

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
May 5, 1988**

Present: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, M. Kathleen Price, W. Phillips Shively (chair), James VanAlstine

Guests: Provost Roger Benjamin, Gayle Grika (Footnote), Geoffrey Maruyama, V. Rama Murthy, President Richard Sauer, Maureen Smith (Brief)

Professor Shively closed the meeting for the first two agenda items, nomination of the vice-chair of the Senate and membership on the presidential search advisory committee.

1. Vice-chair of the Senate

The Committee members discussed a number of possible nominees; Professor Shively agreed to contact them.

2. Presidential Search Advisory Committee

Professor Shively reported that, in accord with his instructions from previous discussions, he had obtained the consent of one individual to serve as chair and had also received assent from one other individual. The Committee agreed on the names of the remaining seven faculty members and Professor Shively was asked to contact them about serving.

3. Chair of the Senate Finance Committee

Professor Clark nominated Professor Brenner to serve as the FCC representative to SFC (who automatically serves as chair). The nomination was approved by acclamation.

4. Faculty Personnel Function

Provost Benjamin reported that Betty Robinett had prepared a list of the continuing personnel issues which her office dealt with, which included such matters as disability policy, parental leave, interpretation of the tenure code, consulting, P&A policies, development and monitoring of academic policies and procedures, and providing information to the colleges. The Provost said that he and the Committee needed to discuss the future of the office, particularly in light of the Swan Committee recommendations concerning faculty development (quality of the workplace and environment, among other things). He told the Committee that he supported the recommendation that faculty development play a larger role in the functions of the office. Members of the Committee strongly endorsed an emphasis on the faculty development proposals; they would serve to confirm for the faculty that the

* 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.

issues will not take a back seat to other problems.

Two questions are whether or not an acting appointment should be made and whether or not the search should begin before the selection of a new president. The Provost commented that the workload of the office could not be divided among the staff; Committee members agreed that an acting appointment should be made. The Committee also suggested that time be taken to draft carefully the job description and that it include as the primary responsibilities the faculty development functions; the continuing personnel issues would be secondary. Provost Benjamin concurred with the suggestions. He also said that a mini-search could be conducted, internally, to find an individual to serve as Acting Assistant Vice President.

5. Discussion with President Sauer

Professor Shively welcomed President Sauer and told him the Committee had four issues which it wished to raise with him. The President said he also had matter to bring to the Committee.

Extension of the Rajender Consent Decree President Sauer said he supported the proposal, made by President Keller, that the decree be extended. While progress has been made, time is still needed. One objection to extension is the cost in time and required advertising (e.g., in the New York Times and Chronicle of Higher Education). One possibility might be to make appropriate changes to make the advertising requirements less burdensome. Provost Benjamin said that faculty reaction seems to be overwhelmingly in favor of extension and supportive of proposals from Professor Morrow (presented at an earlier meeting of FCC), including examination of quality rather than quantity problems as they affect women faculty.

One point emphasized in the exchanges was that the Senate, in adopting its resolution on affirmative action, wished to see the establishment and use of negative and positive sanctions associated with the treatment of women in departments. There should be special emphasis on the department head or chair, and the sanctions or rewards should be concrete; moreover, expectations about the atmosphere and treatment of women in a department should be built into the expectations of the chair or head. Provost Benjamin acknowledged that he had not taken action on specific proposals but assured the Committee that he did not intend to let the matter drop but would pursue it vigorously. At the suggestion of one Committee member, who told the Provost that women faculty are concerned that the initiative would be lost, Dr. Benjamin agreed to write a short article for Footnote outlining his plans.

The Provost was also asked to provide a report on what has been accomplished: have the percentages of women changed, what are the continuing costs of the decree, what procedures are in place so that the University can eventually operate independent of the decree. Another element which should be included is how much sex discrimination has cost the University.

It was also agreed that there was a definite need to be sure that self-sustaining procedures would be in place in order that the decree would not need to be extended again. Both the President and Provost assured the Committee that work was in progress on the development of such procedures.

One of the specific sanctions that had been proposed by Professor Morrow was that a woman faculty member would have the option to move to another department if the climate in her home

department was intolerable; her line item would move with her. One faculty member opposed the idea on the grounds that it would reward a department for misbehavior by permitting it to drive a woman out.

Also briefly discussed was the problem of hiring spouses; a college or department is reluctant to hire a male spouse because it received no credit for the hire, which becomes a problem when a department wishes to hire a married woman faculty member who has a spouse who is also a faculty member. The EEO office has taken the view that hiring procedures cannot be bypassed in such instances.

Representation of Duluth and Waseca Faculty in the Governance System President Sauer asked if there would be any support for restoring the representation of the two coordinate campus faculty in the Senate structure. Professor Shively responded that they had been invited last year but had declined; he said the union representatives left a "don't call us, we'll call you" impression. Professor Berscheid recalled that they had done a lot of work on the possibility of changing the rules last year, but had been told bluntly that the unionized faculty had more influence under their present arrangement and that it would be a waste of time to participate in governance. Professor Shively noted that there was still interest in having them participate, if they wished to do so.

Supercomputer Institute President Sauer commented that the principle of the contract with Control Data remained the same; using reserve funds for the entire \$4.7 million or for \$3.6 million (plus the \$1.1 million appropriated by the legislature) was not a good idea. He said he has asked Vice President Dunham and Vice Provost Murthy to contact Control Data about renegotiating the contract. The President also asked Vice Provost Murthy to provide additional information.

Dr. Murthy explained a number of points, in particular responding to criticisms that recently appeared in the press. The Supercomputer Institute (SCI) is now financially stable. It is also unique in its programs and its magnitude. It is not secretive; SCI is a regular department with an open budget. It has a service contract with the Minnesota Supercomputer Center, which does not have a budget which is in the public domain but which is audited annually and which is submitted to a separate board of directors. The structure is not flawed; it was organized as it is in order to avoid putting \$1 million at risk. Those financial reasons may no longer apply in the future, but the structure should not be changed before next year. Finally, Dr. Murthy said the SCI has been a spectacular success in terms of the research which has been conducted (e.g., in superconductivity); there is no other center in the country (including the other NSF-funded centers) which can do what SCI has the capability of doing.

President Sauer emphasized that he is interested in supporting SCI if it can be done without compromising budget principles; Control Data appears to be ready to cooperate fully. There are two directions that could be taken, the President opined: One, have a reliable supercomputing facility which provides service and generates revenue but which would not be on the leading edge of research, or Two, pursue a unique opportunity to have the cutting edge with state-of-the-art machines (which might have a few kinks in them) and which would not generate as much revenue. He would personally prefer the latter, and said the University has the chance to have the best program in the nation.

Other points discussed were these:

- Two machines, in this case, are better than one; there are advantages with each, and they are used for different classes of problems. It is conceivable that at some point in the future

the University might opt to keep only one architecture

- The SCI would not rank above other academic priorities in the next legislative request (such as libraries, rank funding adjustment money) but would be a part of the request.
- That SCI has played a significant role in the ability of the University to attract a number of outstanding faculty in departments across the University.
- That the success and funding for SCI not be seen as solving the much larger problem of desperate computing needs for the faculty nor should those needs have to compete with SCI for funding (the President did not believe they would).

Budget for Footnote Professor Shively pointed out to the President that Footnote was budgeted for one year on an experimental basis; the FCC had concluded that it would like to continue it for another year. The President said he found Footnote helpful and he would like to continue it. The administration has not made enough use of it, he added, and he has encouraged the vice presidents to do so. He asked the Committee to advise him on where the funds should come from.

6. Faculty and Academic Staff Assistance Program (FASAP)

Professor Maruyama, chair of SCFA, joined the Committee to hear its objections to the FASAP which SCFA had forwarded (see FCC minutes, April 28). The issues of concern (confidentiality, intrusiveness, duplication of service) were reviewed in order that Professor Maruyama could be prepared to respond to them at the Senate meeting if they were raised. One matter which caught the attention of the Committee was that the funding for the proposal, which had appeared in the plan for the spending of the reserves, was no longer part of the plan. The Senate Finance Committee would be interested to know when the funds were removed.

The Committee adjourned at 12:05.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota