

Minutes\*

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**  
**Thursday, September 28, 1995**  
**238 Morrill Hall**  
**3:15 - 5:00 P.M.**

Present: Daniel Feeney (chair), Carole Bland, Carol Chomsky, Cheryl Coryea, Mary Dempsey, Robert Fahnhorst, Judith Gaston, Roland Guyotte, Kinley Larntz, Richard McGehee, Samuel Myers, Kevin O'Laughlin, James Stone, Yang Wang

Regrets: Richard Goldstein

Absent: Samar Barakat, Willard Manning, Carol Miller, Ken Roering, George Seltzer

Other: Judy Leahy

[In these minutes are discussion on tenure (various locations), reports from subcommittees, and listings of agenda items for the 1995-96 academic year.]

**1. Introductions**

Professor Feeney asked all the committee members to introduce themselves.

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as amended. The report on Kiosk became the first subcommittee report.

**3. Chair's Report**

Professor Feeney said there were several issues for SCFA to address that were not detailed on the list sent to committee members. These additional items are:

- Re-addressing the Conflict of Commitment document
- Reviewing University disabilities benefits
- Reviewing the Sexual Harassment Policy

Tenure: There was a call this summer by the Board of Regents to examine the issue of tenure during the 1995-96 academic year. Professor Feeney asked Assoc. V. P. Carrier to elaborate on this. She said that the Board of Regents informed the Administration that it would like to have a series of discussions about tenure. To date, three meetings have been scheduled for this purpose. On October 12th, the entire Board will meet to hear a presentation on the trends and issues of tenure. National expert, Judith Gappa (Purdue), will be making a presentation similar to one made for the Arizona Board of Regents. Professor Ronald Phillips will do the introductions, followed by Judith Gappa. Faculty voices

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities 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.

at this meeting will include Professors Carl Adams, Ellen Berscheid, and Ronald Phillips. The second session will examine tenure at the University: what is its code, history, and the process. This session will also examine statistics regarding tenure and how the University compares to other large research universities. The third presentation is undefined, but is likely to include a report from the SCFA Tenure Subcommittee. One committee member asked why the Regents were interested in this issue. Assoc. V. P. Carrier said that they may be responding to national trends, articles, etc., and the Arizona Regents' exploration of opening a non-tenure institution.

**Sexual Harassment Policy:** Dr. Feeney spoke with Professor Mindy Kurzer (Chair of the Sexual Harassment Board). They will get together on October 9th to produce some draft material to present before their committees.

**Conflict of Interest:** There were some revisions to this policy this summer based on NIH requirements. The University is being closely watched by the NIH as a result of some matters which have occurred over the past years, said Dr. Feeney. The revisions included expanding the financial interest from \$5,000 to \$10,000 before reporting is necessary. The revisions appeared to be a bit more lenient, said Professor Feeney. Revised copies are available from Interim V. P. for Research Mark Brenner.

**SCFA Subcommittees:** The final list for the subcommittees was completed and distributed. Nevertheless, Dr. Feeney said that membership to the subcommittees was not closed.

**Critical Measures:** A lead Senate committee has been identified for each of the upcoming critical measures. In addition, other Senate committees have been identified that are likely to be included in discussions on these items. SCFA was not chosen to lead any of these issues but will be involved in some of the discussions.

#### **4. Overview of Plans and/or Activities, Reports for Selected SCFA Subcommittees**

a. Kiosk - Carole Bland

A market survey was conducted with a sample of faculty and staff asking about the goals of the paper, the quality of the issues, the distribution, etc. The results showed that:

- \* The section on professional tips for faculty was not necessary
- \* Those surveyed were not interested in writing for the paper
- \* The distribution method was insufficient
- \* Articles needed to have more depth

The changes will include sending copies directly to departments, and providing more "in-depth" articles. Because no one wants to write the paper, more resources are needed for it to be staff written. As a result, there is only enough funding to publish the paper once per month for the next year. Professor Bland recommended that the University should form a task force to find more money for the paper.

Comments from SCFA:

- \* The Internet version of Kiosk is poor in format. Nevertheless, this is better than other publications which are only available in print.

- \* Footnote, Update, and a civil-service newsletter were discontinued to fund Kiosk.
- \* Subscriptions and advertisement could be used to raise money.

Professor Feeney asked that the minutes reflect SCFA's appreciation to Carole Bland, James Stone, Martha Kvanbeck, V. P. Mel George, and the staff of University Relations for their effort to develop and implement Kiosk. In view of upcoming budget cuts, Professor Bland recommended that the paper be referred to as a "faculty/staff" publication, and not simply one of the administration. Professor Feeney said that he would be waiting for Professor Bland's advice regarding the funding task force for Kiosk.

b. Heath Care Subcommittee - Richard McGehee and Robert Fahnhorst

Professor McGehee explained to SCFA that changes for the 1996 health care plan will include a new low cost option, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, which under-bid Medica. This new option does not allow use of the University Hospitals. Another change is that MedCenters has been replaced by Heath Partners. Robert Fahnhorst said that this situation will provide a broader range of health care providers. Nevertheless, there may be rare cases where people lose access to a particular physician.

Professor McGehee proceeded to describe the University's health care plan, and its considerations to develop an independent set of options. The University does not control the health care plan for its employees. It uses the plan negotiated between the State of Minnesota and the labor unions. The University is allowed limited or no role in the negotiations. Over the years, the University has considered separating from the State plan. It is not completely clear that the University could find a better deal on its own. Leaving the State could also be difficult because approximately 40% of University employees are unionized and would probably stay with their negotiated plans. Concerns of the faculty are not heard or represented at this time, said Professor McGehee.

Mr. Fahnhorst distributed an outline of the history of the health care plan at the University. The University entered the State plan in 1967. The University has two representatives on the Joint Labor/Management Committee on Health, but are not involved in the collective bargaining. Mr. Fahnhorst continued by providing a number of details about the current health care options. As stated earlier most of the plans do not allow use of the University Hospital facilities. Faculty using the University's medical centers expressed deep concern regarding this issue.

Additional points:

- \* The graduate assistants' plan was recently renegotiated providing no increase in cost.
- \* Another committee member said that the Morris campus faculty would like to have a University representative come and speak to them about the health care options.
- \* Mr. Fahnhorst said that discussion, newsletters, health fairs and seminars, etc., are available throughout the Fall quarter to learn about the health care options and to improve one's health.
- \* The "Health Care Report Card" produced by the State demonstrated that there are some significant complaints about the State Health Care Plan.

c. Tenure Subcommittee - Mary Dempsey

Professor Dempsey provided a review of the Subcommittee's activities last year. She said that the Subcommittee wrote President Hasselmo last Spring asking for input on how to amend the Tenure Code for the purpose of accommodating the new provost/chancellor structure. In the letter, the President was asked what he would recommend regarding the interpretation of the Tenure Code given the new administrative structure. A one-year interpretation of the Tenure Code was presented for action and approved by the Faculty Senate last Spring allowing promotion and tenure decisions to be made at the provost/chancellor level for the 1995-96 academic year. This interpretation expires in June, 1996.

An additional question was posed to the President asking if the University was concerned about the remarks made by some of the provosts and other administrators about the status and future of tenure. Therefore, the Subcommittee requested a white paper (a paper prepared for the purpose of taking a position on a matter of interest) from the Administration regarding the future of tenure at the University. President Hasselmo responded to the Subcommittee in July stating that he would be turning the matter over to Professor Mario Bognanno.

Professor Bognanno arranged a meeting including himself, Professor Dempsey, Assoc. V. P. Carrier, and Sr. V. P. Infante to discuss the two questions. Professor Dempsey said that the first question can easily be dealt with between Assoc. V. P. Carrier and the Subcommittee. Sr. V. P. Infante told the group that he would prefer not to prepare a white paper as requested. According to Professor Dempsey, he thought that the faculty and the administration should work this out themselves. Professor Dempsey added that the Regents deliberations about the Tenure Code may effect the end result. Nevertheless, the Subcommittee and Assoc. V. P. Carrier will be working on the Code. Professor Dempsey said that she hopes to bring the proposed changes to the Tenure Code forward to the Senate in the Winter quarter.

Assoc. V. P. Carrier and Professor Dempsey agreed that the Subcommittee will also be examining the proceedings of the Senate Judicial Committee regarding how it reviews tenure cases especially since the courts are becoming more involved. This may take several years to resolve, said Professor Dempsey. First priority will be the changes to the Tenure Code given the new provost structure.

Professor Feeney said that over the course of this academic year SCFA will be determining whether the University should have a universal tenure code or one that is flexible by provostal unit.

#### Additional Points:

- \* Not all units are supervised by the provosts (i.e., the libraries). These units will continue to receive tenure review through the V. P. for Academic Affairs.
- \* The nine year probationary period implemented in the Medical School was allowed (although it contradicts the Tenure Code) under the condition that it was experimental. Professor Feeney asked that the document for this experiment be resurrected and reviewed. Otherwise, the experimental practice may become policy without discussion
- \* The Medical School representatives expressed concern for the lack of consultation that Provost Brody provides for faculty senators from this section of the University. They added that although the University Senate is trying to restructure according to the new provost mechanism, the Medical School is likely to have a separate consultative mechanism developed by Provost Brody before the Senate one is proposed.
- \* SCFA would like to be represented at the Regents meetings on tenure.

Assoc. V. P. Carrier and SCFA agreed to add Professor Dempsey to the delegation of faculty representatives at the Regents discussions on tenure. A committee member urged Professor Dempsey to express the faculty position in favor of a universal tenure code.

In summary, Professor Feeney said that he would look forward to a Tenure Subcommittee report at the October 26 SCFA meeting.

### **5. Additions, Discussion, and Ranking of issues for Future SCFA Meetings**

Professional Commitment: Professor Feeney explained that a conference committee has been formed to examine the Professional Commitment Policy. Their review will be followed by an examination through the Senate structure.

a. Items for SCFA agendas per FCC requests:

Due Process: A discussion of "due process" has arisen on campus, said Dr. Feeney. Last Spring, a groups of Regents professors and faculty governance chairs met to discuss procedures and concerns that "due process" for actions against faculty is possibly being neglected at the dean/departmental level in some units. Professor Feeney said that SCFA should address this issue following tenure.

Additional Tenure Items: There is discussion to have tenure awarded at the departments level rather than the University level. If this did occur, what would happen to the tenure of faculty if the department that awarded their tenure was dissolved? In addition, should the probationary period for tenure be universally increased? Finally, post tenure reviews need to be examined, said Professor Feeney.

b. Other items that Professor Feeney said that SCFA would need to address:

- \* Mid-career vitality of faculty
- \* Timing of B appointments with the change to semesters
- \* Statement from SCFA on how the University may reap some financial rewards from its research

c. Ranking of Agenda Items for SCFA:

Professor Feeney said that the Non-Retirement Benefits Subcommittee may be taking on new responsibilities including review of cafeteria benefits and sabbatical leaves.

The Committee recommended review of the following items:

- \* The Disabilities Policy
- \* The part-time benefits program (if it is up for review this year)
- \* Quarterly leaves (given the fact that the University is changing to semesters)
- \* Tuition benefit for faculty/staff dependents
- \* How grant administration is to occur and if responsibility and liability will change for faculty
- \* The implementation of a single payroll system: "Delayed Biweekly"

- \* Re-engineering - After appropriate discussion with FCC, SCFA may request someone from the Re-engineering Committee to speak on the issue.
- \* Responsibility Center Management - Assoc. V. P. Kvavik will be invited to discuss this matter with SCFA.

-- Kevin Gormley

University of Minnesota