

MINUTES***SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS****Thursday, January 9, 1997****3:00 - 5:00****140 Nolte Center**

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Joseph Altholz, Gary Balas, Carol Chomsky, Mary Dempsey, Robert Fahnhorst, Richard Goldstein, Rolland Guyotte, Jack Merwin, Carol Miller, Kevin O'Laughlin, Anne Pick, Richard Purple, Naomi Scheman, Bernard Selzler

Regrets: Judith Gaston, Richard McGehee

Absent: Carol Carrier, Samuel Myers

Guests: Jack Johnson (Director - University Summer School)

Other: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

1. CHAIR'S REPORT

Tuition Policy: Professor Dan Feeney explained that a tentative revision of the Tuition Policy was presented to the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents. The process for this issue is proceeding in an organized manner.

Modem Pool: A letter has been drafted by Professor Feeney regarding the modem pool charges for off-campus users of University computing services. This letter was forwarded to Professors Carol Chomsky and Dick McGehee. The Regents are also addressing this issue.

Faculty Liability: The University has determined the Primary Investigator (P.I.) is the final responsible party if a problem occurs in a research project. Grants management on campus appears to be evolving such that faculty are encouraged to acquire outside funding for research, but may not receive legal support if difficulties arise. Discussion on this issue is expected to come before SCFA this academic year.

AHC: Department chairs has received some apparently surprising information regarding retrenchments for what may be several million dollars that could effect a number of individuals in this area. No other details are available at this time.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The approval of the agenda was unanimous.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The November 7, 1996, November 21, 1996, and December 11, 1996 minutes were approved.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at 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.

4. DISCUSSION ON SUMMER SCHOOL SALARIES w/ Dr. Jack Johnson

Dr. Johnson proceeded to outline the policy, described the development of the policy, and its impact as implemented this past summer.

The policy states that a course at the lower level (1000 - 3000) requires at least eight (8) students in the summer session to be held. 3000 - 5000 courses require at least five (5). These numbers were selected by examining similar policies at peer institutions. Classes held to this requirement are only those paid for by the Summer School office, and only applies to structured classes (as opposed to independent study classes). There is a provision for exceptions. Summer School operates on an allocation from University administration as part of University College. No cancellations were allowed beginning in the early 1970s until last summer.

Beginning in 1992, Summer School began to experience significant cutbacks. In 1994, the Summer School had spent about \$300,000 on courses with eight students or less, not including fringe benefits of instructors.

The Summer School was informed in the winter of 1994-1995 that it was going to receive \$500,000 in cuts, after the budget had been set. The course cancellation policy was one idea to resolve the financial deficit. This was presented to and approved by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Professor Jim Enfante. This was presented to the departments as calls for courses were requested by the Summer School. Although advice was not sought through faculty governance, several faculty were consulted in the process of constructing the policy.

Questions and Answers:

Q Did any one advice you to take it to the Faculty Senate.

A To be honest, no.

Q This type of thing would have to go before the Faculty Senate if the faculty were unionized. Accountability previously was determined by the department, and now has shifted to individual faculty.

A The old system did hold departments and faculty accountable because they were held accountable for enrollment. The old policy also allowed the University to commit itself to the courses listed in the course schedule. Unfortunately, retrenchments required the Summer School to change this policy.

Q How much money was saved this past summer?

A 38 courses were canceled. They had an average size of 2.58 students, amounting to 98 student slots for the related courses. 31 faculty, 7 graduate assistants, and 80 students were effected by the course cancellations (only 80 students effected because some cancellations involved a set of courses that had registration for only one or two students). Total savings amounted to \$105,581. Exemptions for cancellation were petitioned for 51 courses. 38 exemptions were approved, six were denied, and 7 were negotiated. 149 courses in the College of Education were given blanket exemption before this process began for teacher summer classes.

Q How many courses were offered by Summer School, 1996?

A Approximately 1000 courses were covered by this policy. Student count on the Twin Cities campus for Summer School was 15,464.

Q What is the budget for the Summer School?

A \$8.6 million. Therefore, the savings was rather minimal. When factoring in lost revenue from tuition, the savings was even lower at about \$80,000.

Q What is the relationship between Incentives for Managed Growth and Summer School?

A Decisions about allocations will be made by the colleges. The Summer School is not likely to play a big part in this, especially given the fact that this "school" serves as a mediating agency for funding and course scheduling only in the summer months. The existing allocation system for the Summer School ends after the summer 1997. The future system for the Summer School has not been detailed to date.

A faculty member added that SCFA was interested in hearing how the policy developed given the fact that faculty governance was not involved. This trend of bypassing consultation appears to be growing on campus. In this case, it appears that the former V.P. of Academic Affairs decided to circumvent the governance process. As discussion continued Dr. Johnson explained the particulars of how the classes were canceled

A motion was made to invite V.P. of Academic Affairs, Professor Marvin Marshak, to discuss refurbishing the Summer School budget such that this action of canceling classes can be discontinued. During the discussion, a committee member recommended including some of the substantive information from the discussion in an invitation letter to Dr. Marshak. **The motion was approved.** Professor Feeney requested Professors Naomi Scheman and Rick Purple to draft the invitation letter to be reviewed by SCFA once drafted. The material coming from Dr. Johnson may help in writing the letter. Professor Scheman assured Dr. Johnson that the letter would be friendly with respect to his office.

5. TENURE

Professor Mary Dempsey explained that the Board of Regents approved the Sullivan II proposal as the new Tenure Code for the Morris campus, but was willing to work with the faculty to amend the Code.

In cooperation with the Tenure Subcommittee, Professor Carol Chomsky drafted a set of possible amendments titled "Proposals Regarding Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure: Specific Units." Professor Chomsky proceeded to review the proposed amendments with the committee:

Item 1: Motion A -- Housekeeping amendment to footnotes.

Item 2: Motion B -- Housekeeping amendment to Section 12.4.

Item 3: Motion C -- Amendment to Section 4.5 on financial stringency.

- * The reference to "collegiate unit" has been removed.
- * Administration and faculty should share in the cuts when financial stringency is declared.
- * The President is responsible to made this declaration.
- * Total regular salary includes both base and supplemental pay.
- * There is no quantitative definition for financial stringency or financial emergency.
- * As much of the Regents language has been left intact.

The committee continued to discuss this amendment and the relationship between faculty governance and the Board of Regents.

Item 4: Interpretation 1 -- Relating to Section 4.5 on financial stringency.

- * The last line was changed using the word "foresee" rather than "predict."

Item 5: Motion D -- Amendment to Section 7a.5 on alternative methods of peer review.

- * The change consists of allowing the dean and the related faculty to make changes to the peer review process for a **collegiate** unit.

Item 6: Motion E -- Amendment to Section 12.3 on reassignments.

- * This is not the time to deal with issues of programmatic termination. Rather, this is the time to deal with providing for faculty affected by such a change.
- * Could budgetary entity be used when referring to programs?

Item 7: Motion F -- Amendment to Section 14.6 (Temporary suspension during proceedings).

Item 8: Motion G: Amendment to Section 10.22 on minor disciplinary actions.

- * Suspension as a minor sanction has been deleted. Rather, a minor sanction is either a letter of reprimand or a sanction that is articulated in a University or collegiate policy.
- * This provides for disciplinary mechanism that operates shy of dismissal.

The committee continued to wordsmith this particular amendment.

Item 9: Motion H -- Definition of regular compensation.

- * This makes an effort to change the use of "base salary" to "recurring salary" for the purpose of agreeing with NIH definitions.
- * Maybe "compensation" should be replaced with the word "salary."

Item 10: Interpretation 2 00 Regarding Section 4.4 definition of base salaries.

Item 11: Discussion -- New ground for dismissal or suspension

- * This discussion relates to issues that are understandably egregious breaches by a faculty member.

The committee applauded Professor Chomsky and the Tenure Subcommittee for the quality and swiftness of their work.

The AAUP conducts reviews of tenure codes regarding their conformation with its own general policy. A question was asked if the current policy had been reviewed by this body. SCFA agreed to allow AAUP to review the code (knowing that it is still in draft form).

Without dissent, the committee approved a motion in favor of the amendments listed above.

Kevin Gormley
University Senate