

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, January 23, 2003**  
**1:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Susan Brorson, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Arthur Erdman, John Fossum, Marti Hope Gonzales, Marc Jenkins, Mary Jo Kane, Candace Kruttschnitt, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Fred Morrison, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Charles Speaks

Absent: Gary Balas, Muriel Bebeau

Guests: Interim Vice President and Chief of Staff Kathryn Brown; President Robert Bruininks; Interim Dean Victor Bloomfield (Graduate School)

Other: Katie Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff); Joyce Wascoe (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) election of FCC chair and vice chair for next year; (2) governance policy; (3) IMG subcommittee; (4) Nominating Committee; (5) report from legislative liaisons; (6) Regent candidates; (7) IRB questionnaire; (8) intellectual future topics; (9) athletic committees; (10) service and productivity initiative; (11) the budget situation (with the President); (12) Scholars Walk]

**1. Election of 2003-04 Chair and Vice Chair**

Professor Feeney convened the meeting at 1:20 and called for ballots to be distributed to elect next year's chair and vice chair. Professor Martin was elected chair; Professor Erdman was elected vice chair. Both received a round of applause from the Committee.

**2. Governance Policy**

Professor Feeney distributed copies of a revised academic unit governance policy, the product of a second ad hoc committee consisting of Professors Akehurst, Chomsky, Feeney, Jenkins, Konstan, and Morrison. The central point of the revised version is that as long as the legitimate authority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty can be asserted when needed, departments may operate however they wish.

The Committee resolved a few minor editing questions and then unanimously approved it as a document to be distributed for further consultation. The policy approved at the meeting (with the understanding that additional edits and changes could be made within the next few days) reads as follows:

1. The regular faculty [footnote: As defined in the Regents' policy "Faculty Tenure."] are invested with academic freedom and are charged with responsibility in all aspects of the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service. They have been selected

---

\* 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.

through rigorous search processes, are subject to substantive annual and tenure-related reviews, [footnote: The work of the tenured and tenure-track faculty is judged, and tenure is granted, on the basis of demonstrated proficiency and contribution to all three elements of the University's tripartite mission.] and have entered into long-term relationships with the University. For these reasons, the regular faculty hold ultimate authority for governance in tenure-granting units. This governance authority includes but is not limited to research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and personnel allocation (in concert with the chair, head or dean).

2. The regular faculty shall create governance mechanisms that provide for participation by all appropriate groups in the decision-making processes of the unit. Academic unit governance currently varies from consensus-decision-making to the extension of voting rights to non-regular faculty and professional/administrative staff when appropriate. Any such participation is subject to the ultimate governance authority of the regular faculty.

3. Only members of the tenured faculty participate in tenure decisions. Only [regular faculty] members at higher ranks participate in promotion decisions. [footnote: This is identical to language in the "Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments."] Recommendation by the regular faculty is required prior to hiring regular faculty for that unit. [footnote: As required by the "Administrative Policy on Academic Appointments."]

4. Individuals in all non-tenured/non-tenure-track appointment classes who regularly fulfill the requirements for regular faculty status should be considered for appointment as regular faculty members.

5. The Executive Vice President and Provost will ensure that each collegiate unit and department conforms to these requirements. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs will interpret this policy, review and monitor adherence to it, and advise the Executive Vice President and Provost, as necessary.

The Committee expressed its deep thanks to all who have worked on the policy. Professor Feeney said he will arrange to bring the policy for consultation to the P&A executive group, the health sciences, and so on.

### **3. Incentives for Managed Growth**

The Committee concluded that this was not the time to appoint a subcommittee to consider the implications of IMG for cross/interdisciplinary teaching and research. This issue will remain "on the list" for future consideration.

### **4. Nominating Committee**

The Committee agreed on three individuals, of whom two must be persuaded to agree, to run for the position on the Nominating Committee that becomes open on July 1, 2003. Professor Feeney agreed to call the three individuals to ask about their willingness to be considered by the Assembly.

## **5. Report from the Legislative Liaisons**

Professor Feeney noted that Professors Morrison and Marshak had agreed to divide the responsibilities of legislative liaison following the death of Professor McEvoy. Professors Marshak and Morrison related the gist of conversations they have been having with legislators about the budget situation and their assessment of the likely outcome of the legislative session with respect to both the current year's budget and the next biennial appropriation. The numbers are ominous, perhaps the worst the University has faced in decades.

## **6. Regent Candidates**

The Regent Candidate Advisory Council will conduct public interviews of candidates for the Board of Regents; FCC members are invited to participate.

## **7. IRB Questionnaire**

Professor Feeney reported that the questionnaire about the practices of the Institutional Review Board, to be sent to those who have gone through the process in recent years, is in process with Interim Vice President Hamilton but will be distributed soon. He added that the Research Subjects Protection Program has taken seriously comments from this Committee and the Senate Research Committee and they are to be commended for grappling with problems.

## **8. Intellectual Future Discussions**

Professor Feeney noted that the Committee has another "Intellectual Future of the University" discussion slated for April. He said he would ask the current and incoming leaders of FCC plus a couple of other FCC members to develop a proposal for the discussion. Possible topics include public goods and the appropriate faculty/student mix (given the significant increase in applications to the University).

## **9. Athletic Committees**

Professor Feeney asked if the Committee wished to take additional action on the membership of the athletic committees (this Committee is charged with nominating members). He said he would work with Professors Erdman and Martin to develop a list of candidates as well as a list of individuals who could be asked to serve as chairs.

## **10. Productivity and Accountability Initiative**

Professor Clayton reported that the work of the committee reviewing the accountability and service of support units is temporarily on hold while surveys are being conducted. Along the way, however, suggestions are being made. One is that there be some source or place where one can send commendations or complaints or blow the whistle. This would provide an opportunity for "venting" but could also lead to improvements in practices or the inauguration of practices that do not exist. A suggestion place serve as an informal mechanism to learn about what is going on and where things are going well outside the annual or triennial review process.

Could the suggestions or comments be anonymous, Professor Feeney asked? Presumably they could be either signed or not, Professor Clayton said. Would this be run through Vice President O'Brien's office, Professor Feeney asked? Probably, Professor Clayton said. It should also be on the web, Professor Erdman suggested.

Professor Martin took this opportunity to say that the class management web site is "amazing"; she said that Mr. Fitzgerald and his staff have done an astonishing job.

## **11. The Budget Situation**

Because the President was detained at the legislature, Vice President Brown joined the meeting to discuss the budget. She explained that the administration is developing a set of principles, parallel to the ones developed to guide the stadium discussion, to guide the University's response to expected budget cuts. The proposed principles will be circulated for discussion.

Professor Speaks asked who would be consulted and if there is any mechanism in place to develop scenarios responding to deep budget cuts. As to the first, Ms. Brown said that consultation would be with other senior officers, this Committee and the Finance and Planning Committee, the deans, and other employee groups. As to the second, she said she has not seen any models. They are looking at a broad array of places where cost reductions can be achieved and will try to get as far as possible down that road before making cuts. Such cost reductions could include health insurance or other benefits as well as changes in Human Resources policies.

Professor Martin said she hoped that any modeling would include potential tuition increases (Ms. Brown said they would) and that students would be included in the discussions so they understand how much deep cuts will damage the improved educational mission of the University which has attracted so many talented students in recent years. She also suggested to Ms. Brown that the University put up a big United-Way type of thermometer in Coffman Union that visually communicates the descending level of state support.

Ms. Brown said there will be weekly communications on where the University is vis-à-vis the budget situation; this is a time when it is not possible to communicate too much. This will allow people to be knowledgeable, even if they don't like what they are hearing.

President Bruininks joined the meeting. While some of the discussion was off the record, some was not.

Anyone who has suggestions for budget priorities or principles should send them to Vice President Kathryn Brown. The President said he would use his report to the Board of Regents to focus attention on the budget issues. He will talk then about the magnitude of the cuts and the range of options for balancing the budget. The following points were made in the discussion:

-- The Governor's recommendation for the biennial appropriation "will not be pretty" and the University must be prepared to say something publicly about the tradeoffs that any cuts will require.

-- It will be helpful to start the budget discussions with a set of core principles; the President distributed copies of a draft version of such principles.

-- The administration will try to reach all people in the University; they want the message out and want it straight. There will be meetings with employee groups; employees must be part of the process because they will be part of the shared sacrifices.

-- Has there been an analysis of the impact of the cuts made in the early 1990s, Professor Martin asked? There have been, the President said, and they will be made available. It takes a very long time to "crawl out of the hole," Professor Martin observed, and the University has made progress the last five years. This budget situation could set the University back farther than it was ten years ago. Any messages must also communicate what will happen to the STATE, Professor Kane added, not just what will happen to the University. The President agreed but said that the problem is that higher education has not been as high a priority in the state on a "human need" scale as are other budget items.

## **12. Scholars Walk**

Because the time for the meeting had run out and the room was in demand, Professor Feeney turned belatedly and apologetically to Interim Dean Bloomfield to express regret that his time to discuss the Scholars Walk had been used for the budget discussion.

Dean Bloomfield quickly distributed the proposal and explained that it would call for recognition/commemoration of individuals in nine categories (national and international awards, Regents Professors, McKnight Presidential Chairs and Distinguished McKnight Professors, distinguished teachers, major disciplinary awards [those given only once or twice per year], Departmental Legacy Scholars, students [Rhodes, Marshall, and Truman Scholars], special honors, honorary degree recipients). Associate Vice President Gerald Fischer from the Foundation brought the proposal to Dr. Bruininks when he was Provost; Dr. Bruininks asked him to follow up, Dean Bloomfield said. The walk would run from the Gateway Center to Union Street (and at least conceptually to the Mall) and include niches and commemorative plaques, etc. It would be entirely funded from private sources.

Dean Bloomfield said it would helpful to have endorsement from the Faculty Consultative Committee. It was moved, seconded, and enthusiastically and unanimously voted to support the proposal.

Professor Feeney adjourned the meeting at 3:10.

-- Gary Engstrand