

Minutes*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Thursday, June 9, 1994
186 Humphrey Center
3:30 - 5:15

Present: Carl Adams (chair), Carole Bland, Daniel Canafax, Carol Carrier, Ann Erickson, Daniel Feeney, Roger Feldman, Morris Kleiner, Richard McGehee, Dianne Mulvihill, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, Yang Wang

Regrets: Mary Dempsey, Judith Gaston, Audrey Grosch, Roger Paschke, Michael Sadowsky

Absent: Rose Brewer, James Stone, Phuong Phan

1. Chair's Report

Professor Adams told the committee that Roger Feldman, Morris Kleiner, and Audrey Grosch will not be serving on SCFA next year. Professor Kleiner will be advancing the Faculty Lobbyist position. Professor Feldman will be serving on SCFA's Health Benefits Subcommittee. Dr. Adams explained that Professor Grosch will be remaining at home to work on her book during the remainder of her illness.

The President has begun to implement the first stages of the administrative reorganization. Dr. Adams said that FCC is considering a resolution supportive of this initiative. Based on minutes from various University Senate committees, and conversations within Morrill Hall, agreement is not universal within the administration or faculty, the chair added. The Board of Regents are expected to vote on the restructuring in July. Positions that could be eliminated include Vice President for Agriculture, Vice President for Health Sciences, Vice President for Arts and Sciences. The responsibilities held under these positions are to be fully, or in part, designated under new provost positions. The titles accompanying some administrative positions are still undetermined, i.e., officers relating to graduate programs and research, undergraduate programs, and outreach. The Vice President of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering position is the only one that may present the administration with a challenge to transition into a provost position, because the current vice president will not automatic progress into the new role.

The President responded to the letter from SCFA requesting permission to establish the Compensation Advisory Committee as described in the University Compensation Policy. Professor Adams said that the President has given his approval for SCFA organize this committee.

Daniel Feeney chaired the following sections of the meeting while Professor Adams temporarily dismissed himself for a conflicting event.

*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.

2. Retiree Benefits

Professor Feeney asked Associate Vice President Carol Carrier to describe to the committee the current decision by the administration regarding retiree benefits. Assoc. V. P. Carrier said that between 85 to 95 faculty who retired before 1963 needed to have their retirement benefits supplemented. The administration decided that effective July 1, 1994, these retirees will be supplied with a minimum annual income, including social security, of \$20,500. The portion of this income given by the University will be increased annually by the same percentage rate increase of social security. One committee member commended that administration for this decision, and recommended that this item be placed on the SCFA agenda every January. The committee agreed to send a letter of appreciation to administration for their punctual attention to the matter.

3. Discussion of the Meeting With the President - Carole Bland

Professor Bland distributed the latest draft outlining the format for a meeting between the President and SCFA to discuss the unhealthy relationship that may exist between faculty and administration. The committee discussed the material and made several minor editorial suggestions. Some of the specifics of this discussion included:

- The University is always dealing on a crisis mode
- Most Senate committees, along with the faculty, do not possess a sense of participation with the administration
- This discussion with the President should be seen as an effort by the faculty to help the administration succeed
- The facilitator for the meeting should have some background of the problems that the faculty perceive exist
- To avoid presenting an excessively critical perspective, the document should include matters the administration handled in a collegial manner: i.e., establishing the Early Retirement Committee, the Health Care Committee, the income floor for the above mentioned retirees, and the soon to be assembled Compensation Advisory Committee
- A note should be added that the meeting will be scheduled some time in November

The committee approved a motion to forward this document to FCC after the latest suggestion are added. One committee member abstained from voting. The committee agreed that a joint meeting between FCC, SCFA, and a facilitator, should be scheduled for the first FCC meeting of the Fall 1994 quarter. Several suggestions for a facilitator included Robert Fin-ing-ga (**Spelling?**) from Health Sciences (recommended by Dan Feeney), and Thomas Fiutak from the Conflict and Change Center.

4. Discussion of the Proposal to Change the Research Associate Series Title

Professor Feeney briefly explained the most recent document produced relating to the issue of providing the title "Research Professor" select individuals currently titled "research associates." The qualifications to acquire the title are rigorous, said Dr. Feeney, and nearly mimic the eligibility standards in the Faculty Tenure Code although the positions would not be on a tenure track. The committee progressed into a discussion regarding whether the "professor" title should be protected or not. Highlights of this interaction were:

-- At the May 26 meeting, SCFA decided to suggest to FCC that this item should be discussed by the Faculty Senate in the Fall 1994

(Professor Adams rejoined the committee meeting.)

-- Giving the "professor" title to research associates rewards them with peer status to faculty
-- Non-regular, temporary, professorial titles are used at the University (i.e., adjunct professor)
-- Faculty would need to be involved in rewarding this type of title

The committee was reminded that it could not take any action on the matter as Ron Ostrow (the major spokesman for the title change) had been informed.

Professor Feeney said that he would begin working to assemble the Compensation Advisory Committee. He also recommended that SCFA may want to meet during the summer to discuss faculty salaries as they relate to the biennium budget. The budget is to be submitted early in the Fall 1994 quarter.

-- Kevin Gormley

Committee members added the following items to the discussion:

-- Stanford University uses the title "Associate Professor, 'Research'"
-- Approval of the proposal would allow departments that ordinarily do not award tenure to bestow the "research professor" title
-- Non-regular ("T") appointments using the title of "professor" do exist at the University. (These are not P&A positions)
-- The proposal provides the use of a faculty title for a P&A appointment. This has not occurred at the University in the past. The use of this title also opens the door for those who would want to be referred to as "teaching professors"
-- Research associates would like a broader award structure through the use of this title as well as solving their problem with acquiring grants under their present titles
-- The positions would follow so closely to the tenure code that future litigation to receive tenure was seen as conceivable
-- Several concluded that the title "professor" should exclusively relate to those who have or will interact (not necessarily at the same time) in all of the three aspects associated with the title: teaching, service, and research
-- Some departments may be abusively using people
-- The title "research associate" does not accurately communicate that some of these researchers are the primary investigators
-- An adjunct professor title could be available for these individuals, but possibly not in all departments
-- The alternative title associated with their field of study, i.e., Research Biologist, was unacceptable to the research associates promoting this dialogue

-- The policy requiring that "T" appointees serving over seven years must go before SCFA is not currently enforced. Therefore, the research associates would not need be concerned about the temporary aspect of the adjunct professor title

 The committee decided to communicate to the research associates promoting this change that the faculty and administration are sympathetic to their problem of acquiring research funding, but have the above mentioned concerns.

University of Minnesota