[In these minutes: Comparison of CIC Report to Intellectual Property Policy, Subcommittee Updates]

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, February 15, 2000
300 Morrill Hall
3:00 PM

MINUTES

[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 view, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

Present:	Richard Goldstein (Chair), Josef Altholz, Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Robert Fahnhorst, Roland Guyotte, Charlene Mason, Marcia Pankake, James Perry
Regrets:	Avner Ben-Ner, Daniel Feeney, John Fossum, Andrea Hinding, Marti Hope Gonzales, Robert Jones, Meghan McCauly, Cleon Melsa, Larry Miller, George Seltzer, Geoffrey Sirc, Tom Walsh, Sheila Warness, Carol Wells
Absent:	NONE
Guests:	Kent Bales

1. Chair's Report

- The academic year is almost over, but the committee still has many pending issues.
- Low attendance at the meetings is becoming a concern.

2. CIC Copyright and IP Report Discussion – Josef Altholz

Professor Altholz began the discussion by outlining the report presented by the CIC:
- The CIC report focuses upon ownership of instructional materials, which is just one of the many areas that is considered in the University's Intellectual Property Policy.
- After comparing the report to the University's policy, it appears that the policy is within the parameters of the issues raised in the report.
- The report raises the issue of copyright implications, but the only way to enforce the parameters would be to alert people to the problems associated with the use of copyright.
- The report suggests a vision for distance education be developed by each institution. This suggestion should be forwarded to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) for further consideration and possible development.
- There is nothing further that SCFA must do with the report.

Comments:
- Any web-based course that is developed by a Professor is his/her property, but the University will retain rights to it if that person were to leave the University.
- Under the stipulations set forth by the Conflict of Interest Policy, professors would not be allowed to teach the same (web-based) class that they offer at the University at another institution. In essence, it would take away potential students.

- The University should provide assistance on copyright permission since it is such a complex issue.

3. Subcommittee Updates

Retirement Subcommittee - Josef Althloz
- Robert Jones is working with the subcommittee to draft a new faculty emeriti policy and administrative procedures.
- The policy and procedures should be ready for action at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

Tenure Subcommittee – Carol Carrier
- At least 3/4 of the post-tenure review policies developed by departments have been submitted for review.
- It is unknown if anyone has been brought up for review on the Twin Cities Campus, but there have been reviews of some senior faculty members on the Morris campus.

Academic Appointments – Kent Bales
- Professor Bales discussed the handout that compares the Working Group's suggestions to those of the Joint Committee.
- FCC will decide how to proceed with the issue and there are many alternatives available.
- The basic problem for implementing new guidelines is how to ensure that they will be maintained.
- The types of hires that are conducted each year should be reviewed under the new plan.
- The administration did not want to accept a quota in the plan, which is what was suggested by the joint committee.

Comments:
- The FCC should be reminded why the joint committee was developed and how the major problems will not be addressed if the working group's suggestions are implemented.
- The outline that compares the two plans should be presented to FCC since it shows various levels of agreement between them.
- Titles become very important when funding agencies look at proposed projects.
- There should be one plan that covers the entire University instead of leaving it up to each unit to decide how to handle hiring quotas.
- The joint committee developed fair regulations because it was always aiming towards developing something that was best for the University.
- No modifications should be made to current practice if the only alternative is that offered by the working group.
- The FCC plans to create a group from the membership of the working group and joint committee to see if any resolution can come about between the two groups.
- If this issue is not resolved, it will create retention implications for both faculty and academic professionals.
- The argument that quality would be improved if there were more tenured faculty could have negative connotations on the perception of the level of quality offered by the academic professional classes.
- Different expectations must be developed for the two classes so that people from each are not doing the same work, but are in a different class because of budget constraints.
- It is against Regents' policy for academic professionals to perform all of the tasks of faculty members.
- Another employee class may have to be developed to handle appointments made in units that pay salaries with soft funds.

Charge Review Group – Dick Goldstein
- Comments on the proposed amendments to the charge should be submitted to Professor Goldstein by the next meeting.

Comments:
- The proposed changes suggest any connection to academic professionals be removed from the charge, but there was no ASAC representative present when that decision was made.
- ASAC will not have a link to the Faculty Senate if the academic professional language is removed.
- It is important to keep that link because benefits for academic professionals are determined through decisions made by SCFA.

Faculty Development – Carol Carrier and Carole Bland
- The Regents' Faculty and Student Affairs Committee will hear a presentation on faculty development at their March meeting.
- The presentation will entail a faculty panel discussing their view points of faculty development.
- Such areas that will be covered are teaching and learning enrichment, development for faculty of color, and the faculty/administration task force.
- A letter to the task force will soon be distributed that stipulates they must develop a long-term plan by Fall 2000.

Comments:
- It is already clear that more faculty development is needed for senior faculty members.
- Emphasis should be placed on providing faculty development throughout the various stages of a faculty member's career.

Faculty One-Stop – Carol Carrier
- A new director of the project has been named since Michael Handberg has left the University.
- The Human Resources component of One-Stop is still under development and a prototype will be available by summer.
- One area still under major development is the instillation of software that will work between One-Stop and PeopleSoft.

ASAC – Charlene Mason
- ASAC is considering a leave policy, vacation policy, and phased retirement policy.
- The vacation policy would entail switching the terms of A appointments from eleven to twelve months and gaining two more days of vacation.
- Even though salaries would not increase, the one month of vacation that is earned would be considered as paid leave since the appointment would be for twelve months instead of eleven months over twelve. However, that may not be fair to those on B appointments since they receive no paid vacation at this time.
- ASAC and SCFA should be more aware of what issues each are working on since most are of similar interest.

4. Adjournment: Professor Goldstein adjourned the meeting at 5:00 PM.