use the information collected in the Compensation Task Force Report and the Classroom Study.
- The next and likely final version of the critical measures proposal is to be presented late April/early May for discussion.

Dr. Whiteside expressed that many faculty, including those on SCFA, had expressed concern about the focus of the faculty staff measures on the University's "stars" rather than the majority of the academic employees. The former title of this measure contributed to this perception: Faculty/Staff Recruitment, Development, Satisfaction, and Retention. The new title, Faculty/Staff Experience, seeks to pursue critical measures that are relevant to all faculty. Dr. Whiteside added that it may be more appropriate to address issues of retention and recruitment at the collegiate or departmental level.

She added that there are three focal points of the new faculty/staff measure:

- 1) Development: This measure will examine how well does the University help people to develop. The Office of Human Resources has been considering how they may be involved in collecting information for this measure.
- 2) Satisfaction: The three sub-points of this measure are:
 - a. Clear expectations and feedback,
 - b. Effective problem solving around interpersonal and personnel issues,
 - c. A supportive interpersonal and physical environment.
- 3) Compensation: This measure builds on the results developed by the Compensation Working Group. The recommendations from the report produced by this group are to be used for this measure.

Points made by SCFA members:

-- Certain departments of the University have an undefined future direction. Therefore, the measure of Development may be difficult to determine because individuals may not know how they should prepare for the future needs of the department.

-- The outline of the "Interrelationships Among Eighteen Critical Measures" as listed in Figure 3 of the *Discussion Draft* follows an industrial model (We set goals/We achieve goals). This approach has been largely discredited on behalf of a quality approach that focuses on process and the individuals served rather than goals.

Dr. Hendel responded by saying that although there is a current emphasis to examine goals, the process of how goals are achieved needs to be accentuated. Dr. Whiteside added that the measure for Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Accomplishments there is likely to have a qualitative emphasis.

Q What happens once all the measures are approved?

A The Office of Planning and Analysis (Academic Affairs) will have to determine how the University is going to implement the measures. There is data available for the measures that passed in Phase I. Those data for Phase II will need to be created in cooperation with colleges, departments, and other University units.

Q Will the results be used to develop financial support from the legislature?

A The relationship between the results of the measures and budgeting is undefined at this point. A periodic report will be made to the Regents regarding the measures, some of which will likely be presented in the University's biennial request. Performance based funding is developing greater interest across the country (e.g., the number of degrees awarded) needs to be approached cautiously.

Q Will a questionnaire be sent from the Regents or will I receive a call from my department chair asking what I think about my job, etc.?

A These options are being considered, but are not determined to date. There is likely to be some kind of institutional survey with departmental instructions to conduct something similar.

Additional points made by SCFA:

-- The language in the Faculty/Staff Experience measure is similar to the that of the Student Experience. It would be preferable to have these two statement match in language.

-- Page 8 of the Discussion Draft expresses the presence of faculty with instructing undergraduate courses, but neglects to mention the apprentice quality of TA's. Would there be some way to link faculty supervision with teaching assistants as a performance measure?

Dr. Whiteside said that she would bring these points to Dr. Hendel's attention.

Q This document seems more concerned with developing sets of numbers to measure the indices. How is the survey project going to solicit open ended responses?

A We do need to figure better ways to communicate the emphasis on gaining qualitative information. Numbers by themselves can be misleading.

Q I understand the public relation needs for conduction this project. What are the other reasons?

A When the critical measures were first being talked about last spring, four main purposes were outlined:

1. To report to the public,
2. To guide the University internally toward common goals,
3. To provide better linkage between planning and resource allocation, and

4. To compare the University to other institutions.

The entire group contributed the following items:

- The numbers allow gross indicators of areas that may need some development.
- You cannot put a price on good public relations.
- The resource issues are going to only become more difficult. These measures will help the University to know where it should focus its attention as it works toward the goals of U2000.
- Goals need to be outlined to guide evaluation.
- Outcome goals must be linked with process goals. In other words, do not measure outcomes without the accompanying processes. The outcomes figures serve as public relations while the process information helps the institution to change for the future.
- Under-represented and diverse groups may get lost outside of Phase I of the critical measures.
- The idea of selecting out the prestigious scholarly and artistic accomplishments

Dr. Whiteside said that the more the discussions on critical measures progress, the more defined the goals of the University are being limited. Under-represented groups will be part of all the critical measures which will be "pulled together" when all 18 measures are completely developed. The committee members encouraged Dr. Whiteside to mention this point in Phase II as it was in Phase I.

6. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

Dr. Feeney asked the committee to respond to the latest alternative for the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement. After a short period of discussion, the committee members were requested to review the latest statement over the next week and contact Professor Feeney with their responses. Dr. Feeney will assemble the reactions and present them to FCC.

7. RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FACULTY/ACADEMIC STAFF ADVOCACY AND GRIEVANCE ADVISORY PROGRAM

Professor Feeney asked SCFA to express an opinion as to whether the University should re-establish the faculty/academic staff advocacy program. He explained to the committee that a certain amount of money is available to initiate the program. Funding on a continuing basis has not been solicited.

Points offered by SCFA:

- Under the current grievance procedure, the grievance officer reports to the Administration.
- There may be faculty who do not know of any objective party they could speak with regarding a possible grievance.
- The interpretation of what a grievance is has changed due to personnel changes. There was a case that one committee member thought was a grievance which the current grievance officer declined to process formally.

The following questions were fielded by Dr. Feeney and Assoc. V. P. Carol Carrier:

Q Who would review performance, hire, fire, etc. the personnel in an advocacy office?

A Associate Vice President Carol Carrier said that the former reporting mechanism used for Dr. Maureen Venters (reporting to a committee) would need to be improved. Ideas from the committee were:

- Setting up a subcommittee to supervise the staff for an advocacy office,
- Hiring an outside supervisory service (This could be arranged for Nick Barbatsis)

Q Could this type of office effectively be established?

A Dr. Ward also said that there is a need for more general faculty representatives. The Grievance Office (and possibly the advocacy program) was set up to avoid the sending cases to the Judicial Committee which usually deals with situations involving potential dismissal.

Points offered by the committee:

- The University Grievance Officer is not only serving as an advisor, conflict mediator, and also as a "gate-keeper." An advocacy office would not be representing the administration in any way.
- We could ask the faculty and staff if they thought this service could be useful (possibly through *Kiosk*).
- Dr. Clarence Carter (former Grievance Officer) should be invited to speak with SCFA.

Professor Feeney saw the emergence of two issues from the discussion:

- 1) Does the faculty want an advocacy office? If an office is established, how should the reporting mechanism be constructed?
- 2) Should the University Grievance Officer continue to report to the President? There seems to be a conflict of interest in this arrangement.

The committee continued discussing the matter and decided that there seems to be a need for an advocacy office. They decided to invite Dr. Carter to an upcoming meeting for the purpose of refining the discussion on developing a faculty advocacy program.

8. RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Feeney told SCFA that the retired faculty group had recently spoken with the subcommittee to discuss the differences between retirement policies and programs for those employed at the University before 1963 vs. those working after that year. Supplements have been provided by the University Benefits Office to make sure that sufficient income is provided for the pre-1963 retirees. Dr. Feeney said that the subcommittee had asked SCFA if it could interact independently with the Administration for the purpose of seeking further augmentation for these pre-1963 retirees. The subcommittee will be meeting with the Administration again on April 17. Professor Feeney asked the committee for permission to act on behalf of SCFA again, freeing the subcommittee to take action on a decision, if needed, at the April 17 meeting. SCFA gave the subcommittee permission to act independently at this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

-- Kevin Gormley

University of Minnesota