

[In these minutes: Discussion with Warren Ibele about Basketball Scandal Allegations, Recommendations for the Hearing Officers Panel, Update on the Faculty Development Task Force and Survey Development]

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Thursday, May 18, 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, Avner Ben-Ner, Carole Bland, Robert Fahnhorst, Charlene Mason, Marcia Pankake, James Perry, George Seltzer, Tom Walsh

Regrets: Carol Carrier, Daniel Feeney, John Fossum, Roland Guyotte, Andrea Hinding, Marti Hope Gonzales, Robert Jones, Cleon Melsa, Larry Miller, Sam Mok, Geoffrey Sirc, Sheila Warness, Carol Wells

Absent: NONE

Guests: Warren Ibele

1) Chair's Report

Key Issues Status Report/Update

Professor Goldstein drew the committee's attention to the most recent version of the key issues status report and noted that there have not been many revisions since the last meeting and that any pending issues would be held over to the next academic year.

2000-01 Meeting Schedule

Professor Goldstein distributed the meeting schedule for 2000-01 and noted that all meetings are currently scheduled to be held in 300 Morrill Hall. That may change, though, depending upon the availability of the Regents' Room or space in the new Mechanical Engineering addition.

CLA Faculty Workload Issue

Professor Goldstein informed the committee of an update that he provided to the FCC on the CLA faculty workload issue:

- FCC would like SCFA to continue its involvement until the issue has been resolved.
- The three main components of the issue include workload neutrality between the quarter and semester systems, faculty empowerment in regards to the dean's approval of department workloads, and the notion that workloads should be determined by the number of courses and not the number of contact hours.

Comments on continued involvement:

- SCFA should remain involved in the issue because semester conversion was implemented through a Senate policy, which caused workload changes, so it is only appropriate that a Senate committee consider it.
- The Senate may be the only body for a college to appeal to when there is an issue between faculty and the dean.
- The committee has been designated to handle all faculty affairs issues and it should do so at any level.
- Hearing no other comments, it was decided that there are no objections from committee members to continue involvement.

Faculty Salary Review

Professor Goldstein informed the committee of its new involvement with the review of faculty salaries:

- SCFA will become more involved with the review of faculty salaries during the next academic year.
- A joint subcommittee will be developed that includes members from SCFA and the Finance and Planning Committee.
- Larry Miller has agreed to chair a subcommittee out of the SCFA Benefits Subcommittee that will review faculty salaries.

2) **Approval of April 25 and May 3 Minutes:** The minutes were approved as presented.

3) **Basketball Scandal Allegations and the Impact on Faculty – Discussion with Professor Emeritus Warren Ibele**

Professor Emeritus Ibele provided the committee with background information on the Faculty Oversight Committee that he chaired:

- It has been about a year since the office manager who produced over 400 papers for athletes came forward.
- Under the University's own initiative, an outside investigation was conducted and a 2500-page was produced from that investigation.
- The Faculty Oversight Committee was appointed by EVPP Bruininks and its charge was to investigate each of the 400 allegations that were outlined in the report and determine which of the allegations required response from the implicated individual and/or college.
- The only source of information that was made available to the committee during its deliberations was the report and transcripts of the accused individuals.
- The committee did not provide any judgement, that was left up to the colleges.
- The progress report that Professor Ibele distributed to the committee indicates how many students and which colleges were outlined in the investigation.
- College responses to the allegations have been collected and a final report will be available by mid-June.
- It is easier for colleges to deal with student allegations than it is for faculty allegations, but the committee developed a classification system of the allegations to assist in dealing with them.
- Faculty issues will be handled according to stipulations outlined in the *Tenure Code*.
- There is only one student who was accused still at the University and another at a different institution.

Comments:

- The General Counsel's Office is handling those instances where accused students received degrees to determine if they should be revoked.

- It is unclear what the penalties would be for faculty since the *Tenure Code* does not provide specific actions to take.
- Penalties could include letters of reprimand and salary reductions.
- The post-tenure review process would be too slow in dealing with the allegations.
- The Tenure Code would only be applicable if a faculty member was terminated for cause.
- Throughout the investigation it has become very apparent that there was no part of the University that was not impacted by the scandal.
- There were no limits to what was done in order to maintain eligibility, which is a corrosive situation for the University.
- Faculty are concerned with the allegations involving the assignment of incomplete grades since many faculty assign them for various reasons.
- The only investigation of the assigning of incomplete grades will be to consider whether there were different stipulations used for assigning them to athletes versus non-athletes.
- The committee commended Professor Emeritus Ibele for his service to the University.

4) **Hearing Officers Panel – Recommendations for the President**

The committee recommended that the following individuals be suggested to the President for his consideration of appointment to the Hearing Officers Panel: John Budd, Tim Brennan, Amos Deinard, Joel Samaha, and Steve Befort.

5) **Other Business**

Faculty Development Task Force

Professor Bland updated the committee on the newly formed Faculty Development Task Force that she will chair:

- The task force will soon begin to meet and its main charge will be to examine possible indicators that the University will need to improve productivity in areas other than teaching.
- Information will be gathered from other institutions to investigate how faculty development is handled.
- Faculty may eventually be asked for their input on the matter.
- The task force hopes to complete its work by November.
- The goal of the task force will be not only identify areas, but also take appropriate action.
- Along with reviewing productivity levels, the task force will also include investigation of outreach with the state.
- There is a different group considering development in the teaching area so this task force will consider all other areas.

Comments:

- The report should include qualitative and quantitative information.
- It is important to remember that some areas (i.e. research versus service) offer more rewards than others in different disciplines.
- Use all of the information that is gathered from other institutions to develop a comparison between good and bad cases.

Survey Subgroup

Professor Bland updated the committee on the status of the faculty survey development that is currently underway:

- Professors Bland, Hendel, and Walsh recently met and compiled a list of critical issues to faculty that could be incorporated into a survey.
- Given the possibility of the Faculty Development Task Force conducting a survey, further development of this survey will be put on hold in case one survey could meet both objectives.

Comments:

- This survey appears to be much more ambitious than the climate survey that was previously conducted.
- This survey would question people's perceptions of the entire University and not just their personal experiences, which may be the first time some people have ever thought those types of issues.
- It is useful to put out broader questions so that open-ended discussions may arise.
- The survey may educate faculty on some of the issues before the University.
- The new survey is not intended to question faculty about their perception of the climate.
- It may be helpful to have two parts to the survey, with one relating to climate that can be used on an ongoing basis.
- The survey is in the very early development stages.
- Better results may be obtained if the survey was issued to focus groups instead of to all faculty.

SCFA Benefits Subcommittee

The subcommittee has two remaining meetings for the current academic year to discuss faculty development leaves and the frequent flyer policy.

- 6) **Adjournment:** Professor Goldstein adjourned the meeting at 4:50 PM.