

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, October 11, 2005
2:30 – 4:15
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Morris Kleiner (chair), Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Dann Chapman, A. Saari-Csallany, Patricia Frazier, Eric Gupta, Theodor Litman, Steven McLoon, Jane Miller, Kelly Risbey, Geoff Sirc, Oriol Valls, Larry Wallace, Timothy Wiedmann, Lori-Anne Williams, Virginia Zuiker

Absent: Vladimir Cherkassky, Will Durfee, Janet Erickson, John Fossum, Darwin Hendel, Roderick Squires, Aks Zaheer

Guests: Peter Zetterberg

Other: None

[In these minutes: Faculty Funded By Grants, Statement/Policy on Endowed Chairs, Discussion of Status of SCFA-Initiated Policies Approved by Faculty Senate]

1. Faculty Funded By Grants

Professor Kleiner called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. He cited items that were requested from the previous meeting, and said that he and John Fossum had met with Julie Schweitzer regarding the education issues on sexual harassment. He noted that Ms. Schweitzer had been responsive to the comments from the committee, including the suggestion that training involving faculty and staff be brought to the appropriate committee before it takes place. Ms. Schweitzer will meet with Robert Jones to review the training program. Professor Kleiner then introduced new members to the committee, Eric Gupta and Jane Miller.

Professor Kleiner welcomed Mr. Peter Zetterberg to the committee. He was asked to present information regarding faculty funded by grants. Mr. Zetterberg introduced himself by saying that he worked in the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, and that he conducted the University's annual salary analyses. He distributed reference materials to the committee. When faculty salaries are reviewed annually, the ninth payroll is considered a "snapshot" to look at actual salary increases or comparing salaries with peer institutions. For this analysis, he looked at total salary earnings over the entire fiscal year 2005, base salary and additional salary and earnings an individual may have had over the year. The source of the data in his report is the historical earnings file, which is a record of every University employee's salary earnings for an entire fiscal year by fund source. Professor Zetterberg explained that in the report he assigned all faculty members to their tenure "homes". While some faculty might get paid from different colleges, he assigned each faculty to just one place. He then combined their salary earnings by fund source, using fund groups. The first fund group is O&M funds, which consists of

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

state-appropriated dollars and tuition revenue. He pointed out that these two cannot be separated on the expenditure side. The other group is sponsored funds, whether from private companies, foundations, federal or state sources. Professor McLoon asked if that included private grants and Mr. Zetterberg said yes. The third fund group includes everything else. McLoon asked for further clarification, asking if "Other" was fee-for-service. Mr. Zetterberg said that might include federal appropriation or state special funds. Professor Kleiner asked where funds from the University of Minnesota Foundation were placed and Mr. Zetterberg said they appear in "Other." McLoon referred to money that was paid from the clinical practice plans in the medical schools and asked if the University had any control over that. Mr. Zetterberg replied that the Dean of the Medical School did have control as a University employee.

Mr. Zetterberg went on to say that he combined salary amounts by the three different fund sources to see how much came from each, which was summarized in the Excel worksheet he distributed. In the worksheet there are three sets of columns. Columns C and D look at total salary earnings for faculty with tenure and tenured track appointments, regardless of what kinds of appointments held during the fiscal year. Columns H and I highlight total salary earnings for other faculty, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, and faculty to term appointments as well as some kinds of clinical faculty. Mr. Zetterberg highlighted columns F and G, which look at how tenured and tenure-track appointments are funded. He explained that, for instance, in the case of a 9-month faculty member in the Institute of Technology who also has salary earnings in the summer, that summer appointment is not considered a part of the individual's tenured and tenure-track appointment. It is typically considered an "Other" appointment. So columns D and E include all those appointment types, but the F and G only include the "P" and "N" appointments. The F and G columns actually display the University's tenure obligation. He pointed out that 9.3% of the tenure obligation came from sponsored funds in fiscal 2005. Nearly all the sponsored money was on the Twin Cities campus, and Mr. Zetterberg pointed out that for the purposes of this analysis, the Duluth medical school is considered part of the Twin Cities campus. In the college detail, the use of sponsored funds to support tenured and tenure-track appointments is greatest in the Medical School (32%) and the School of Public Health (53%). He pointed out that the Institute of Technology is at 14%, but that it is only 2% of the tenure obligation and noted that the question is whether there is any risk in terms how tenured and tenure track faculty are funded, the answer for which is no. He said that it's important to recognize the difference between how a person may actually be paid during the year and what kind of money actually sits in the college. Because a faculty member is paid with sponsored funds does not mean that funding isn't available if those sponsored funds were to disappear. In such cases, he felt that the college would have the resources necessary to continue paying the individual. In the cases of the CLA, Carlson School of Management and the law school, about 80% of money that pays for faculty salary is tuition revenue, not state appropriated dollars.

Mr. Zetterberg said that there may be concern that individual faculty members are at risk, and he again reiterated there should be no reason for concern. He also noted another question the committee had presented, which was who teaches what at the University of Minnesota. He said that was part of another complicated analysis that his colleague, John Kellogg, was working on in the upcoming months, the results of which he planned to present to the committee in the next year. McLoon wanted to know how the sponsored and other categories have changed over time. Zetterberg replied he felt it hadn't changed that much and there has always been a significant reliance on sponsored funds in places like the Medical School. He suggested it is probably more different in the School of Public Health than it might have been twenty years ago, due to its change in focus and aim to be more of a research institute than in the past. He reiterated that the basic patterns are not significantly different than they might have been ten years ago, and that the University is relying more on tuition revenue than in the past. McLoon expressed his concern

that the Medical School is likely to be affected if NIH funding is cut. Mr. Zetterberg acknowledged that changes in Medicare and the lack of financing of medical education on the part of the government profoundly affect how medical schools and Academic Health Centers are funded. He went on to say that when salary analyses are conducted, they are instructed to leave out medical schools, due to how differently they are funded.

Professor Kleiner thought the same thing would be true with the School of Public Health, since over half of their budget comes from sponsored projects. He said that one of the things that the Faculty Consultative Committee requested of this committee is to examine these issues, and acknowledged that everything is at risk at this point.

Professor Wiedmann clarified that 90% of the dollars go to tenure-track faculty and that 10% go to non-tenured-track. Mr. Zetterberg confirmed this, and Ms. Williams pointed out that that does not include PNA instruction. Professor Valls said that he was struck by the imbalance in different colleges, and pointed out that there are no financial walls between one college and another college, and a college that keeps its books in order, like IT, could be put in jeopardy by another college. He asked what happens if one college has its books in order and another one collapses. Mr. Zetterberg said that possibility existed though it was unlikely. He said he'd like to share another analysis with the committee in the future which highlights different faculty cultures within the University. He described these cultures as an NIH culture, a USDA culture, and an NSF culture, and pointed to the differences in appointments as informing the different cultures. He acknowledged that it wouldn't work to have a common set of business practices for all colleges.

Professor Wiedmann suggested individual units could take greater risks because of the University's diversity and compared it to retirement investing, in terms of greater risk being spread around. Professor Kleiner said that one issue that had come up was the emphasis on graduation rates, since a large part of funds come from tuition. He suggested that it should be noted that there are a great many transfer students to account for and asked how transfer students were measured. Kleiner said that transfer students are often viewed negatively in spite of their large financial and diversity contributions, and that the goal to be one of the top three universities is really focused on those who start and finish at the University. Professor Frazier added that transfer students are not captured in the graduation rate. Mr. Zetterberg said that graduation rates only measure how a first-time fulltime freshman fares at the University but doesn't measure how productive the institution is at graduating students and that must be measured by how many degrees are granted each year. Professor Sirc asked Mr. Zetterberg if tuition was where it should be and he replied that the University of Minnesota was at number four in the Big Ten, and said that the tuition increases have not affected the ability to provide access to low income students, nor have the increases affected overall enrollment or the quality of incoming freshman class.

Professor Kleiner thanked Mr. Zetterberg for his informative and useful presentation.

2. Statement/Policy on Endowed Chairs

Professor Kleiner thanked Professors Wiedmann and Frazier for their work on the revision of the evaluation of faculty with named professorships who received funds, noting that this had been discussed in the previous meeting and the committee requested that a sub-committee look at the issue. Professor Kleiner said that the Tenure Committee was in agreement with the statement, which currently reads:

Faculty and administrators have a responsibility to review that faculty within their unit that hold titles (as defined by Board of Regents policy on Awards, Honors and Recognition, Article 6: Lectureships, Fellowships, Professorships, and Chairs as part of the post-tenure review process. Moreover, they must establish goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity and contributions to service and outreach that take into account the unique expectations associated with the title held by the individual undergoing review. When faculty members who hold titles perform below standards in their positions, the same procedures that are used in post-tenure review should be followed to assist them or remove them from the titled position should they continue to have substandard performance.

Professor Kleiner said that the statement had been through several drafts, and the main point is trying to deal with the fact that individuals who receive funding from foundations receive extra funds and that those extra funds ought to be monitored in some way. Professor Wiedmann said it was drafted from a post-tenure review document, and that he and Professor Frazier saw the statement as an interpretation of that. Professor Kleiner said there was currently no policy on reviews for faculty who hold titles so that this would be a new policy. Professor Wiedmann said that his sense was that if someone has greater resources provided to them, there should be greater expectations. He pointed out that if there's just a title, he wasn't sure it was especially valuable nor would there be a greater expectation. Vice-President Carrier said that sometimes extra funds might be acquired to do research and the like, and Professor Kleiner said that it would then apply. Professor Frazier asked if expectations regarding responsibilities were clear that when someone receives a titled position, and do they need to know that their review process is different. Ms. Williams said that that should be written into the endowment agreement. Professor Kleiner said that the assumption is that these funds come from the foundation, and not from other sources.

Professor Valls pointed out that there are two or three separate issues that should be distinguished. When someone has a named chair, the person gets the title. Second, in most cases, they get money to support their research and travel. Third, they may or may not get a higher salary. Professor Valls felt that these things should be treated differently and specifically, salary supplements. He added that the money for research, etc., should be a separate process and should be much easier than losing one's tenure. Finally, as regards one's title, it was irrelevant: if someone's research money and salary supplement were taken away, let them keep the title nonetheless. Professor Kleiner said that the problem with that is that when a foundation endows a chair, the title comes with the money and the two could not be disentangled.

Professor Chapman suggested some grammatical and spelling clarifications in the statement. He also noted that regarding the second sentence: "Moreover, they must establish goals and expectations...." it was not clear to him who the "they" are that are referenced and suggested clarification. Professor Kleiner suggested repeating "faculty and administrators"; or the "reviewing authority". Professor Frazier noted it was intended to mean faculty and administrators. Professor Wallace asked, regarding how a Chair is brought about, if it wasn't dependent on whether the chair is originating in department within a college or if a chair that has been developed through the college. In other words, the stipulations that go with that particular chair originate within that department, and that the department should be stipulating what the person must do to be selected into that chair. Professor Kleiner said that the election procedures are already established, and this statement was for individuals that have been established in the chair and for monitoring their progress. He went on to say that the stipulations would be part of the policy. The procedure would then go to the Faculty Senate and may need to be a Regents policy as well. It is subject to the conditions that have been established thorough the foundation and the endowment.

Mr. Gupta asked for clarification as to who would actually be doing the reviewing. Professors Kleiner and Wiedmann said it would faculty within the unit. Wiedmann speculated that there may be a disconnect between the appointing unit and the tenure unit in the review. Professor Kleiner said that the procedures and the individuals would be the same as a post-tenure review. Professor Wallace pointed out that these differ within units. Wiedmann said that he supposed some would prefer to have it at a collegiate level and would draw from faculty from collegiate units or choose not to do it at all. Vice-President Carrier said that this goes through the same process as the special panel review, and that the Dean enters into the review process at a certain point. Professor Kleiner confirmed that this would establish a process of review, and given the growth in the number of people who have such titles and the expectation that this type of faculty appointment is going to grow more rapidly than other faculty, that there should be some sort of a policy established before personnel issues come up and there is no policy in place.

Mr. Chapman asked if there are funds associated with a foundation, is the foundation doing some sort of review and are there stipulations that come with the funds. Professor Kleiner said foundations usually do some review but mostly in terms of accounting and if the money is being appropriately spent. Vice-Provost Carney said she gets an annual report from McKnight professors but that the level of review was not as deep as it might be. Professor Sirc referred to Professor Valls' previous comments, and said that tying this to post-tenure reviews presents certain challenges, and asked if negative pay occurs without restricting the titles. He pointed out that the title may even be more important to some people, and asked how that might work. Wiedmann said that he didn't think the two could be separated and Vice-President Carrier agreed. Professor Kleiner clarified that the title comes with the money, but that there was a proposal before FCC that Regents professors be fixed-term appointments and that after a certain period of time, a faculty member who is a Regents professor can keep the title but not the money. Professor Saari-Csallany asked what happens if an endowed chair with money from a company is in the department who has the title but is not actually tenured. Professor Kleiner said that they would go through the normal tenure procedures. Professor Valls said these issues would disappear if the appointments were for a fixed term, and saw no fundamental reason why chairs and titles should be forever. Professor Wiedmann said that he'd argued at the subcommittee that guidelines should actually be developed, in terms of suggesting things that should be considered in creating titled positions. Professor Saari-Csallany asked what happens if the money dries up for endowed chairs: does that person become a regular faculty member. Professor Kleiner said this applied when there are funds above and beyond the normal nine month appointment. Professor Valls asked if it could be considered a friendly amendment to add "hold titles for an indefinite period", pointing out that this would only necessary for people who hold titles for an indefinite period. Professor Wiedmann clarified that it would only apply to people who hold those titles as if it was a tenured appointment. Professor Kleiner said that this allows for some action to be taken if a person is not performing during a period.

Professor Sirc asked what year of an appointment the repercussions would go into effect. Professor Kleiner said that a faculty member would be evaluated on an annual basis according to whatever the post-tenured review process would be in that unit. If someone was performing below average there would be an opportunity to bring their performance up to expectations. Vice-President Carrier said it would be helpful to look at the section on sanctions, since it wasn't designed to address the problem and it may suggest other language about sanctions.

Professor Frazier asked for clarification if this would apply to the McKnight presidential scholars. Vice-Provost Carney said they are all a bit different: that McKnight presidential scholars are fixed term; some are awarded by the President directly; and others for the McKnight Presidential Fellows are selected in the tenure process among those who have just been tenured. Professor Wiedmann said that spoke to his point that if there is going to be a problem it is in this kind of situation because the unit faculty is being called upon to review something that wasn't chosen by the unit. Ms. Williams asked how long the terms were and Vice-Provost Carney said they varied. Professor Kleiner said the language should be changed to clarify that the unit appointing the individual would address the issues. Professor Wiedmann said he felt it should be the tenured unit as they set expectations, and that it is practically not relevant since many of these appointments are given with the intent of greater freedom and long-term, high risk types of research. Professor Kleiner said that that's what the Regents' state as the objective of the foundation funds. Professor Kleiner clarified for Professor Saari-Csallany the point that this might only apply to individuals on indefinite terms. Wiedmann said that people regard post-tenure review as a mechanism to penalize faculty but it is also a means to recognize outstanding contributions. A review in and of itself is not a negative thing; therefore, the idea of having a review only for indefinite terms did not make sense to him.

Mr. Chapman said that he thought it odd that in the instance of someone who's getting a five-year award based on their previous performance, after the review is done, they've got the bonus, and that seems different from something indefinite and on-going. Professor Circ agreed, saying it seemed like splitting hairs. Professor Valls favored a friendly amendment, saying that a 3 or 5 year appointment is not the same thing as tenure, and said that what was proposed was reasonable for the indefinite appointments. Ms. Williams emphasized that when the funds are accepted, there are parameters imposed by the donors. There are special considerations and responsibilities with gift money and said she was more comfortable with making the term six years or under. She felt that someone should not have a title with privileges for a decade without any kind of review. Professor Kleiner asked for a motion to amend the statement and Professor Wiedmann suggested that it go back to the subcommittee to review it more clarify and consider some of the sanctions. The subcommittee agreed to Professor Kleiner's request to continue to review the statement and ensure that the policy is consistent with the post-tenure review and adjust accordingly. He asked that the committee return with a further iteration of the statement at the next meeting.

3. Discussion of Status of SCFA-Initiated Policies Approved by Faculty Senate

Professor Kleiner said the committee had had three initiatives approved by the Faculty Senate and wanted to monitor the status of the policies within the administration. These issues were: faculty who come to the University of Minnesota as an assistant or associate professor and whether the University should contribute to their retirement fund in their first two years; the second issue regards faculty who depart and conducting interviews with them to solicit their input as to why they are leaving the University; third, the issue of tuition remission for faculty and staff. Vice-President Carrier updated the committee on these issues, beginning with the waiting period for contributing to faculty retirement. She said an analysis had been conducted, looking at three or four different alternatives which had been provided to the senior executive team. After that, it will go to President Bruininks and the Senior Vice-Presidents for their decision as to the best approach. She further explicated the issues, including how limited the participation should be, and for which employee groups should this be done, and said that a number of other questions arose.

Vice-President Carrier continued with an update on the tuition-remission issue for dependents, which she said had been with the committee for a long time. There had been several points of decision toward not doing it, and it was back before the committee again last year. An analysis that had been conducted a few years ago was again being reviewed in terms of cost and comparison to other universities. She cited a range of issues which included a likely increase in costs, in accordance with inflation and tuitions increases. Other issues that needed to be addressed are using it in a recruitment situation; and if it used for one employee group would it have to be used for all employee groups? If so, what would be the cost of doing it? Professor Kleiner cited an argument made by John Fossum that it would help in retention of faculty and staff in their most productive years.

Regarding faculty who depart the University, Vice President Carrier said that it had been communicated to the committee that a written form is sent to faculty who are leaving, in which an offer is made to talk to the individual in person about their reasons for leaving. She said that perhaps 5% of respondents want to have a conversation regarding that. One of the things she suggested to the Provosts' office is that there be someone in the Employee Assistance Program who could assume the task of establishing a protocol to provide reporting on this issue, and specific individual had been identified to take this on. Professor Valls cited another issue that had come up last year, which was about medical benefits for retired people. In reviewing previous committee minutes, he noted that the committee was strongly opposed to changes in the benefits, yet it was his understanding that these changes had been implemented. Professor Kleiner offered as a point of information that there was no position taken by the committee and that committee members had been evenly split in the vote. Professor Valls asked why this had been implemented. Vice President Carrier said that the process of deciding on the benefits package falls under the purview of the Benefits Advisory Committee, which consists of representation from all the employee groups. She said that there was extensive discussion about changing to a multiple tier system of benefits, and that the committee recommended it and the administration accepted. The tier system will go into effect in 2006. Professor Valls disputed this, saying the minutes that he read said that everyone was for the tier system if the cost did not go up. Vice-President Carrier asked Mr. Chapman to discuss this, pointing out that the new cost structure is favorable for most everyone. Mr. Chapman confirmed this, saying there was much discussion regarding this at the Benefits Advisory Committee and there was a significant level of support for moving ahead with it. It is cost-neutral to the University in the sense that it is not a transfer of expense from the University to employees; rather, it is a realignment of expenses among employees based on the quantity of coverage that is being purchased. He said that more employers are moving away from a two-tiered rate structure to a multiple tier structure, which provides an incentive to employees to consider the least expensive way to purchase coverage and thus, shift risk to the appropriate groups. The intention was to be more aligned with the marketplace and prevent assuming unnecessary risk from other employers.

Vice Provost Carney asked to bring something to the attention of the committee. The University of Minnesota has been approached by a group called the Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher Education at Harvard University regarding a nationwide study that looks at the satisfaction of new faculty members. The pilot data were conducted with a survey of new untenured faculty. She cited many colleges participating, including Berkeley, Brown, Duke, University of Arizona, University of Illinois and University of Washington, as well as some selective liberal arts colleges. At this point, a fairly large number of public research universities had agreed to participate in the project. The University of Minnesota would provide the names of tenure-track junior faculty to Harvard, which would then send out a letter from the University of Minnesota that would go out to the junior faculty. The survey would take about thirty minutes to fill out, and asks questions regarding climate, family-friendliness, barriers toward

tenure, ability to succeed, etc. The data would be analyzed and provide information from peer institutions against which the University could compare itself. It is a long term, longitudinal study with data collected at three-year intervals. Vice Provost Carney said the data would come back about the time the Faculty Culture Task Force is completing its work and would enhance their work, and she felt that it was a worthwhile project for the University to be involved in to garner useful information for the University. It will cost \$20,000 to participate over a three year period, and cost would be shared by Vice-President Jones' office and the Provosts' Office. Professor Kleiner asked if it the survey was required or voluntary and Vice Provost Carney confirmed that it was optional. She pointed out that in the option chosen by the University of Minnesota, there is no way to track individuals, unless the individual participant chose to identify him or herself, and it would all be aggregate data. Frazier clarified that the University would be getting data back about other institutions, and Vice Provost Carney confirmed this, saying that other institutions would have access to the University's information as well. Professor Kleiner concluded the discussion by saying he felt the view of the committee was that it was a good idea, and as long as it's voluntary. He thanked the committee for its participation in all the issues presented.

Professor Kleiner adjourned the meeting at 4:16.

-- Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota