

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Syttende Mai 1990**

- Present: Warren Ibele (chair), John Clark, W. Andrew Collins, Amos Deinard, Paul Holm (newly elected from Crookston for 1990-93), Norman Kerr, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, Burton Shapiro, Michael Steffes, Charlotte Striebel, James VanAlstine
- Guests: Associate Dean Mark Brenner (Graduate School), Vice Provost Anne Hopkins, Senior Vice President Leonard Kuhl, Maureen Smith (Brief), Rabun Taylor (Footnote)

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Ibele opened the meeting with reports and comments on several issues:

- He will meet with Roger Forrester for an update on the work of the task force on health care.
- The work of the mandatory retirement task force needs to be reviewed for disposition of its recommendations.
- The liberal education task force will not have any report prior to next Fall.
- The task force on extending the probationary period will report later this Spring.
- The ad hoc committee on reviewing honors programs is being appointed.
- The ad hoc committee to recommend a University-side (or campus-wide) ombuds service has been appointed and will begin its work shortly.

There are a number of items which will need to be carried forward: Procedures used in PUF chair appointments; review of implementation of recommendations of the Report of the Task Force on Support and Service Units (Professor Ibele is working with Senior Vice President Donhowe on this matter); revised policy on indirect cost recovery funds; faculty governance and control of athletics on the Twin Cities campus; review of the Academic Freedom statement (Professor Ibele proposes to ask a small group to examine the statement for possible expansion); reviews of administrators; and review of the search process.

Professor Steffes reported briefly on the progress of the ad hoc committee on intercollegiate athletics. It was agreed that the Committee would have a lengthier discussion of the draft report of the ad hoc committee at its June meeting.

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

2. 1992-93 Calendar

Professor Ibele next turned to Professor Clark for a presentation on the 1992-93 calendar. Professor Clark distributed two versions of the calendar, one the "traditional" University calendar and the other an "early in, early out" model. He explained that the early in, early out question had usually been lost in the discussions about converting to a semester system; with semesters no longer under consideration, the possibility of an early in, early out calendar could be considered once again. The calendar subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, he reported, recommended the early in, early out calendar.

Last year, he said, SCEP asked its subcommittee to look more seriously at the early in, early out calendar; they recommended the option being presented at the meeting. The number of days of instruction remain the same. Fall Quarter would begin after Labor Day; the week containing Thanksgiving would be break week between Fall and Winter Quarters. There would then be three weeks of Winter Quarter, starting November 30, and then two weeks off, and the final seven weeks of the quarter after the new year began. After a full week for Spring break, Spring Quarter would end in mid-May and there would be a week break, ending with Memorial Day, before the beginning of Summer Session I.

The real issue is the break during Winter Quarter, Professor Clark commented; there are various educational views on the wisdom and impact of such a break and SCEP did not take testimony on that particular point.

Professor Clark was asked why the early in, early out option was seen as desirable, apart from the fact that everyone else has such a calendar. Another, he said, is that those who have families have to be home anyway because their children must be in school after Labor Day (a time when children are in school and they are not, however, is one that some faculty might find desirable--indeed, "an unrelieved joy"). Yet another is that students will be in a better position to obtain summer jobs--they will be better able to compete with students from institutions which finish earlier (a proposition that other Committee members questioned).

One problem for St. Paul could be the parking because the Fairgrounds lot is usually closed for the week after the fair--although perhaps that practice could be changed. Professor Clark expressed the hope that details such as these could be worked out in the two years which will elapse before the early in calendar would be in effect.

It was pointed out that the proposed calendar is the one currently used at the Crookston campus. One problem they have is that students are anxious to leave earlier than the break and not anxious to return until later; otherwise, however, it is a very workable calendar. Some courses, it was agreed, are more problematic than others in terms of the impact of the break in Winter Quarter. Classes which have (outside) projects in either the Fall or Spring would be adversely affected by the change.

Committee members expressed a range of views about the early in option; they agreed that the calendar proposals should in any event be presented for information, rather than action, at the Assembly meeting which followed immediately after this meeting; the faculty need time to think about the impact of the changed calendar before being asked to vote on it.

3. Representation of GAPSAs on the Consultative (Steering) Committee

Professor Ibele distributed enrollment statistics for Fall Quarter and pointed out that the members of the Assembly Steering Committee (the Twin Cities campus representatives) were charged with the responsibility of allocating seats on the Steering (and, thereby, Consultative) Committee between MSA and GAPSAs.

