

Minutes*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Thursday, February 24, 1994
3:15 - 5:00 p.m.
238 Morrill Hall

Present: Carl Adams (chair), Daniel Canafax, Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Daniel Feeney, Roger Feldman, Judith Gaston, Richard McGehee, Dianne Mulvihill, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, James Stone, Yang Wang

Regrets: Audrey Grosch, Morris Kleiner

Absent: Carole Bland, Rose Brewer, Roger Paschke, Michael Sadowsky, Phuong Phan

Guests: Paul Lampe, William Oetting, Ron Ostrow

1. Chair's Report

Dr. Adams said that the committee has been asked to address compensation issues which include a proposed 6% faculty increase, a 2% retroactive and 5.25 % increase for civil service personnel. Three major questions within this issue are:

1. Is there clarity in the faculty arena about the instructions accompanying the 6% salary increase? Namely, can deans skim off money for retention?
2. Is the 2%/5.25% civil service pay increase consistent with the administration's notion that they are going to treat the various categories of employees equitably?
3. Is this increase based on merit, or is some portion of it across-the-board?

The items have not specifically been presented to SCFA because FCC and the administration have been determining many of the details related to this matter. The chair mentioned that he is interested in addressing these questions in a substantive manner. One committee member said that he understood that the increase was going to be merit based ranging from 2-10% per person with provisions for exceptions. Vice President Carol Carrier said that information has been circulating that retention money was not to be used from the merit pool money. The committee was concerned that deans may not follow these instructions. This money is also not to be used by departments/schools for retrenchment without good reason, the chair expressed.

Acknowledged "retention" offers can be met through the use of funds other than the 6% mentioned above. (Carl mentioned something about "open lines" as a source for this money.) This issue is complicated in units which have the acknowledged retention cases, but no funds to fulfill the obligation. It was affirmed that this increase does not include fringe benefit increases. Such supplements were provided to units at an earlier time, said the chair. Some units did not pay attention to the warning that these earlier funds would be needed later. Therefore, some units which have spent that money are

*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.

going to have to determine how to resolve this situation without using the 6% increase. **The chair requested that a subcommittee be established to communicate with those in Vice President Carrier's office, and address the three questions listed above.** The subcommittee of James Stone, Judith Gaston, and Daniel Feeney were asked to report back to the committee at the March 17 meeting.

The Conflict of Interest Policy was passed at the February 17 Faculty Senate meeting. Professor Adams said that he expects the coming Conflict of Commitment policy to be much more controversial.

2. Approval of Minutes from Former Meetings

The January 20 minutes were approved. The February 3 minutes were approved as amended.

3. Discussion of Tenure Subcommittee Recommendations

Professor Adams introduced Mary Dempsey, the chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, to address the related issues to the committee. She reviewed on two recommended changes in regulations concerning faculty tenure:

1. Stopping the Tenure Clock for Caregiving Responsibilities
2. Timely Response of Administrators to a Termination Report

The administration is generally in favor of both of these recommendations.

1. Stopping the Tenure Clock for Caregiving Responsibilities - Dr. Dempsey motioned for the committee to accept the recommendation to stopping the tenure clock for caregiving, and then opened the floor for discussion. One committee member was interested in the definition of a "household member." Specifically, the member wondered who would fit in this category other than a domestic partners. Fred Morrison, Law School Instructor, sent Dr. Dempsey a letter which included an interpretation of this term, stating that the dean would be responsible for determining to whom this term would apply. The chair presented three possible options for addressing this term:

- a. delete "household member"
- b. "household member" be defined as a domestic partner
- c. keep the "household member" term in place

One member said that it would be unfair to leave the deans in an awkward position of having to define this term in each circumstance. The ambiguity of the term could lead to litigious situations if faculty members felt that a dean was interpreting "household member" too strictly. **The committee discussed that "family" should be noted to include domestic partners and foster children.** Other points in the discussion included:

- those whom a faculty member can stop the tenure clock to care for should be a broader group than family members or domestic partners as defined in the University insurance plan
- stopping the tenure clock would not necessarily mean a faculty member would take any time off work
- the lack of department head consultation was mentioned as a possible weakness of the recommendation.

It was decided that the ambiguity of the term "household member" should be further defined by the subcommittee and presented again to the committee.

2. Timely Response of Administration to a Termination - The typical progress of a termination case is that a case is brought before the dean. The faculty then vote on the matter and return their decision to the dean/unit administrator who forwards the case to central administration. Upon receipt of formal notification from central administration, a faculty member may then request for the case to be brought before the Judicial Committee. The problem is that cases are being left unresolved for unreasonable amounts of time. Dr. Dempsey presented some time limitations to the committee as recommended by Mr. Morrison. The faculty could have **60** days to vote on the matter. The unit administrator should present a report to the central administration within **10** days of receipt of the faculty vote. Finally, the central administrator would then have **30 or 60** days to notify the faculty member of the overall decision. **The committee passed a motion to recommend the following time limits in relation to the discussion above:**

- **the faculty have 30 working days to vote on the matter and present it to the unit administrator**
- **the unit administrator then has 10 working days to present a report on the case to the central administrator**
- **the central administrator has 30 working days to give written notice to the faculty member**
- **the faculty member has 30 working days to request a hearing before the Judicial Committee if so desired**

3. Recommended Change in the Title of Research Associate Series to a Research Professor Series - Dr. Dempsey described some background information on the issue. She said that research associates are currently listed under the professional and administrative category (P&A) of employees. This group needs SCFA's approval to go before the administration to request the additional title of research professor (a non-tenure position) to their P&A title of research associate. This title would be independent of those classified as "research (post-doctoral) fellows." Eligibility for this title would require that an individual have a Ph.D., work independently, and write grant proposals. In other words, the title would not be applied to all research associates. The main benefit would be that those with this title would be in a better position to secure grants from outside sources. This title is being used in several units at this time as stated allowable in the tenure regulations.

Ron Ostrow spoke to the group on behalf of research associates desiring this title. He said that the title of research associate is inadequate for those applying for grants as principle investigators. The addition of this title will help research associates to bring more funding into the University, to increase the status and the career potential of the individuals in this classification, and to increase their ability to do better research. Research associates have difficulty receiving grants awards because of the ambiguity that exists between their positions and those of post-doctoral fellows. Of the 345 research associates at the University, approximately half are principle or co-principle investigators bringing more than \$100,000 to this institution. Dr. Ostrow said that this amount could be greater if these researchers were not hampered by the restrictions of their title. The alternative titles such as research scientist; topically related titles, i.e. research microbiologist were not seen as effective means of meeting the researchers' needs.

Several committee members commented that they were in support of recommending the addition of the research professor title for research associates. **The committee decided that it would be best to revisit this matter again at a later time.**

4. Health Care Subcommittee Discussion - Richard McGehee

Professor McGehee said that the subcommittee had met and wished to recommend to SCFA for it begin gathering information on developing an independent insurance policy for the faculty. The faculty are currently covered under the state health care plan. He foresaw that the entire inquiry could be completed by January 1996. Dr. McGehee pointed out that the February 3 minutes charged the subcommittee to put together a proposal to investigate whether SCFA should begin this investigation. The subcommittee overwhelmingly decided to "move forward," but requested further definition of this term.

The chair asked the administration representatives on the committee to advise SCFA if it needed to present a preliminary proposal together to the central administration. Associate Vice President Carrier said that she spoke with Vice President Infante about this matter. She told the committee that would be good to present some type of preliminary information possibly describing 12 months of investigation activity. The chair said that a preliminary proposal may request for about \$10 - \$20,000 to "make the case," by stating that such an investigation is reasonable, important, will address real problems, and is feasible. Dr. McGehee asked SCFA if it wanted the subcommittee to begin developing an outline of the investigation procedures (including costs). **Dr. McGehee agreed to convene the subcommittee and develop a short document describing the general procedures and anticipated expenses such a study would incur. This draft is to be presented to the committee at the March 17 meeting.** The chair said that this document could be brought before the administration which could decide whether more information (and possibly finances to collect such information) was needed.

-- Kevin Gormley

University of Minnesota