

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
September 16, 1999
Thursday, September 16, 1999
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

Present: Richard Goldstein (Chair), Josef Altholz, Avner Ben-Ner, Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Robert Fahnhorst, John Fossum, Andrea Hinding, Cleon Melsa, Larry Miller, Marcia Pankake, James Perry, Geoffrey Sirc, Tom Walsh, Carol Wells

Regrets: Daniel Feeney, Roland Guyotte, Charlene Mason, Harlan Smith, Sheila Warness

Guests: Kent Bales, Robert Jones, Richard McGehee

[In these minutes: pending business of the committee]

1. Introductions

The members of the committee introduced themselves to each other.

2. Meeting Schedule

Professor Goldstein reviewed the 1999-00 meeting schedule with the members of the committee.

3. Agenda Items for the Year

Faculty One Stop: Carol Carrier and Len Kuhi are heading a group of faculty, administrators, and technical employees who are developing a web-based tool to allow faculty members access to information related to teaching, research, administrative policies, and employee-related issues. The group is still deliberating on whether or not there should be a paper-copy of the same information made available to faculty members. She will continue to provide updates and drafts to the committee throughout the year.

Resolution Regarding Retention of Faculty Lines: The resolution will be presented for action at the 30 September Faculty Senate meeting.

Employee Benefits: Bob Fahnhorst reported that Employee Benefits is looking into altering the 28-day waiting period for medical coverage to begin for new employees and he hopes that the issue will be resolved by the end of this year. He also noted that he would provide a report about the waiting period for new faculty members to join the retirement plan at an upcoming meeting.

Post-Tenure Review: Robert Jones informed the committee that the new policy has been distributed to all units, but the implementation process is not going as rapidly as was hoped since only half of the departments have implemented procedures for post-tenure review. The delays are arising

* 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.

because standards need to be developed and a compensation policy has to be put into place. He noted that he will be meeting with Carol Carrier and Mary Dempsey to review the documents that have been submitted and they will then provide feedback to the units. Hopefully, all of the documents will have been submitted and put in place by the end of Fall Semester. A mechanism to track the impact of the review process will also be put into place. He then stated that the post-tenure review process is meant to be used as a human resources development tool to identify faculty who are not performing up to the standards set by the unit and help them to get to that level. It is not to be used as a tool for dismissal for cause.

He then went on to explain that the implementation of the post-tenure reviews has raised serious questions about Section 7.12 of "Faculty Tenure" because it does not address probationary faculty or when to implement the post-tenure review process so revisions may be necessary. EVPP Bruininks will distribute a memorandum that outlines how to go about modifying Section 7.12, the layout of the approval process, and how to determine the effective period. Probationary faculty who are evaluated this year should follow the unrevised version of Section 7.12, but term and tenured faculty can decide which version they want to use. Hopefully, this issue can be resolved by this year so a firm policy and procedures can be in place as soon as possible.

Faculty Workloads: Joe Altholz raised the issue that in CLA faculty were required to teach five classes under the quarter system, but are now expected to teach four classes under the semester system, which adds up to more teaching hours. Thus far, the Council of Chairs has not pressured the dean to make any changes, but the faculty within the college have. However, the faculty must have backing from a strong body in order for anything to change. Therefore, the committee should consider this issue since faculty should be involved when deciding workload and it should be a central decision, not something left up to individual departments.

Semester Conversion: Peter Zetterberg and SCEP members should be invited to an upcoming meeting to provide an update on how semester conversion is going. Particular areas that should be addressed include calendar development, workload of faculty, credit conversion in relation to credit requirements, and the general effect it is having on students and faculty.

IP addresses: The University is charging departments for IP addresses and the cost for them is so high that departments do not know how to fund them. It is just another example of central costs being deferred to departments and the committee should consider the impact this is having on faculty retrenchments.

Faculty Satisfaction Survey: Professor Goldstein provided the committee with results from a 1998-99 survey evaluating faculty attitudes and characteristics that was published in the Chronicle on Higher Education. Carol Carrier will provide blank copies of the satisfaction survey that was distributed to University faculty members a few years ago so that the committee can modify and redistribute it to find out how faculty feel now.

Faculty Salaries: The committee should be in contact with the Finance and Planning Committee because they are considering doing a survey involving faculty salaries.

Interim Professional Development Leave Policy: The committee should learn how the interim policy and procedures have worked once information is available so it can incorporate that into the permanent policy and procedures that is eventually developed.

4. Subcommittee Membership

Anyone interested in serving on one of the subcommittees or task forces should contact Dick Goldstein or Nicole Boldt in the Senate office. Chairs of the standing subcommittees are as follows:

Benefits Subcommittee: John Fossum
Retirement Subcommittee: Dan Feeney
Tenure Subcommittee: Mary Dempsey
AAUP Liaison: Carol Wells

5. Ongoing Input from SCFA-related Task Forces and Subcommittees

Academic Appointments: The committee went off the record to discuss the status of the Academic Appointments Joint Subcommittee. Professor Kent Bales, chair of the joint subcommittee, provided the committee with background information on the joint subcommittee, the status of the joint subcommittee, and the relationship with a parallel working group that is chaired by John Brandl. He also noted that the deadline to provide a report is November 1 so that it can be presented to the Faculty Senate at the December 2 meeting.

Health Plan Task Force: Dick McGehee, chair of the task force, provided the committee with background information on the task force, where the task force is at now, and what its future tasks will be. Specifically, he noted that for the past two years the task force has gained representation on the State Labor Management Committee and conducted two actuarial studies to determine whether or not to separate from the State. He also mentioned that evidence is mounting that the University employee pool is no more expensive than that of the State and there may be options available that are better suited for University employees. However, the University will not be able to separate from the State until at least January 2002. The product that would be made available would include options as the current model does now.

6. Adjournment

Professor Goldstein adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.