The graduate and professional students represented by GAPSAs constitute approximately 29% of the students on the Twin Cities campus, which would entitle them to 1.5 seats (of the total of five allocated to students from the Twin Cities campus) on the Steering Committee. After brief discussion the faculty agreed that they would propose that GAPSAs receive two seats one year and one seat the next, a pattern which should repeat each biennium, contingent on analyses of enrollment. The Committee also agreed that GAPSAs should have two seats for 1990-91 because they have not previously been represented on the Committee.

4. Discussion with Associate Dean Brenner about the new Research Support Policy

Professor Ibele welcomed Dean Brenner to the meeting to discuss the new research support policy, which addresses the manner in which Indirect Cost Recovery funds are to be used.

Dean Brenner began by noting that the proposed policy has gone through a number of iterations. The money, when it comes in, is labelled Indirect Cost Recovery; when it is made available to the University it is because of authorization by the State to use them in support of research--the funds are not, therefore, actually Indirect Cost Recovery monies. The concern of the proposed policy is with the distribution of these funds.

The draft presented to the Committee has been endorsed by the Senate Research Committee.

The policy does not preclude, although does not explicitly mention, support of a small cadre of technicians out of the general pool of funds--on the grounds that it would be a more efficient use of personnel rather than having specialized people for a small project. It is also expected that units such as the Morris campus would (continue to) have access to research support funds as seed money. Collegiate units would continue to retain some funds, and the amounts would grow as the amount of external research funds each generates increases.

There were no dollar amounts associated with any of the principles set forth in the document. Dean Brenner was asked if the release by the legislature of the final \$6.5 million in ICR funds would be necessary to implement the policy; Dean Brenner said that the \$6.5 million would make a difference in terms of how far the University could go in their implementation. There will be an implementation document once the principles are approved by the University; Dean Brenner related briefly the contents of a letter recently sent to Senior Vice President Donhowe concerning principles governing the use of ICR funds.

Funds for administrative costs in departments are taken off the top and returned to them independent of formula funds. The formula funds, proportional to the previous three years of grant

income by unit, are distributed to the units; this year those funds increased by 5% (although there is no average; in some units the amounts increased and in some they decreased, depending on grant activity by unit).

Committee members seemed to be of a mind to endorse the principles on a contingent basis--contingent on seeing the numbers involved in the implementation document. One specific concern was the delivery of services from Physical Plant; the funding and services to be provided will affect the attitude of those who receive research funds and who have research space to be maintained. Dean Brenner said he will work with Senior Vice President Donhowe on implementation and will communicate the results to the research community; he also said that endorsement of the principles subject to the implementation was acceptable to him.

Professor Ibele thanked Dean Brenner for his presentation.

4. Discussion with Vice Provost Anne Hopkins

Professor Ibele introduced the members of the Committee to Dr. Hopkins and told her that they would be interested to hear whatever she might have to say.

Dr. Hopkins began by saying that the most interesting group session she had while interviewing for the position was the one with FCC; she urged that the Committee continue to participate in the vice presidential interviews, even though they may be tired of it, because it has an effect on the candidates.

After having been here only 12 days, Dr. Hopkins said, she had much to learn; she said she could report, however, that she already found it troublesome that she had no systematic way to consult with faculty. She asked the advice of the Committee, noting that the agendas of FCC are too full for her to regularly rely on it. Professor Clark observed that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy would very much like to consult with her regularly; it was also suggested that she would be welcome to join FCC at its meetings and that she should feel free to bring issues to it.

Dr. Hopkins promised, in the course of discussion, that she would try to visit the coordinate campuses during the upcoming summer.

Dr. Hopkins next explained that she would like to hire two staff members; it is her preference to hire faculty members. One would be a budget officer, of sorts, although it would be a policy-making position; the other would be to work on the Undergraduate Initiative; both would be full-time. It will be important to have someone from the Twin Cities campus, someone who knows how the institution operates. The budget appointment would be a permanent staff position.

FCC members indicated doubt that a faculty member could be found for the first position; Dr. Hopkins reported that she has been told that few if any have the experience required. The second position, which might be a short-term or term-specific job (perhaps 2 years), might be more likely to attract a faculty member. The Committee discussed various ways in which the positions might be structured and the impact appointment would have on a faculty member who accepted it; Dr. Hopkins solicited nominations for the positions from FCC members. She would, she said, like to fill the positions no later than the beginning of the next academic year.

Dr. Hopkins next distributed to the Committee a list of the members of the search committee for the CLA dean. The faculty will be requested to suggest candidates; FCC should also direct names to the chair. The deadline for applications is November 1; a slate is to be recommended by December 15. Dr. Hopkins also asked that if FCC members heard about any problems associated with the search that they let her know immediately.

It was agreed that a list of the continuing issues before FCC and SCC should be prepared for Dr. Hopkins in order that she could be aware of and participate in appropriate discussions. Dr. Hopkins expressed interest in several of the matters which have come before the two committees during the year.

Dr. Hopkins then raised the subject of course access; she reported that she intends to address the issues associated with it. The phenomenon ranges from who majors in engineering to who can take business courses to "can I take freshman composition." Her interest right now, she said, is in timely access to general education courses and service courses and ensuring that the needs of students are met. "Bottleneck" courses have been identified but there is no good student demand data--departments do not know how to determine the number of courses and sections to offer. Dr. Hopkins said she intends to propose opening up sections in classes which meet certain general criteria: Classes which are needed by students in a wide range of curricula, which have regularly closed early, which are at the 1-XXX and 3-XXX level, and which are not courses which serve the interests of a major. On the last, she commented that the departments and colleges should be managing such courses and should be petitioning for additional funds if they have problems.

The courses, Dr. Hopkins said she expected, will be concentrated in CLA, some in IT, and some in Biological Sciences, although any units which meet the criteria would be eligible for consideration for funding for additional courses.

There is a danger, she said, that a unit will receive the money and open up new sections; her office will have to be certain that there is a substitution effect and that documentation is maintained by the departments in order to justify the numbers and levels of courses. Dr. Hopkins was warned that units may respond that they don't have the money to continue to offer the same number of courses because of the 2% reallocation. Committee members discussed the way in which Dr. Hopkins' plan could be implemented.

Dr. Kuhi noted that the 2% reallocation this year was difficult because 80% was mandated to return to the units for salary increases and because of the short notice. He said he would propose that the use of the funds for salaries not be repeated; if the legislature provides 5% for compensation then that is what the University should deliver--otherwise the 2% reallocation tax will not generate sufficient funds to make any significant reallocations possible. Colleges which need money will then receive it, but they will also have to make hard decisions about programs offered.

Faculty get their hopes up, Dr. Kuhi observed, when the salary increase percent is identified (such as 5%) but they tend to forget that the amount is for total compensation; it must cover such items as increases in fringe benefit expenses as well. In the future there will be more flexibility in salary increase funds, he added, because the consent decree funds will have been distributed and more of the increase will be for regular salary increases.

It was suggested to Dr. Kuhl that there had been an agreement with central administration that "exactly that statement would not be made" [about consent decree funds] because of the possibility of backlash. Dr. Kuhl responded that he was describing what had occurred with the distribution of salary increases and that his office had made it very clear that retaliation would not be tolerated.

Committee members agreed, however, with respect to course registrations that departments can do little more than guess at what demand might be; once classes have begun, the only thing they can do is expand the size of the classes. The possibility of generating demand data was discussed, although Dr. Kuhl cautioned that demand data were provided at Berkeley and that they were not useful,

Professor Ibele welcomed Dr. Hopkins to the University, thanked her for her comments, and advised her that the governance committees with which she might most appropriately maintain contact would be the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate Committee on Research, and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning. She might also wish to attend to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

5. Discussion with Senior Vice President Kuhl

Elimination of Mandatory Retirement/Periodic Review System Dr. Kuhl began by commenting on the recent Senate action on elimination of mandatory retirement. Since FCC had recommended dropping of the mandatory retirement age in 1991 in concert with development of a review system, and since the Senate rejected the review, the administration will not accept the recommendation to eliminate mandatory retirement in 1991. He reported that it appears there is agreement, based on discussions he had had with Professors Collins and Ibele, that to show the University is proceeding in a responsible manner there must be a full-fledged review system in place. What will have to be done is work out jointly the development of the review system; he said it would difficult to eliminate mandatory retirement without having a review system in place--because one question that will arise will be how to assess whether a faculty member should continue. The review cannot take place only in the context of deciding about retirement, because that would constitute age discrimination.

One Committee member argued that one legitimate question raised in the Senate discussion has not been answered: What will the periodic review be? There are two models and it is not clear which one will be established. Discussion at this meeting implied that the periodic reviews would be merit reviews, similar to what is done now for (some) people annually--except that rather than uneven and sometimes inadequate annual reviews there would be less frequent but more thorough reviews. Such reviews have to do with faculty development, merit, and assigning raises--and it is unrelated to the question of uncapping retirement, it was maintained.

If the issue is dealing with uncapping and with retirement, then the question is how will the University "remove people who are senile and not doing their job." That is what everyone is concerned about, it was asserted, and there are regulations governing such removals--dismissal for cause, laid out in the tenure code. Dr. Kuhl expressed skepticism, noting that very few people have ever been dismissed for cause.

Dr. Kuhl was asked whether or not the periodic reviews would be mini-reviews for dismissal for

cause, done for everyone, every five years or so--and thus a change in the tenure code? He said it was not. Or was it, he was then asked, like the reviews which have been held before--and if so, how is it related to uncapping? Dr. Kuhi said it would be a review in connection with merit increases, done less frequently so that the time involved would be less of a burden on everyone. The other element of the review, perhaps the more important element, would be faculty development--if someone is not doing well or is contemplating a shift in career goals or for whatever reason, he or she can receive feedback. It is the latter part, he said, which is entirely appropriate at intervals following the grant of tenure and, as one gets closer to a possible retirement.

The number of people in this much-discussed non-performing group, Dr. Kuhi observed, is most likely very small. Maybe there will be a few cases of removal for cause under the tenure code--but the number of people who will stay on after 70 is not going to be very large. Most people are now retiring a number of years before 70.

These items are all part of a package, Dr. Kuhi explained, that will be related to the University's approach to the legislature; there is a need for a strategy to improve salaries. A review system will be part of the package.

Another part of the problem, communicated to him by every dean, is existing commitments--mortgages, bridge loans, other commitments. There are at least a dozen in CLA alone, predicated on positions becoming vacant. The financial implications of lifting the retirement age in 1991 are significant; Dr. Kuhi promised to provide to the Committee more precise data about these commitments as soon as his office has gathered them.

One Committee member pointed out that the reviews will have to be reviews which will bring cases of removal for cause to light--which is perfectly appropriate. There is no reason to believe that only people who are 65 or 70 are likely to be seen as not meeting their obligations; there are likely to be those who are 35 years old in the same situation. In the past those cases have been overlooked for a long period of time until they became so outrageous that they became causes celebre. With periodic reviews there would be a systematic way to look at everybody to determine if they are meeting the general obligations of the position. If not, the review might be a stimulus for initiating removal for cause proceedings--in accord with the processes outlined in the tenure code. Tenure is not a sinecure, the Committee was reminded by one of its members, and was never intended to be; it has been distorted beyond all understanding.

Another Committee member agreed with all the logic of a periodic review system--but continued to argue that it was unrelated to uncapping the retirement age. Even with few cases, dismissal for cause of people who have been around a long time might work--but not with the older people. Removal for cause takes a long time; with review at age 70, and another at age 75, it will take a long time to remove someone. The connection between uncapping and reviews is illogical; people see it as vindictive against older people: The reviews were never contemplated until mandatory retirement was ended. Another Committee member rejoined that it should be seen as a stimulus to do something the University should have been doing all along and that it has been lax about.

The Committee was informed that the intent of the reviews was to improve faculty, not get rid of them--but if at some point someone had to be removed, it was thought that from the standpoint of

defending the policy against charges that it discriminated on the basis of age it would be best if proceedings against a younger faculty member occurred before any against an older faculty member. The idea was to look at all faculty from the moment they obtain tenure; the review, in the eyes of the task force, was to be tied to the merit system.

One Committee member said there were short-term apprehensions about the proposal: Anytime the plan is implemented, it will be applicable to an older group able either to continue or be required to retire. In the longer term, however, the merit system would begin to recognize early--when it was non-threatening--that in guiding and advising a faculty member he or she could make career decisions and perhaps avoid the trauma and embarrassment of dismissal for cause--which does neither the individual nor the institution any good. The merit system would not only reward quality performance, it would allow the faculty member to plan for the longer term, obtain advice from colleagues on what direction they should go or what they might need, and if something developed the review would serve as an early warning system.

Several Committee members agreed completely--and remained wholly unconvinced that it had anything to do with uncapping.

Another Committee member explained that the proposal should be seen as a carrot and a stick--not only would there be a review but there would also be the possibility of receiving a real merit increase (rather than cost-of-living disguised as merit).

It was agreed that FCC would help establish a small group of people to work on the development of the review system. Another suggestion was that the Task Force itself be reconvened to consider the issues and provide comments.

Removal of the "Notch" in the Retirement System Dr. Kuhi reported that a rough estimate of what it will cost to remove the notch is 1 percentage point of the salary increase for one year; the easiest thing to do would be to take the percent out of the 1991-92 salary increases. The result will be a University contribution of 13% of the entire salary to the retirement plan. Dr. Kuhi added that there may be other ways to fund the plan and that he would welcome any suggestions.

Appointment of P.U.F. Chairs Dr. Kuhi next distributed copies of PUF chair search guidelines and a list of all the chair-holders. Different departments, he reported, have chosen to use the lower-funded chairs in different ways, identified in the materials distributed.

There are still a number of "hunting licenses" out for funding of PUF chairs but they all have termination dates on them because the PUF monies are already over-committed.

Professor Ibele told Dr. Kuhi that the concern of FCC had been two-fold: One, that it ought to be possible to demonstrate to the donors the impact of their benevolence--new people brought to the campus, or people retained, or recognition of excellence; and two, that the units had adhered to the spirit as well as the letter of the search procedures. Dr. Kuhi said it would be difficult to ascertain the extent of compliance with the search procedures and that it might be premature to assess the impact of the chairs because there are a number which are not yet filled.

Dr. Kuhl was asked how prominent a person should be in order to be considered for a PUF chair. In one case a unit would like to consider candidates who are "up and coming" stars and who may have had only four or five years of experience--but who would come in as an Associate Professor even though not a well-known name in the field. How much guidance does central administration extend in these cases? Philosophically, Dr. Kuhl said, the object is to get the best people into the chairs; the goal was to use the chairs to hire outstanding individuals. Different units have interpreted the guidelines differently; there is nothing wrong with bringing in an outstanding individual who is "up and coming"--although someone only four years out of graduate school does not sound quite like the person to fill a PUF chair. If a unit is unsuccessful in finding someone who meets the criteria, he said, the chair should not be filled until an appropriate candidate is available. But there is a lot of flexibility in their use.

Of the 69 PUF chairs, taking out McKnight fellowships, 34 of them have been filled by people already at the University. Subtracting those which are used for visiting faculty, only about one-third have been used to bring in outsiders. Dr. Kuhl pointed out that the most well-funded positions have been filled predominantly by outsiders; the others to a lesser extent.

Given that the objective was to hire people, rather than retain them, and if--as was argued--many of the chairs were given to people who were not going to leave anyway, it can be said that the chairs were not used in the way intended. It was nice to recognize first-class faculty at the University but the opportunity to bring in outstanding external candidates has been missed; any internal candidates were too many. Dr. Kuhl agreed that this was an issue which needed to be discussed further and accepted the proposition that fewer internal candidates should be hired.

Tracking down the search procedures used in each case will be difficult, Dr. Kuhl said. The Committee also discussed the issues raised in the case of internal chairs, where the vote would only be on the chair, as opposed to the external chairs, where there would have to be a tenure vote as well as the grant of the chair. The procedures in the two cases might be different; the advice of the faculty, conceivably, might not be sought in the case of an internal chair. The decision would be made at the department head and dean level.¹

Dr. Kuhl invited comments from the Committee on the procedures and disposition of the chairs and thanked the Committee for its time; Professor Ibele thanked him for meeting with the Committee.

6. Resolution on Diversity

Committee members did not have a copy of the revised resolution concerning diversity so Professor Striebel briefly outlined its contents.² She described it as not as strong as what she had hoped for and not very different from directions already provided to nominating committees. She would prefer, she said, to see a proportional representation system and perhaps a better draft could be formulated with additional work. The revised resolution, however, is much weaker than the one the students had brought to the meeting of SCC two weeks earlier.

¹Upon reading the draft of these minutes, the chair of the Committee dissented from this view, holding that the faculty of the unit should have a substantial role to play even in the selection of a chair from among internal candidates.

²A copy is attached to these minutes.

One Committee member noted the language in one clause, that slates be prepared "so as to provide fair and ample numbers of candidates qualified to represent the interests of the following protected groups" (underlining in vocal emphasis of the speaker). Who, it was asked, shall decide who is qualified? The resolution calls for nominating committees to contact University organizations which represent the interests of the protected groups and where possible to obtain names of candidates and to verify that the candidates are qualified to represent the interests of the protected group. Professor Striebel affirmed that those organizations would determine whether or not a candidate was qualified and that they would exercise a veto over candidates; the alternative, she said, was to provide proportional representation. This resolution tries to get away from the idea, for example, that any woman represents the interests of feminist groups and of gender diversity, and the same for minorities. There are groups on campus, she said, that have been organized for a long time and that represent the interests of these groups and which can provide the names of those who will represent those interests.

A second point was that any slate of candidates or nominees, according to the resolution, had to be submitted to the President's Task Force on Excellence Through Diversity for its approval; the Task Force could approve the slates or return them for improvement of diversity balance. The reservation expressed at the meeting about this proviso was whether or not the governance system wished to turn over to an administrative group the choice of who shall sit on its committees; does that not resign away the powers of the governance system to an administrative group?

Professor Striebel said she would welcome suggestions for another group to perform the function; the objective was to get away from the current model for nominating committees, which is the "old boy's" club. Any suggestions about how to break that model so that there is more openness and more diversity would be welcomed.

One Committee member declared that even though he did not have a good answer at the moment he would rather not accept something flawed and would like another effort made. The faculty should not give up what it ordinarily does and have its hands slapped by a task force and be told it had done something wrong. And who, it was also asked, would choose the groups to judge the representativeness of the nominees? From where are they chosen? They are self-selected, Professor Striebel reported, people interested in working on the issues; anyone who wishes to join is welcome.

The list of classes does not match the federal definitions, it was pointed out; it was extracted from the University's EEO policy (with modifications, because it is the younger faculty and the older students who are under-represented in governance). One Committee member inquired about the absence of reference to religion and handicapped; the latter, Professor Striebel said, was an oversight. Religious groups, she said, were lumped with racial minorities; there was no particular reason they were not identified separately. The point was to look for organizations which exist on campus; she acknowledged that there are religious organizations represented on campus and said that if they came forward and sought representation that would be acceptable.

Another Committee member described this as the "squeaky wheel" response, which was described as "atrocious." Either one is committed to the principle, it was argued, or one is just going to "kow tow to noisy people." Such as, it was responded, the noisy graduate students. Other Committee members argued that they were a different case. The model is the same, it was asserted; if there is an existing constituency

organized enough to be identified, and it falls within the protected categories, then it should have reasonable representation.

One Committee member said it had been the sense of the Committee that graduate students were as different from undergraduates as students were from faculty. This proposal, it was said, is not the same model at all--it is totally different. This has been a philosophical argument for centuries, it was said; "I have never for one moment felt that I represented the Health Sciences in any University committee I ever sat on. I always felt that I could represent the faculty as a faculty member, and I would hope that would be true of anybody who gets on this Committee." Better representation is to be sought, but not in the controlled fashion proposed by the draft resolution.

One Committee member pointed out to Professor Striebel that one thing problematic on FCC is that she has "taken a position on the Committee as the defender of a particular narrow view and beater of that drum--and I think that has worked to the detriment of the Committee." Professor Striebel responded that she was present and elected by a constituency and represented that constituency; that contention was directly challenged: "No you were not. You were elected by the faculty at large." Professor Striebel replied that "I know who elected me"; several Committee members denied that she did. Several pointed out to her that they had voted for her. Another commented that she did not know her constituency by noting that a lot of people who she did not regard as her constituents voted for her "because they thought that you would be a thorn in the side of the administration and that would be good for them."

Professor Striebel observed that she found this discussion very interesting and said that perhaps now Committee members could understand why she was concerned about being the only woman on the Committee next year. [With the action of the Senate and Assembly in selecting Professor Shirley Zimmerman as vice chair, there will be another woman on the Committee.] She said she wished the Committee represented the diversity of the University but expressed doubt that it did. The "whereas" clauses of the resolution support diversity; the proposal represented a way to achieve it in faculty governance. There is a need for suggestions on how to accomplish it rather than assertions that everything is fine.

One Committee member pointed out that CLA has an electoral system which ensures that minorities can obtain representation in the Senate; that system, however, would not work in small units which can only elect one or two senators. The resolution, Professor Striebel pointed out, is much weaker than that and speaks only to the nominating process.

There was agreement that the current nominating process needed to be reviewed; Professor Striebel asked the Committee to devise a better method.

Professor Striebel was asked "who credentials the credentialers?"--these organizations provide credentials to certain candidates to run; who says that the organization represents the interests of the entire group? Professor Striebel said that the nominating committee or the Senate should be involved in that decision. It would not be difficult to determine, for instance, that the Commission on Women would be an appropriate credentialing group. There are other groups, such as of minority faculty, which have been around for a long time and which could serve the function. It was suggested that the provisions would have to be made for identifying the groups.

Faculty Consultative Committee
May 17, 1990

12

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota