

[In these minutes: 1. Intellectual Property Policy, 2. Discussion of the "Enforcement Model", 3. Faculty Workload under Semesters, 4. Right of Departments to retain a position when the Department rejects a Tenure Candidate, 5. Request for Professional Expense funds for faculty as part of the capital campaign, 6. Update on the South Mall Project]

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (SCFA)

MINUTES

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1999

3:00 - 5:00

229 NOLTE

[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 or, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Kent Bales (Chair), Josef Altholz, Gary Balas, Avner Ben-Ner, Roland Guyotte, Andrea Hinding, Cleon Melsa, Marcia Pankake, Geoffrey Sirc.

REGRETS: Gerry Baldrige, Carol Chomsky, Robert Fahnhorst, Janet Holdsworth, Anne Pick.

ABSENT: Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, John Fossum, James Perry, Richard Purple, Georgina Stephens, Caroline Turner, Tom Walsh.

GUESTS: Len Kuhi, Christine Maziar, Jim Turman.

1. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

Vice President Christine Maziar reported that she and Professor Len Kuhi has discussed the Intellectual Property Policy with the Regents, who seemed receptive to the proposed policy. Three areas were identified where additional work needs to be done to the policy. The first is to strengthen the language on the uses and purposes of the funds that will be available to the Office of the Vice President for Research.

Second was the language regarding granting exemptions to campus visitors and outside researchers working in collaboration with University employees. The drafting committee felt that it was better to have intellectual property restrictions placed in a letter of invitation to the University rather than to expect them to be aware of rules and policies once coming to campus. The Regents preferred not to include this language in the policy but to incorporate it in a set a guidelines.

The last issue is also the most difficult. The Regents have a concern about intellectual property as it relates to distance learning and the potential for employees to create intellectual property that would be sold in competition with the University's interests. As Vice President Maziar has

said before, this issue would most appropriately be dealt with in the Conflict of Interest Policy. The Regents understand this argument, but still feel that the University is opening the door to potential conflicts.

Professor Kuhi added that another group discussed the Intellectual Property Policy as it relates to the Consulting Policy.

2. DISCUSSION OF THE "ENFORCEMENT MODEL"

Professor Len Kuhi, chair of the Research Committee, said that this is a policy and was approved by the Research Committee on April 1. This policy came from the grants management effort, of which the purpose is to demonstrate to the NIH and others that there are mechanisms in place for enforcing compliance with the grants management policies and procedures. The policy details the steps that will be taken if violations do occur.

The floor was then opened for questions.

Q: The whole policy is written in the passive voice which puts responsibility on everyone and no one. Who wrote the policy?

A: It came to the Research Committee from David Hamilton.

Q: Is there currently an Office of Institutional Oversight Analysis and Reporting (IOAR)?

A: This office will be established under the new Grants Management System.

Q: When the policy refers to the dean's office, is this meant to imply the dean's office in a faculty member's college?

A: Yes.

A committee member said that complications could occur for interdisciplinary programs, because deans do not always discuss these programs with each other.

Another member also proposed finding a new name for the policy.

The committee then recommended revising the title and modifying the passive language. Once this has been done, it should be brought back for approval.

3. FACULTY WORKLOAD UNDER SEMESTERS

Professor Bales reported that he sent a letter to Peter Zetterberg, which was forwarded to Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks. He distributed a copy of the letter to Bruininks and asked the committee what additional action should take place.

A committee member said that although letters of complaint have been sent to Bruininks, it still needs to be stated to him that some deans are imposing a model on departments which is not workload neutral.

Professor Bales said that he would have a conversation with Bruininks on this issue.

4. RIGHT OF DEPARTMENTS TO RETAIN A POSITION WHEN THE DEPARTMENT REJECTS A TENURE CANDIDATE

Kent Bales commented that at a meeting between the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and President Yudof, the President indicated that he would be willing to discuss this item with the deans.

It appears to be a good policy to allow departments to retain positions as an insurance of quality control, but this does not always happen. This leads to departments retaining less than desirable faculty.

The committee then made the following comments:

- SCFA should strongly promote this concept, but not approve a policy on this issue
- Faculty should be the keepers of standards and quality in their departments
- Deans need flexibility, but should be required to explain why a department could not retain a position
- The President should issue a statement to the deans on this issue
- Who has the right to give or take faculty positions?
- Should a department retain a position if they refuse someone for tenure, but then lose a position if the college denies tenure?
- One solution is for SCFA to ask the President to raise this issue with the deans. Another would be to include the practice of retaining positions in the Tenure Code, but how would this be enforced
- This issue could open a Pandora's Box for the deans as well as departments

SCFA favored preparing a resolution which could be approved by the Faculty Senate in the fall. A motion was then made and approved for SCFA to ask the President to discuss this topic with the deans.

5. REQUEST FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPENSE FUNDS FOR FACULTY AS PART OF THE CAPITAL CAMPAIGN

Professor Bales said that this item came from a brainstorming session and involves two issues. The first is whether or not SCFA would like to consider this issue. The second is whether or not this is a good thing to ask for in the capital campaign. Current practices around the University vary across colleges. Also, many faculty do not spend the entire amount allocated to them each year.

Q: What is meant by professional expense funds?

A: It includes such expenses such as travel to professional conferences.

Q: Would this be something extra to raise funds for?

A: Yes.

Kent Bales said that for this to be supported, it would be very important to properly package and market it. Faculty must also be willing to discuss this issue.

It was decided that SCFA would discuss this topic at a later meeting.

6. UPDATE ON THE SOUTH MALL PROJECT

Jim Turman introduced himself as the Assistant Vice President for Student Development and Athletics, Chair of the Building Advisory Committee for Coffman Renovations, and a member of the Steering Committee for the Southmall Project. He then took the committee through a overhead presentation of the three phases of renovations to the Southmall area and distributed an organizational chart for the project.

The first phase includes underground parking for 1700 cars, housing for 450 students, 15 townhouses for visitors to the University, rerouting of East River Road, landscaping, connections to the AHC, and possible rerouting underground of Washington Avenue. The total could reach \$150 million, with housing costing \$27 million and parking costing an additional \$46 million.

The concept for these designs originates in the master plan developed in 1907 by Cass Gilbert to connect the campus with the Mississippi River. One piece of this plan, inclusion of an amphitheater, has not been considered because of noise issues. Obstacles to this plan include the city owning East River Road and the Park Board owning the river flats.

Phase II of the renovation involves the renovation of Coffman Union as well as renovating Delaware Street and Washington Avenue. One plan is to lower Washington Avenue below street level so that people can walk from Northrop to the river flats. The problem with this plan is that the city of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and some people at the University would not consider other investors in this part of the project.

There is a building Advisory Committee for Coffman renovations which includes approximately 20 people representing a broad spectrum of constituencies. Since most of the cost of the renovations is being funded by students, the President wants them to play a key role in the new design. Renovations will begin in the winter of 2000 with completion in the fall of 2001.

Phase III would include additional student housing, light rail transit, and possible underground space for storage and/or parking under the Mall area.

The floor was then opened for questions.

Q: If constructing an underground parking ramp is so expensive, why is it being done?

A: The University does not have land to create parking lots and is being forced to think vertically. To accommodate all parking needs, especially in the AHC, a ramp of this size is needed, and underground is the only space that is available.

Q: Has the President considered moving to Coffman once renovations are complete?

A: It has been discussed but the problem is that it would not only be the President moving, but many other offices from Morrill Hall which would take too much space from the students in Coffman.

Q: After the renovations, will someone be able to stand at Northrop and see the river.

A: No. This can barely be accomplished now from the fourth floor of Coffman.

Q: The Coffman renovation plan calls for meeting rooms on the fifth and sixth floor. Will the Campus Club have access to these facilities? Will the Campus Club food service be able to cater beyond the fourth floor?

A: They will be able to use these rooms. In regards to catering, the University has a contract with Aramark. No final decision has been made yet.

Q: When will the Southmall renovations be complete?

A: Phases I and Coffman renovations will be completed by the fall of 2001. Road renovations are still under discussion and do not have a completion date yet.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A committee member asked whether there would be a faculty response to the cartoon that appeared in the *Pioneer Press* this morning, such as a faculty committee looking deeper at faculty involvement and their susceptibility to pressures.

Professor Bales said that FCC discussed this issue at their meeting today and suggested that the chairs of SCEP and FCC possibly make a statement or hold a press conference on the matter.

With no further business, Kent Bales thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Rebecca Hippert
University Senate