

Minutes*

Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, September 5, 2002
3:00 – 4:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Judy Berning, Susan Brorson, Yev Garif, Marti Hope Gonzales, Candace Kruttschnitt, Kari Lindeman, Judith Martin, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Thomas Walsh

Absent: Muriel Bebeau, Nick Cecconi, Tom Clayton, Les Drewes, Arthur Erdman, Anthony Heryla, Kelsi Holland, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Nathan Saete, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks, Eric Steinhoff

Guests: Professor Shirley Nelson Garner (chair, All-University Honors Committee), Ms. Judy Kirk (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Others: none

[In these minutes: (1) Board of Regents' honors policy; (2) President's Student Behavior Review Panel chair; (3) social event with students]

1. Honors Policy

Professor Feeney convened the meeting at 3:00 and welcomed Professor Garner and Ms. Kirk to lead a discussion of proposed revisions to the Regents' Honors Policy. He noted that there was not a quorum present so the Committee could discuss the changes but could not take action on them. As a result, the Committee cannot meet the deadline requested in order that the policy can be acted on by the Board of Regents at their meeting on September 12-13. He noted that he had an agreement with Vice President Brown that the policy would be pulled from the Regents' agenda if the Committee had problems with the policy or could not take action on it. He suggested that this be an initial discussion and said that the Committee would revisit it on September 19.

The delay is acceptable to the All-University Honors Committee, Professor Garner said. The changes have been worked through the Drafting Committee¹; both she and Ms. Kirk were involved as the Drafting Committee reviewed the language of the policy. The primary changes in the policy were in format; the only change of significance, acceptable to the All-University Honors Committee, is that the committee is also to receive and forward recommendations from the Alumni Association for honors to the Board of Regents.

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

¹ The Drafting Committee consists of four individuals, one from the faculty designated by the Faculty Consultative Committee, one from the General Counsel's office, one from the administration, and one from the Regents' Office, to go over proposed policy changes line by line. The group does not make or change policy, it is charged only with ensuring that policies are written correctly and carry out the intent of the groups involved in approving it.

Ms. Kirk then informed the Committee that on the subject of timing, discussion of changing the policy with respect to increasing the amounts required for endowed chairs and professorships began some time ago. The timing was deliberate: The changes will occur in the last year of the capital campaign, so there will be a transition to a new way of doing business. But they did not want to interfere with discussions with donors that are currently taking place. They wanted to have the policy in place by July 1, in order that all have advance notice, but it is also important that there be support across the institution, so a one-month delay is fine.

Ms. Kirk then drew the attention of Committee members to the changes in the endowment requirements. Discussion with the President's Council on this topic began last year; the Foundation staff were asked to look at the practices at other institutions and to talk to development officers. There had been no changes in endowment requirements for a number of years, however, and the income from \$1 million has not been sufficient to support an endowed chair (salary, fringe benefits, staff support, travel, and possibly other expenses). Most of the University's peer institutions require between \$1.5 and \$3 million (with a few requiring up to \$5 million, which is out of line).

The Foundation staff discussed the issues with 33 college development officers over a couple of months and then prepared proposed changes in the policy. The endowed chair would require \$2 million (which, in combination with salary, would be expected to pay salary, fringes, staff support, travel, and other expenses). The endowed professorship would require \$1 million (which would supplement other faculty salary funds and, in combination with salary, would provide salary, fringes, staff support, travel, and other expenses). For Faculty Fellows, an endowment of \$500,000 is required; the funds would be used to supplement a salary, provide stipends for fellowships, or to cover expenses. In all three cases, if sufficient funds are available, more than one chair/professorship/fellowship may be supported with the income stream, assuming the original intent of the donor is maintained.

The \$2 million requirement may be a stretch in some cases, Ms. Kirk observed, but that is where the requirements stand. The discussions also involved practices when a chair has been empty or market gains have allowed the creation of two (or more) chairs from the same endowment. The proposed policy would allow such support, assuming it is consistent with the donor agreement, with department goals, and does not reduce the support to any current occupant of the position.

Ms. Lindeman inquired why the naming of a building or part of a building for a company or individual donor is considered an honor/award/recognition. It seems wrong for someone to get a name on a building because he or she gives money. Professor Garner said that has been the case for a long time; naming a building or a component of a building is recognition. Professor Kruttschnitt observed that "that is how it works." Professor Garner added that she has talked with many people about this; if the University is willing to take someone's money, it should be willing to put that person's name on the building. And that is why the provision is in the policy, Ms. Kirk said: any proposal to name a building because of a donation must go through the process.

It was agreed that Professor Garner and Ms. Kirk did not need to return to the meeting to discuss the proposal when more Committee members were present, given that those who had discussed it at this meeting had no objections to it. The Committee agreed to decide later whether the policy should go to the Senate for action or information. Professor Feeny thanked Professor Garner and Ms. Kirk for presenting the policy to the Committee.

Professor McGowan joined the meeting later, briefly, and assured the Committee that the drafting group had made no changes in substance in the policy other than ones noted by Professor Garner and Ms. Kirk. Professor Feeney said the Committee was satisfied with the proposed revisions.

2. President's Student Behavior Review Panel

The Committee agreed unanimously and without reservation to recommend to Interim President Bruininks that he reappoint Ms. Jane Phillips as chair of the President's Student Behavior Review Panel.

3. Social Event with Students

Professor Feeney recalled that last year he had proposed a social event with the students so that the faculty and student members of the Committee could get to know each other. Mr. Garif reported that the Student Senate Consultative Committee had also identified faculty-student communication as a problem. He said he was dismayed to have attended one meeting of this Committee last year and see that the majority of the faculty left as the meeting started--the very time the students need consultation with the faculty.

It was agreed that Professor Feeney would inquire of his colleagues why they left the meeting, and that he would change the time of the Senate Consultative Committee meetings if necessary to accommodate faculty schedules.

It was agreed that if schedules permit, there would be a box lunch event for faculty and student committee members before the September 19 meetings of the consultative committees.

Professor Feeney adjourned the meeting at 3:45.

-- Gary Engstrand