

APRIL 20, 1995

The third meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1994-95, was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 20, 1995, at 3:16 p.m. (immediately following the University Senate meeting). Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 122 voting faculty members. President Nils Hasselmo, presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 16, 1995

Action

APPROVED

**II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
RESEARCH COMMITTEE
Workload Policy Addendum
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Workload Policy Addendum:

Workload Policy Addendum

The workload principles and guidelines in all units shall enable its FULL-TIME TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY to devote sufficient time to meeting their responsibilities as would reasonably be necessary:

- (a) for all ranks, to make scholarly contributions expected of their faculties, and
- (b) in the case of assistant and associate professors, to sustain the quality of continuing contributions required in the respective unit to achieve tenure and promotion.

This policy establishes a standard applicable to all faculty ranks. It recognizes that University research is inextricably interwoven with teaching and often with service, and that the proportion of effort devoted to research need not be identical for each individual faculty member in a unit, but may vary around the unit's average. Such activities are to form a part of the faculty member's normal work effort during his or her term of appointment.

COMMENT:

All baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate units share in the University's mission of teaching, research, and service, and the research mission includes research, scholarship, and creative activities and contributions. The University's research mission is to make nationally and internationally significant, high-quality contributions to the advancement of knowledge or the production of creative works in the disciplines of the respective faculties. Although units vary widely in their distributions of effort among the University's missions, it is important that all such University units structure faculty workloads in ways that enable meaningful participation in the University's research mission.

JOHN ADAMS, Chair
Faculty Consultative Committee

DANIEL FEENEY, Chair

DISCUSSION:

Professor Allen Goldman presented the motion concerning the proposed addendum to the Workload Policy. He reviewed the intent of the motion, which is outlined in the commentary section, and said the Senate Research Committee had been working, in collaboration with the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, on this issue for sometime. After calling for comments or questions, and hearing none, the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting.

APPROVED

**III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
COMPENSATION WORKING GROUP**

**Resolution
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

Resolution

Having accepted and discussed the Report of the Compensation Working Group, the Faculty Senate wishes to express its support for the general concepts, principles and positions conveyed in the Report. Further, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Regents give careful consideration to the desirability of quickly establishing a long term compensation policy position for faculty and academic staff and to reinforcing the chosen policy position with the decisions regarding FY 95-96 salary increases.

JOHN ADAMS, Chair
Faculty Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor John Adams introduced the proposed Resolution which endorses the concepts, principles and positions conveyed in the Compensation Working Group (CWG) Report recently completed and distributed to Faculty Senate members. The CWG, he reported, was established during the 1993-94 academic year by the provost and the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee to "analyze the present status of compensation rates and plans for faculty and academic staff and to explore desirable alternative models and approaches," and to ". . . pursue a broader agenda including a more detailed analysis of how faculty and academic staff salaries compare to peer institutions by rank and discipline." The CWG was further asked to consider different models for compensation plans and to address financing scenarios for changes to the current plan.

In the report, which was presented to the Regents in February, the Compensation Working Group made some key assumptions. It assumed that 1) the U2000 agenda aims to place the U of M among the 20-25 major research universities that survive and prosper in the coming decade, 2) faculty and academic staff essential to the University's successful competition for inclusion in the top group are drawn from a national and international academic labor market, 3) a competitive salary position is essential to attract and retain needed faculty and staff, 4) interunit salary variations should reflect market realities but all units should be in the range of similar units in the set of peer institutions, and 5) individual salaries should be based on performance.

Professor Adams then briefly reviewed some of the CWG's findings, views and recommendations, including:

- *that the Change magazine list of 30 top research institutions serve as the appropriate peer set for salary comparisons for the Twin Cities--appropriate groups were identified also for Duluth and Morris and an appropriate peer group should be developed for Crookston*
- *that the 75th percentile position within each group serve as a long term critical planning measure and that over the next 5-7 years a realistic target of the 50th percentile be used*
- *before adjustments to the numbers of faculty and staff, current annual shortfall from the 75th percentile salary position is estimated to be \$40-50 million per year--achieving the 50th percentile would cost a little more than half that amount*
- *some mix of the following adjustments to normal operating funding will be necessary to finance increased salary rates: 1) increased State subsidy, 2) increased tuition (rate and/or volume), 3) increased overhead contribution, 4) improved efficiency, and 5) appropriate program reductions*
- *adjustments to gifts and donations are very important, but are not considered a substitute for normal operating funding*
- *as a feasibility test at the 75th percentile level, the CWG considered the following as a possible mix of adjustments over a 5-7 year period for the five areas noted above: 1) subsidy - \$5 million, 2) tuition - \$10 million, 3) overhead - \$5 million, 4) efficiency - \$15 million, and 5) reductions -\$20 million*
- *flexibility should be increased by allowing the expanded use of temporary adjustments to the basic salary of individuals*
- *group and individual incentives need to be introduced as a means of signaling institutional priorities and facilitating needed structural changes*

The CWG has urged the Administration to formalize and distribute the University's academic compensation policy sooner rather than later and has asked for a reinforcement of the University's longterm policy position by the way in which it makes its 1995-96 salary decisions.

With little discussion, the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting.

APPROVED

IV. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

V. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

**Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor**