

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, October 25, 2011
2:30 – 4:30
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: George Sheets (chair), William Beeman, Ben Bornshtein, Kathryn Brown, Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Linda Chlan, Frank Kulacki, Theodor Litman, Christine Marran, Benjamin Munson, Geoffrey Sirc, Pamela Stenhjem, James Wojtaszek

Absent: Randy Croce, Barbara Elliott, Kathryn Hanna, Joseph Konstan, Jason Shaw

Guests: Assistant Vice President Sharon Reich Paulsen, Jon Binks (Provost's Office), Barbara Shiels (Office of the General Counsel),

[In these minutes: (1) Human Resources strategic planning; (2) ad hoc committee on faculty productivity; (3) changes to the administrative policy on outside consulting; (4) faculty sabbatical/leave policies]

1. Human Resources Strategic Planning

Professor Sheets convened the meeting at 2:30 and turned to Vice President Brown to lead a discussion about Human Resources Strategic Planning.

Vice President Brown distributed copies of a one-page handout with the mission, vision, and values of the Office of Human Resources and said she wished to provide a status report on where they are in strategic planning for Human Resources. What they are doing is looking at what Human Resources should be at the University and what services it should be providing. It will be an iterative process, one on which she wants feedback, and she would like to have it completed by the end of the calendar year. She said she would return to the Committee in December with another report.

They must look at fundamental issues if they are to think of new directions and the engagement of employees, Ms. Brown related. She reviewed the mission: "The Office of Human Resources strategically leads and partners with our community to provide the workforce and organizational capabilities that will drive excellence in the University." The key words are strategically, lead, and partners, Ms. Brown said. Vice President Carrier [her predecessor] did an outstanding job of moving scattered offices into a coherent unit to support faculty and staff, a unit that gets the payroll out, delivers benefits, and so on. Much of the focus in the past was on the functional activities of Human Resources, such as getting people into the system, making salary adjustments, etc., and those functions are now extremely well done.

They are now at the next phase in Human Resources, Vice President Brown said: They must strategically lead and partner with colleges and administrative units on the questions of what work they need to do and how best to get it done. In the past, the University had the resources to perhaps allow a little overlap in employee responsibilities, but with four or five years of cuts, units have reduced their

* 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.

workforce through attrition, early retirement, and in some cases layoffs. They now perhaps have fewer employees but the same amount of work to be done, so work must be redistributed across units. They need to evaluate what work is to be done and what employees should be paid to do it.

The institution must be sure that it is bringing the right talent and skills to its jobs, Ms. Brown maintained. It should post the job that is needed and then actively search for the person with the right skill set, and get the best person it can, while continuing to support current employees.

Ms. Brown next reviewed the values of Human Resources: integrity, service, innovation, collaboration. Integrity: They want to be trustworthy and forthright. Service: "How can we help you?" should be their motto, for Regents, the administration, and employees. Innovation: They want to be at the cutting edge of best and new employment practices so the University has the most productive employees. Collaboration: They want to work with colleges and units.

Vice President Brown turned to the vision: "Create the workplace of the future where people are engaged, connected, thriving, and achieving." There is a book, *Workforce 2020*, about the changing demographics of the workforce, which includes baby boomers, millennials, etc., five generations of employees that must work together. What will the workplace look like? It will have more technology, which is changing every year. It will have a more flexible work environment. It will have better use of space to get work done and house employees.

This is, Ms. Brown concluded, a high-level overview.

There are a handful of priorities for Human Resources that must receive attention regardless of strategic planning, Ms. Brown said, and they will be incorporated in the strategic planning process and she has spoken with the senior officers and the deans about them.

-- How can hiring be done quickly and efficiently? And at the same time retain a qualified and diverse workforce?

-- Rather than employing search firms one at a time, they would like to work with units to identify a search firm that Human Resources has made arrangements with—or provide units with internal search capability.

-- The Human Resources enterprise system was put in in 1998 and is past its prime. There are many opportunities to improve the system and they are working with the people responsible for the student and financial systems on upgrades. PeopleSoft will, after 2012, no longer support the University's human-resources system, so a new system will be needed. All personnel data are in the system, used to track and pay benefits, so it is critical for everyone that the system works well.

Vice President Brown said she is open to comments on the mission, values, and vision, on what Committee members would like to see from Human Resources in the future, and on what people believe the workforce of the future will look like.

Professor Beeman noted that he is chair of the Anthropology Department, which last week entertained a meeting of the CLA Council of Chairs. He learned that there is deep distress among administrators. They know that administrative costs at the University are increasing but department

administrations are shrinking and administrative positions are being cut. CLA is also losing administrators to other colleges at the University because the other colleges are paying higher salaries and CLA is not allowed to meet them. So colleges are poaching from each other, which is poor administration if the best administrators go to other colleges at a 50% salary increase.

Vice President Brown said that it is a college decision not to match salaries. But she has a voice in the matter, Professor Beeman suggested to Ms. Brown. What administrators are in question, Ms. Brown asked? Department administrators and clerical staff, Professor Beeman said. Those are support staff, Ms. Brown said. Professor Beeman demurred and said they are administrators. Vice President Brown responded that the University is criticized for having too many administrators, and she now hears Professor Beeman describe as administrators people who provide operational support. She would not call those individuals administrators, she said, and the University has a problem in how it describes its workforce. Faculty deliver the tripartite mission, some do only teaching and some do only research, some are support staff—when one talks about the University's employees, it is important to talk about how the institution spends its money.

Professor Beeman said he was talking about a specific class of employees, people who are charged to do things he cannot do. Departments cannot run without them. Vice President Brown did not disagree but said she would classify them as operational support staff. Colleges and unit must decide where they will spend their money.

Professor Beeman observed that there is an employee classification titled "administrator," people who departments must have in order to be able to operate. CLA has experimented with "hubbing," using staff members to provide support to more than one department, which withdraws them from the department. The result was an embarrassment. He said he was telling Ms. Brown, as Vice President for Human Resources, that there is a serious problem at lower levels while University administrative costs are rising.

Vice President Brown said it was too broad a statement to say that the University's administrative costs are rising. The question is how many operational staff are needed; that is a valid question. She said she was hearing that the number may be inadequate in CLA. Inadequate and shrinking, Professor Beeman said.

With regard to whether someone is an administrator, Professor Sheets said, there is a job title of "office administrator," at least in CLA, and someone who holds it supervises clerical staff and works closely with unit heads or chairs on budget and numerous other administrative activities. Professor Beeman has raised a number of questions, one of which is the problem of losing competent people to other colleges. Vice President Brown said this is a college rule, Professor Sheets recalled, but Professor Beeman is asking if the central administration can do something to minimize its impact.

Vice President Brown said that she understood that was the question, but Professor Beeman also raised a number of additional questions that should not go unanswered. First is the number of support staff. Second is about having support services for departments put together. The University wants to have high-quality people who do the work, which it can do by right-sizing the number and putting people in the right job classification and paying them appropriately. She said she understood the question, and in any particular case it could be the job classification, the years of experience, and whether the person is at the right level.

Professor Sheets noted that Vice President Brown had said that central Human Resources might be able to provide a search firm and other services to units when they are hiring. If that is a way to help, would she anticipate that there would be overall savings that would benefit the colleges? She would assume so, Ms. Brown said. If they can save money for a college, the money would be for the college to use. Would she see the costs of central Human Resources increasing as a result, Professor Sheets inquired? She would not, Ms. Brown said.

Professor Kulacki asked about the percentage of faculty searches that use search firms. In his department they do not use any firms; the entire search is conducted by the department. He said he did not see savings resulting. Vice President Brown agreed that savings would be unlikely with faculty searches; she was talking about other positions in a college that search firms are used for.

Professor Munson thanked Vice President Brown for dealing with difficult questions. He commented that when he thinks about human resources in the private sector, it is as much about the development of individual capacity as it is about delivering benefits. For faculty members, that development occurs in the unit/department. As she rethinks the mission of Human Resources, how might it build the ability to help him as an individual? He might be at the University for another 25 years, and it might be depressing to think about doing the same thing for that entire period.

Vice President Brown said that there are already many development opportunities at all levels for faculty and staff. She noted the Center for Teaching and Learning, which is part of Human Resources, as one example. She also works with Vice Provost Carney on a number of faculty-development activities, including leadership. There are also sessions to develop supervisory capabilities as well as personal development. Human Resources is committed to providing such help, and she agreed that developing internal capabilities and providing career paths is important. The job classification system for non-faculty should be designed to have entry-level positions with opportunities to grow.

Professor Beeman said he would like to know what the role of Human Resources is in the hubbing experiments. In CLA it is not working at all and administrators come to them repeatedly to say that something must be done. Hubbing divorces staff from the everyday life of a department and involvement in the life of faculty, staff, and students. It has caused enormous distress and left people feeling disjointed and unable to handle the commitments that are required.

Professor Sheets said that hubbing is not a universal failure; in some cases it has worked. In the case that Professor Sheets refers to, Professor Beeman said, it works because the person puts in superhuman efforts. Do they prefer it? It has been a team effort between the units, Professor Sheets responded, and it is not a question of whether they prefer it—if it works and achieves savings, it should be used, and if it is not working, the problems should be addressed.

Vice President Brown said that the role of Human Resources is to support colleges and units in engaging in the practices they wish. They have the expertise to provide help in decision-making about human-resources services. Some colleges are using shared services, some are not; their role is to support unit decisions.

The physical layout is important, Professor Sheets commented. In the case he is aware of, the offices are adjacent so it works well. That is not a trivial matter, he said, and not something Human

Resources can deal with. They can consult on the issues, Ms. Brown said. That is why he asked about the Human Resources role, Professor Beeman said, to learn if it can come up with ideas. Human Resources can help units explore options, and then support units in the decisions that they make, Ms. Brown said. They do not decide how units will spend their money.

Professor Beeman said he was told by a dean that hubbing, or shared services, was a central mandate. Vice President Brown said she would be glad to speak to Dean Parente but indicated that hubbing is not a central mandate. She is glad to answer questions and will look into the situation Professor Beeman has described. She has not been involved in decisions made by CLA.

Professor Marran said she would like to hear more, at a later time, about poaching. That practice leads to a question: Budgets are determined at the college level, but if there is poaching, that presumes there are more funds in some colleges than others for support staff. Not necessarily, Vice President Brown said. The budget process is not in her set of responsibilities (that rests with Vice President Pfutzenreuter), but decisions about resources are made at the college level. That is why it is important to look at whether resources are being spent on mission, on mission support, or on operational support. Some colleges may put money into the best operational and support system while others may focus on mission or mission support. That is why it is important, in human-resources terms, to think about what role the faculty and staff are playing. Is that where the college wishes to put its money? A unit might like to keep a person because of long service or loyalty or good work, but at the end of the day, there is a pool of funds in each college, and the college must decide how to spend it.

Professor Sheets pointed out that at the unit level, they are circumscribed by college policies. A department cannot decide to spend more on faculty than on staff. It would be a college decision to add a faculty line or adjust funding for support staff. As a rule, 40 years ago, the ratio of faculty to support staff was 5:1, Professor Kulacki said. Technology has changed and has obviated the need for that kind of ratio, Professor Munson commented. To a point, Professor Kulacki said; in his experience, the migration of activities to lower levels of the organization is relentless; if his college is to increase the number of students, it will need more support services to run the undergraduate program. He said he did not know the right ratio. It is also difficult to pair departments because of different cultures. There are two departments in his college with similar staffs but they will not share. There is also a faculty workload issue that involves teaching and advising graduate students. He wished Vice President Brown good luck in her efforts.

Vice President Brown said she was not saying that sharing services should be the answer, she is just trying to frame the issue differently so that the institution can respond to the claim that it has too many administrators. Employees do different work, and she agreed that if a college adds more students, it may need more employees. The role of Human Resources is to talk with departments and colleges about the human-resources implications of decisions that may be made. There will be many issues and questions arising in the next few years; her job is to frame the issues and help units sort out the best employment choices. She said she would be glad to talk more with the Committee about the issues as well as have conversations outside the meetings with Committee members.

Professor Sheets thanked Vice President Brown for her report.

2. ad hoc Committee on Faculty Productivity

Professor Sheets reminded the Committee that he had been authorized to appoint an ad hoc committee to work with Ms. Harvey in the President's Office on how to get out messages about faculty productivity. The ad hoc committee consists of Ms. Harvey, Vice Provost Carney, and Professors Konstan and Munson (both from this Committee), Jacobs (from the Faculty Consultative Committee), and Schiappa (from Communications Studies).

3. Changes to the Administrative Policy on Outside Consulting

Professor Sheets now welcomed Mr. Binks, Ms. Paulsen, and Ms. Shiels to the meeting to discuss proposed changes to the Outside Consulting and Other Professional Commitments administrative policy. Committee members were provided a handout comparing the present and proposed policies as well as a clean copy of the policy with the proposed changes.

Associate Vice President Paulsen explained that the policy came up through the regular review process and that those responsible for reviewing it believed the review provided an opportunity to clarify the policy and to be sure it is consistent with the new conflict-of-interest policy. They did not intend to make any substantive changes. She turned to Ms. Shiels to review the changes.

Ms. Shiels said there are three types of changes proposed in order to make the policy easier to understand. One, headings were added; two, some things that were implicit in the policy were made explicit, and three, elements of the policy were moved around and language from the Board of Regents policy was added so that one can go to one place to learn what is needed. They also discovered that the procedures attached to the policy contained policy language, so they moved it from the procedures into the policy. She said she did not believe that any of the changes required a change to the Regents' policy.

Eligibility for professional commitments was not changed, nor was the number of permissible days for such commitments. Professor Sheets inquired about coverage of faculty members on 9-month appointments who are paid over 12 months—are they covered all year? Ms. Shiels said they are not because they are not on appointment during the summer. That should be clarified in the policy, Professor Sheets suggested.

It was implicit before, and is now explicit, that the policy also covers civil-service and bargaining-unit employees, Ms. Shiels said. Those employees may only participate in outside professional commitments during non-work hours and, as with all employees, the activities may "not interfere with the performance of regular employment duties, or compete with coursework offered by the University or services offered by the employee's unit." There are no time restrictions on these commitments for civil-service and bargaining-unit employees (because they are not on work time).

In response to a query from Professor Sheets regarding the time threshold that triggers the requirement to get advance approval of an outside commitment, Ms. Paulsen agreed that they needed to review the language concerning "equal to or greater," because prior approval is presumably not required when the outside commitments are equal to (but do not exceed) the limit established in the policy—there was no intent to change the threshold.

"Reporting Exclusions" was the section of the policy that was most revised, Ms. Shiels reported, and only because they were trying to make it clear. The principle is that there are certain outside activities that are so close to what faculty members are expected to do that they do not count as days of

outside professional commitments unless the faculty member is compensated for them by a business entity beyond expenses. The activities excluded from required reporting in the revised policy are these:

- Preparing scholarly publications or creating works of art;
- Peer review of articles and grant proposals;
- Attendance and presentations at professional meetings (and other similar gatherings);
- Serving on advisory committees or evaluation panels for governmental agencies, non-profit higher education institutions or non-profit entities organized solely for educational, religious, philanthropic, or research purposes (with the exception of non-profit entities created by for-profit corporations);
- Giving occasional lectures and speeches, participation in colloquia, symposia, site visits, study sections, and similar gatherings sponsored by governmental agencies, non-profit higher education institutions or non-profit entities organized solely for educational, religious, philanthropic, or research purposes (with the exception of non-profit entities created by for-profit corporations);
- and
- *Ad hoc* refereeing of manuscripts.

The following activities are considered University responsibilities and therefore also are excluded from the scope of this policy:

- Working on projects supported by grant or contract funds awarded to the University and accepted by the Board of Regents; and
- Teaching extension courses offered by the University.

Professor Beeman said that he is occasionally asked by the Department of Defense or State Department to participate in seminars that pay honoraria. Are those covered by the policy? They are excluded because those are government agencies, Ms. Shiels said. They would be covered if a private-sector business entity wanted to pay him for such seminars.

With more and more for-profit universities coming into existence, Professor Beeman said, are things that are seen as benign not excluded? What if he goes to a for-profit university to lecture? That is worth thinking about for the future. If one can take a lecture and make money from it at a for-profit university, some will try, he said. That is a good point, Ms. Shiels said; they were thinking about something like another Big Ten university, for example, not a for-profit institution. Perhaps the language should exclude only non-profit higher education. Professor Beeman said he thought such an exclusion would be appropriate but wondered if it would violate academic freedom. Ms. Shiels pointed out that the policy at present does not permit anyone to teach at a for-profit entity what he or she teaches at the University.

Professor Beeman observed that there are certain organizations in the private domain that are research organizations, such as Bell Labs, where academic scientists are employed to give a talk. Such a talk would need to be reported even if it were an academic presentation? It would, Ms. Shiels said, but she noted that just because it must be reported does not mean one cannot do it.

Ms. Shiels said there are three categories of activities:

-- Activities that one need not tell the University about, a provision intended to cover occasional activities tied to what one might do for the government or a non-profit organization, with the caveat that the activity may not interfere with one's University job and may not compete with University courses.

-- Activities that must be reported to the University annually on the REPA, but that do not need prior approval because the cumulative time spent on the activities does not exceed the prior-approval time threshold established in the policy.

-- Activities that exceed the prior approval time limit threshold and therefore need prior approval in addition to annual reporting.

Professor Beeman said that the for-profit/non-profit distinction is not important except where someone could make decisions that are inimical to the University and benign to a business entity. It is more important for conflict-of-interest purposes, Ms. Shiels responded. If someone can give many speeches to, for example, Medtronic, and not be required to report them, there is no way the University could manage potential conflicts of interest. Professor Beeman said he could see how these provisions are important for faculty members in business, medicine, law, and engineering, but that they seem less important to faculty members in other fields.

Professor Kulacki said the policy requires a lot and will be a burden. Ms. Shiels demurred and pointed out that none of the proposed changes to this long-standing policy are substantive and that faculty members can use up to 48 days for outside commitments, depending on their appointment type. Professor Kulacki commented that if a faculty member were an invited speaker at a company, with an honorarium, 1-2 days every other week, that would be taking advantage of the policy. The department head should step in. Is it a question of time or money? With respect to this policy, it is a function of time, Ms. Shiels said. With respect to conflict of interest, it is a function of money. The REPA has two purposes: Primarily it is intended to get at conflict of interest, but it also gets at time commitments.

Vice Provost Carney said she would risk muddying the waters further: There are situations where a faculty member with tenure is given a leave of absence without pay, and the University learns later that the person accepted a tenured position at another institution—so the person holds two tenured positions. This policy does not address that situation. Ms. Paulsen said there is a Human Resources policy that prohibits holding a tenured appointment at two institutions. Dr. Carney said she had not located such a policy. The outside commitments policy provides that one cannot teach courses that compete with the University. This particular policy does not say that one cannot hold two appointments—but that is not germane to the consulting policy. Ms. Shiels agreed that this policy was not the right place for such a provision, other than the prohibition on teaching courses that compete with those offered at the University.

Professor Sheets said he wanted it noted clearly that the matter of someone holding two tenured appointments is not a problem now—and when the situation was discovered in the past, the person was fired.

Professor Sheets noted that the proposed changes in the policy remove personal, family, and community activity exclusions; he has a question from a faculty member about them. Ms. Shiels agreed that the problem could be solved by adding a clear definition of professional commitments; family,

church, and similar commitments were excluded in the existing policy and they still intend that such activities be excluded from the policy and not require reporting. They are not included in the policy because it is a policy about PROFESSIONAL commitments. If there is a well-written definition, it will be clear that no one has to report Girl Scout activities, for example.

Professor Sheets next raised a question about the sanctions provisions of the policy; he said the language is more minatory in tone. Presumably the policy is not intended to penalize unintentional or inadvertent violations, so he suggested alteration in the language about violations. Professor Sheets, Ms. Paulsen, and Ms. Shiels discussed proposed language. Ms. Shiels observed that the language in the policy has been there for a long time and that she has never seen any faculty member be sanctioned because of an unintended or inadvertent violation. She said she would prefer not to have to spend time, in any hearing, debating intent, which is a criminal-law concept. Professor Sheets maintained that as the policy was written, even minor or trivial and unintended violations could provoke a sanction, such as a letter in a file—that someone could find 20 years later and point to as a problem.

Professor Sheets proposed, and Ms. Shiels accepted, a new clause at the end of the language governing violations.

Ms. Shiels reported that the language on the Reason for Policy is new, does not change anything in the policy, but explains why consulting is a positive and how it benefits the University. Several Committee members endorsed the new language.

Professor Sheets thanked Ms. Paulsen and Ms. Shiels for bringing the policy proposal to the Committee.

4. Faculty Sabbatical/Leave Policies

Professor Sheets turned to Professor Beeman to start a discussion about sabbatical and leave policies. Vice Provost Carney provided copies of the pertinent policies.

Professor Beeman said he asked to bring the issue to the Committee because of a number of discussions in CLA about the current policy compared to the policies at other institutions. The University sabbatical policy is a concern to CLA chairs because the most important thing they can do to promote faculty development and research efforts is to provide people with time, especially in the humanities—time to work on extended research projects. They continue to hear from colleagues that they are, for one reason or another, ineligible to receive significant financial support from outside the University, and while they need the time for their work provided by a sabbatical, they cannot take one because they cannot afford to do so.

Dr. Carney observed that there are three policies. Professor Beeman said that after __ years of service, a faculty member is entitled to two semesters of sabbatical at half pay plus a sabbatical supplement that is awarded on a merit basis. Even with the supplement, many faculty members cannot afford a sabbatical. Professor Munson said the semester leaves are not applied uniformly, and he has been told one must apply for them.

Dr. Carney said the Board of Regents' policy defines faculty development leaves. There are two kinds of faculty development leaves, a provision different from most universities: a single semester leave

(at full salary and benefits) and a sabbatical leave (two semesters at half salary and full benefits). When talking about leaves, one must consider the Regents' policy, the administrative policy, and the procedures. The administrative policy provides that up to 4% of the faculty of the University may be on a single-semester leave at any one time. Her office sends information to each college every year the calculation of the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the college and the number (4%) who may be given a single-semester leave. The administrative policy explicitly provides that single-semester leaves are competitive.

What is different at the University of Minnesota is that probationary faculty members are eligible for a single-semester leave after two full years of service, Dr. Carney related. Most institutions do not allow probationary faculty members to take a leave. The probationary faculty members must compete against senior faculty members to obtain a single-semester leave, but it is up to the college to decide how to allocate them, and the college may reserve slots for probationary faculty members.

There are times when a college finds that it has more faculty members who have excellent proposals for semester leaves than it has slots for, and Dr. Carney's office may grant additional single-semester leaves if other colleges do not use their full allocation. Dr. Carney said she will authorize an additional one or two more for a college, but the total will never exceed the 4% required by Regents' policy. That is the semester leave program, she concluded.

Professor Sheets observed that the single-semester leave is at full pay and something for which a faculty member is eligible every four years. After four years of service at the University, Dr. Carney agreed. People ask a lot of questions about the policy and it is important to describe it to the outside world as somewhat generous but also competitive, with a cap, and attractive when the University is recruiting new faculty members. She noted that if someone is hired with tenure from outside the University, that person must wait four years before he or she will be eligible for a single-semester leave.

Dr. Carney turned next to the sabbatical leave policy, which provides for half salary and full benefits for up to one year. A faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical after every six years of service and contract faculty are eligible (for both the sabbatical and single-semester leave) if there are sufficient funds. The first use of funds is for tenured and tenure-track faculty; but a college can decide how to allocate its leaves. Sabbaticals are not competitive in the same way that semester leaves are; people are eligible for them, but they must file an application and must show that they will use the time for academic work.

The sabbatical supplement funds amounted to about \$700,000 during the current academic year, Dr. Carney reported, so it is a large investment on the part of central administration. Each college applies for the funds; an individual can receive up to 30% of his or her base salary or \$30,000, whichever is less. Some colleges invest a lot of college money in sabbaticals as well. The policy is that colleges receive an allocation for salary supplements; a college might receive \$20,000 from central funds for supplements and the college might add another \$10,000. CLA goes the other way and makes a large investment so that many faculty members receive a sabbatical supplement larger than if they received only the funds provided by central administration. Faculty members are also allowed to receive supplementary income from other funds (such as grants or salary from another institution) so as to bring their total compensation during the sabbatical leave up to the amount of their regular salary.

The sabbatical supplements, unlike the sabbaticals themselves, are competitive, Professor Sheets pointed out. That is correct, Dr. Carney affirmed.

Professor Beeman said the point for discussion is that if the University allows a sabbatical year at half pay, that is the same amount of money as a semester leave at full pay. Faculty members do not understand why they cannot have a sabbatical semester at full pay (rather than a semester leave, which is competitive). At other institutions they are the norm: A year at half pay or a semester at full pay. He added that the sabbatical supplement is a great policy. Dr. Carney said that at many institutions there are sharp limits on the number of faculty members who may receive sabbaticals. They are self-limiting because people cannot afford to take them, Professor Beeman responded.

Professor Marran asked what Professor Beeman's proposed option is. Professor Beeman said it is a sabbatical leave, either for one semester at full pay or a year at half pay. There would need to be limits on that option, Dr. Carney said. It is worth discussing, Professor Beeman maintained. It may be too costly, Dr. Carney surmised. There would need to be great care taken in crafting a policy as Professor Beeman suggests.

Professor Sheets said that this item would be on a future agenda and adjourned the meeting at 4:35.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota