

From: "Kevin Gormley" <Kevin.J.Gormles-1@tc.umn.edu>
 Date: Thu, 26 Jun 97 13:48:47 -0500
 To: feene001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 bales@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 corye001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 r-fahn@vm1.spcs.umn.edu,
 nschema@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 altho001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 balas@aem.umn.edu,
 choms001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 dempsey@brain.biochem.umn.edu,
 jgaston@mail.cee.umn.edu,
 rjgumn@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 guyottrl@caa.mrs.umn.edu,
 mcgehee@geom.umn.edu,
 mille004@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 myers006@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 annepick@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 purpl001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 bselzler@mail.crk.umn.edu,
 Kevin Gormley Gormles <Kevin.J.Gormles-1@tc.umn.edu>,
 kvanbeck@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 isenberg@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 morri001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 carrier@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 /pn=nancy.livingston/dd.fax=228-5500/@fax.tc.umn.edu,
 murthy@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 ufa@mnhepo.hep.umn.edu,
 fcc@unet.unet.umn.edu,
 merwi001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 olau0003@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 Student Committee on Committees <conc@tc.umn.edu>,
 senate@mailbox.mail.umn.edu,
 kosek@geom.umn.edu,
 farbe001@gold.tc.umn.edu,
 Grad and Professional Std Assembly <gaps@tc.umn.edu>
 Subject: SCFA 6/12/97

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Thursday, June 12, 1997
 Nolte Library
 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Present: Daniel Feeney (chair), Josef Altholz, Gary Balas, Carol Chomsky, Cheryl Coryea, Mary Dempsey, Robert Fahnhorst, Richard Purple

Regrets: Carol Carrier, Judith Gaston, Richard Goldstein, Rolland Guyotte, Richard McGehee, Bernard Selzler

Absent: Jack Merwin, Carol Miller, Kevin O'Laughlin, Anne Pick, Samuel Myers, Naomi Scheman

Guests: Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources)

Others: n/a

1. CHAIR'S REPORT

Tenure: Professor Dan Feeney said that the Regents are voting the following day on the tenure amendments. Professors Mary Dempsey and Ed Fogelman will be at the meeting.

Intellectual Property: It is expected that this issue will not surface for a while based on the messages that were forwarded to Asst. V.P. Frances Lawrenz.

Indemnification: Professor Feeney sent the letter to Mr. Mark Rottenberg requesting for his interpretation of the Regent Policy on indemnification policy and use of outside counsel. Mr. Rottenberg's response is expected in the near future.

Data Practices Document: This item will be included on the list for next year's agenda.

Professor Feeney said that he has appreciated the cooperation and enthusiasm that the committee members have shown. The committee is able to celebrate a few successes (i.e., the Sexual Harassment Policy).

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The committee approved the April 24 and May 22 minutes. Professor Feeney asked for the committee to offer their corrections via e-mail for the June 12 minutes so that this item does not carry over to the next academic year.

3. DISCUSSION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW w/Nan Wilhelmson

Professor Feeney asked Ms. Wilhelmson to review the document with the committee. Some of the terminology was changed due to the new administrative structure. There also are changes on the participant identification and confidentiality. Organizational changes in the document regarding recommended guidelines for the review committee.

The document briefly discusses the difference between annual review and periodic ones, the later being much more comprehensive, and the focus of this discussion/document. The remainder of the discussion highlighted:

- * Recommended steps for the comprehensive review process
 - The responsible administrator is the decision maker
 - The committee is selected by the responsible administrator together with the reviewee.
- * Description of core performance criteria
- * Appointment of the review committee
- * Content of the file
- * Guidelines for the review committee
- * Developing a questionnaire for the review process
- * Confidentiality of assessment information
 - Internal and External Peer administrators: Identification is required
 - Faculty and Staff who report to the administrator: Identification is NOT required.
 - Faculty and staff who report indirectly are identified without any link to specific statements.
 - Students are not required to be identified.
- * Summary of the responsibilities per group/person
- * Performance review summary sheet

Ms. Wilhelmson said that the process was piloted with a number of administrators. Overall, the administrators and reviewers seemed to appreciate the structure and consistency that was made possible with the document.

Comments from the group:

- * Allowing identification for focus group members is acceptable as long as the groups are not too small.
- * Are the tapes available to the reviewee? Ms. Wilhelmson said that she did not think so, and would check.
- * There should be a list of guidelines for the review committee chair that outline how confidentiality could be maintained (i.e., sufficient number of focus group members, destruction of tapes, etc.).
- * If surveys are used, identifying information needs to be secured and/or destroyed in a timely manner.
- * The document is very well constructed.
- * It might be helpful, early on, to define responsible administrator.

- * External vs. internal reporting could be confusing. This could be clarified with a few more examples.
- * The second bullet under "participants in review" on page 14 could also refer to the Senate Sexual Harassment Policy as it relates to potential conflicts of interest.
- * The review committee is able to have closed meetings base on advice from the General Counsel.
- * This process is being used, and has been assessed by those reviewing and those being reviewed.
- * Due process does not imply perfect process. Therefore, any court cases that could result for a review committee's decision would probably hold-up in court if the process outlined was kept.
- * Human Resources keeps a list of those who needs to be reviewed and when it needs to occur.

Professor Feeney said that once the document is fully "tuned," it should be presented to the Faculty Senate for information. SCFA approved a motion to endorse and complement the drafters of the document, and that the chair send a letter to FCC requesting their review for presentation to the Faculty Senate.

4. FURTHER UPDATES ON SEMESTER CONVERSION/FACULTY APPOINTMENT SCHEDULING

Professor Chomsky said that Dr. Peter Zetterberg (Change to Semester Committee Chair) was going to speak with Assoc. V.P. Carol Carrier about how SCFA's recommendation relates to Human Resources policies/procedures. He also wanted to review if the recommendation would create overlaps with the summer schedules. Professor Chomsky said that SCFA should expect a letter from Dr. Zetterberg in the fall for discussion and possible reconsideration/recommendation. She reviewed the Change to Semester Committee was skeptical about the need to have an absolute start and end date. It also was concerned about the narrow amount of time between the start date and the first day of class.

The committee discussed how many calendars the University may have and the fact that this discussion is irrelevant for those who choose the 9 or 12 pay option. One member asked how this will impact those in their year of retirement. Another said that faculty members can retire at odd times (i.e., other than the end of the academic year). Another aspect of this issue is that Grants Management may need the fixed start and end date. Professor Feeney said that he would add this item to next year's agenda.

5. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT YEAR

Professor Feeney proceeded to list a number of items that will need to be addressed by SCFA next academic year:

- * Intellectual Property
- * Faculty Guide to the Data Practices Act
- * Indemnification
- * Summer School Class Cancellation: SCFA never received a response from Sr. V.P. Marvin Marshak on this issue. The committee decided to send the letter to Professor Bob Brunicks asking for a response to SCFA's concerns regarding this matter (cc'd to President-Elect Mark Yudof).
- * Semester Conversion/Faculty Appointment
- * P&A and term appointments clarification
- * Health Plan changes: Deletion of Medica Premier and the potential changes in the State plan
- * Sabbatical Leave Policy
- * Monitoring of the re-enactment of the Compensation Committee
- * Restructuring of the governance structure: What is to be done with the provostal consultative committees? How can the governance system work more effectively?

A motion for presented to express SCFA's profound appreciation for Professor Feeney "long and arduous service" to University governance. In response, the committee applauded Professor Feeney.