

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
March 1, 1990**

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), W. Andrew Collins, Norman Kerr, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Burton Shapiro, Michael Steffes, Charlotte Stribel, James VanAlstine

Guests: Laura Cooper (Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women), Ann Hanson (Daily), President Nils Hasselmo, Senior Vice President Leonard Kuhi, Geoffrey Maruyama, Nick LaFontaine

**1. Discussion with Professor Maruyama**

Professor Maruyama explained that he wished to obtain the views of FCC members about the extent of support for the capital request for the recreational sports facility. He said he had hoped that the students would make the case for the building but it is eighth on their list. The recreational sport building was "on the fence," Professor Maruyama reported, and he wanted to know if it had a constituency among the faculty.

A number of points were made in the ensuing discussion.

- The building is not an isolated piece but rather part of a larger package of athletic facilities for men's and women's athletics as well as recreational sports.
- The student list is strongly political, including a building from every campus; there is not sufficient discussion of the merits of any particular item.
- The facility will not make the Twin Cities campus into a residential school, even if seen as part of a community-building effort, although it will contribute to health and well-being.
- Recreational sports are low on the students' list of priorities for student fees, and support for the building has not been strong in MSA.
- The Committee should not attempt to "re-prioritize" the University's capital request or to pull specific items out of that list.
- While it is nice to have attractive athletic facilities, there are plenty of other options in the Twin Cities; the focus should be on academic buildings.
- There have been no new buildings for Morris since 1972, so it is not true to say that each campus gets a building all the time; it was understood that each campus was free to lobby for their buildings.

---

\* 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.

On the last point, Dr. Kuhi said that he thought the capital request was a list of University priorities; each item on it has a key campus or individual responsible for lobbying for it. No one was to oppose other items and there was to be a concerted effort rather than 120 different activities leading to an uncoordinated list of projects.

The Committee appeared to be strongly of the view that it supported the University's list as is and that this was not the time to be making changes in the request.

## **2. Discussion of a Regents' Statement on Equal Opportunity for Women**

Professor Ibele welcomed Professor Laura Cooper to the meeting to discuss the draft statement formulated by the Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women.

Professor Cooper began by noting that the Rajender consent decree expires in 1991; the University must decide what it wants to do thereafter. Possibilities include a statement by the Regents, some procedural changes, and some data collection. There is a subcommittee at work trying to evaluate what provisions of the decree should be retained by the University and where there are areas which can be improved. The conclusion has been, however, that the work of the decree is not over; while much has been done, there remain problems in "climate," hiring, and so on. Some units have made enormous progress; others have not and there is a need for continuing attention.

One question raised about the draft policy is whether or not it should be extended to all protected classes. Professor Cooper said she had spoken with Associate Vice President Cross, who had thought it appropriate to develop a policy addressing the concerns of women; policies addressing the concerns of other groups could be developed later. There is a need to act now, in the case of women, because of the expiration of the decree. Committee members urged, however, that as other policies are developed they be merged with this one.

President Hasselmo noted that there may be budget implications for the continuing work; any need for additional staffing will be incorporated in the budget process. One Committee member entreated the President to look at the overall machinery and eliminate those activities which are not helpful to the University in achieving its goals; Professor Cooper observed that all of the "unnecessary" activities were required by the consent decree. In the case of searches, she said, they should be conducted where they are real and not in those instances when they are not needed and would be a sham.

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to approve the statement.

Professor Ibele thanked Professor Cooper for her presentation.

## **3. Discussion of Administrator Evaluation with the President and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs**

The discussion turned next to the materials on administrator evaluation which had been distributed previously to the members of the Committee. Dr. Kuhi began by recalling a concern that administrator reviews were being done on an ad hoc basis (from department chairs on up); some units have formal procedures and others engage in only perfunctory reviews.

Assessment of administrators should provide "feedback" to them as well as evaluate how they are functioning: they should help improve performance as well as provide background for retention decisions, salaries, and accountability. There is also a need to assure both internal and external constituencies that there is a system of review in place.

A key element of the review would be a questionnaire; an example of one possibility was distributed. It would try to assess both the accomplishment of goals as well as the behavior of the administrator in reaching them. The goals would need to be set clearly, in conversation with and in agreement with the administrator's superior.

The questionnaire was developed in consultation with the deans and presented both to them and the President's Cabinet. There is total agreement with the need for mandated assessment of administrators in relatively uniform fashion, the results of which go into the personnel files; the chief problem is that there is "violent disagreement" about the questionnaire itself. The system, Dr. Kuhl said, is intended to be flexible, with each unit working out its own way of proceeding; the deans dislike the form and would prefer a more collegial approach rather than checking boxes on a questionnaire.

The next step is to try to develop an alternative to the form, but one which will cover the dozen or so points which any evaluation must address. The ultimate aim is to have a clearly-stated policy.

One Committee member contended strenuously that the question of confidentiality must be solved. Would these forms be confidential, with only summaries provided to the administrator? An essential part of a review is that responses will be confidential. Faculty are occasionally advised not to pursue a complaint because even guarantees of confidentiality are often breached--and frequently there is no guarantee at all. It was also suggested that some of the reviewers should be individuals who are, in the hierarchy, under the administrator; often the relationships between an administrator and a superior are much different from those between an administrator and those below him or her. Dr. Kuhl concurred with these views.

On the question of how often the reviews should be conducted, Dr. Kuhl pointed out that administrators are now being hired on an initial three-year appointment with annual appointments thereafter; a review after five years might be appropriate. One Committee member contended that five years is too infrequent; it was also urged that faculty members be included in the review process. Other suggestions were that a review after the second year would be most appropriate, as a decision for reappointment must be made soon thereafter, that the forms should not be used every year, and that there should be a very sweeping review at the fifth year.

Other comments by Committee members included advice not to back off on using the form, because it is the only way individuals can make their views known in an anonymous way, and commendation for the contents of the form and a call for consistency in data collected so a data base could be built up and comparisons made. No questionnaire should contain too many questions, it was said, and this one should be factor-analyzed to minimize the number of questions needed to obtain good information. This process, one said, should help to increase communication among levels at the University as well as help to keep reasonable goals and expectations. It would also be useful to have a place for open-ended comments on any form. Another observed that the goals should be discussed not

only with the administrator's superiors but also those who report to the individual--and they should be written down so all can understand that they are reasonable.

One point emphasized vigorously by a Committee member was that an administrator who fails the review should be replaced.

One Committee member dissented from the notion that the forms could be kept confidential, any more than can letters of evaluation; people have a right to know who evaluated them. Dr. Kuhi expressed concern, however, that if individuals do not speak the necessary information cannot be obtained. Another, however, argued that evaluations could legally be kept confidential, even though the University Attorney's office will say that everything must be made public; there is, it was maintained, no necessary conflict between the issue of confidentiality and the data privacy act--and if there is, then the University should go to the legislature and tell it that the act is preventing the institution from doing what it needs to do.

The President pointed out that this data-gathering, or opinion poll, would not automatically determine the outcome of the review; the information will need to be interpreted and a composite evaluation made. He also commented that others in addition to faculty would be included in the reviews (such as students and civil service staff). In response to a remark that it would helpful for a committee to know who above the administrator should be included, the President replied that the review committee could decide on who it wished to include.

One Committee member commented that he had thrown away a questionnaire about his dean because what he wanted to comment on--the broad elements of the job--was not included. It was also pointed out that goals often have resources attached to them; no administrator should be evaluated on such goals unless the money to attain them is provided.

The President said he would start the evaluation with a pilot project and see how what works and what doesn't; there will be no a priori decision on what will work best. He also asserted that the evaluation must not become a mechanistic scheme and a meaningless exercise, which would only destroy morale; the point is to build morale and help avoid problems.

The President asked the Committee to consider the status of the five-year reviews: Should they be continued if some other review period, such as three years, is adopted? One possible problem might be the review provisions contained in college constitutions; the President said that while he did not wish to interfere, he surmised that a Senate policy would override the college constitutions--he asked the Committee to look into this matter as well. In any event, he said, there must be a rationalized system in place. He added that the Regents have not approved the college constitutions--precisely because it takes too much effort to change them if they are approved by the Board.

\* \* \*

Professor Ibele expressed appreciation to the President for his letter concerning free speech and academic freedom and promised that the Committee would take up exploring a possible expansion of the academic freedom and responsibility statement.

\* \* \*

One member of the Committee brought up, and expressed dismay about, the recent IRS rulings that reimbursement for meals provided during day trips must now be counted as income and the elimination of the six-city rate for those metropolitan areas which are very expensive. The meal reimbursement ruling, it was pointed out, will have a significant impact on coordinate campus representatives who travel to meetings on the Twin Cities campus. Dr. Kuhl pointed out that the University has no mechanism for declaring that reimbursement as income and agreed that the general issue is one which must be raised.

\* \* \*

Professor Striebel took a moment to extend her thanks to the Committee for its support in seeing that the new grievance procedures were put in place. Professor Ibele also noted that Professor Striebel will serve as the "point person" representing the Committee in implementing the procedures.

\* \* \*

Dr. Kuhl was asked not to develop a description for, or appoint, a chief information officer without consideration of how the libraries would fit into the scheme; he assured the Committee that he would not and that he would seek views widely on how the job should be structured.

Relatedly, Dr. Kuhl expressed concern that the search committee for the new chancellor at Morris had been asked to write the job description; why, he inquired, is a search committee writing a job description? The person to whom the individual reports should write the position description, Dr. Kuhl asserted; he agreed that consultation with the Committee or other appropriate groups would thereafter be useful. He noted, in response to urging that the search for the CLA dean be conducted as soon as possible, that the position is one which should include campus-wide considerations not necessarily a part of the CLA constitution.

The Committee adjourned at 2:45.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota