

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 18, 1993
12:00 - 2:30
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Mario Bognanno (chair), Amos Deinard, Lester Drewes, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Benjamin Liu, Karen Seashore Louis, James Tracy, Shirley Zimmerman

Regrets: John Adams, Toni McNaron, Irwin Rubenstein, James VanAlstine

Absent: none

Guest: Senior Vice President E. F. Infante

[In these minutes: appointees to committees; SCEP report on recommendation for program in gay & lesbian studies; representation of coordinate campuses on Senate committees; report on NCAA review team visit; discussion with Senior Vice President Infante (budget; medical school review; faculty salaries; elimination of mandatory retirement)]

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Bognanno convened the meeting at 12:25 and welcomed Professor Lester Drewes from the Duluth Medical School to the Committee; Professor Drewes has been elected to serve as the ex officio representative from the Duluth Medical School to FCC.

2. Nominating Committee. Committee on Committees

Professor Bognanno next asked the Committee to consider the proposed list of members for the nominating committee for the Committee on Committees (such a nominating committee exists because the Committee on Committees does not appoint its own membership). He emphasized the importance of the Committee on Committees to the effective functioning of the Senate and the governance system. The Committee approved for the docket of the Faculty Senate without objection the nominating committee that was proposed.

3. Nominees, Academic Integrity Committee

Professor Bognanno next suggested several names to fill two vacancies on the Academic Integrity Committee; the names were agreed upon and Professor Bognanno will contact the individuals to find out about their willingness to serve.

* 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.

4. Report from SCEP on the Select Committee on Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals

Professor Bognanno reported that he had received a letter from Professor Tracy, chair of SCEP, containing the response of SCEP to the recommendation of the Select Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Concerns that a program of study in gay/lesbian studies be initiated. One of the absent Committee members has asked that discussion of the issue be postponed until the next meeting; it was agreed that Professor Tracy would make his report but that the Committee would revisit the issue.

SCEP's response, Professor Tracy reported, is that questions with regard to academic programs are not the business of the Senate. Curricular matters are in the hands of the faculty, and college curriculum committees are the appropriate forum for such recommendations. This response, he said in response to a question, was based more on principle than historical precedent; the proper vehicle for faculty governance of the curriculum is through curriculum committees, not the Senate. If a program is to be established, it will require funding, and the Senate is not the right body to make decisions about resources in this fashion. SCEP also believes it is also not the business of the administration to make curriculum decisions, he added.

Committee members expressed general agreement with the position SCEP took and the principle enunciated thereby. Committee members also supported the view that the administration should also not make curriculum decisions; although the Select Committee was presidentially-appointed, and some of its recommendations can be implemented centrally, this one should not be. The comparison must be of the academic priorities in a college or unit and how, with diminished funds, the unit can focus its activities; it is not a question of whether or not a program is deserving or not deserving, but rather how it fits within the academic priorities of a unit.

The Committee briefly discussed additional points related to the proposal, and then agreed it would return to the topic at the next meeting.

5. Vice Chair of the Senate

Professor Bognanno asked Committee members to think about a nominee for the position of vice chair of the Senate; the nominee must come from among those who are members of the Senate this year.

6. Representation of Coordinate Campuses on Senate Committees

Professor Bognanno then drew the attention of Committee members to a handout containing two email messages about representation of coordinate campuses on Senate committees. There is, it was pointed out, continued representation of both Morris and Crookston on the Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs committee, but not on Finance and Planning. There is, however, no provision in the committee bylaws which specifies coordinate campus membership on these committees; the continued representation on Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs is, apparently, a matter of practice rather than policy.

Committee members agreed that the perspectives of coordinate campus faculty is important, but no one appeared to be in favor of a bylaw amendment REQUIRING such representation. Two possible

problems are the expense of transportation to meetings and the possibility that among the small faculties of Morris and Crookston, the number of faculty available and willing to serve could be exhausted if every Senate committee were to have continuing representation from both campuses. Possibilities for enhanced involvement, even without continued representation, included use of interactive video and assignment of responsibility for tracking committee business to faculty members on the coordinate campuses.

It was agreed, after some discussion, that continued representation of both campuses was desirable for Finance and Planning, Educational Policy, and Faculty Affairs and that the Committee on Committees should attempt to appoint representatives from both Crookston and Morris to the three committees. It was also agreed that when an issue important to a coordinate campus was slated to be on a meeting agenda, the appropriate coordinate campus(es) should be notified and invited to send a representative to that meeting (even allowing for the fact that many agenda items appear at the 11th hour, making advance notice sometimes difficult).

Professor Drewes said he did not believe that the Duluth campus would be interested in continued representation on other Senate committees, but Duluth faculty would appreciate being notified when issues of interest to them will be considered.

7. April 15 FCC Meeting

Professor Bognanno announced that the April 15 meeting of FCC will be held on the Crookston campus and urged Committee members to make plans to be able to attend.

8. Report on Visit of NCAA Review Team

Professor Bognanno next explained that a review team from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) had recently been on campus and that he had asked Professors Garrard and Tracy to represent FCC at a meeting with the review team. Professor Garrard then reported that the NCAA representatives were quite positive about the University's (Twin Cities campus) governance structure for athletics, especially the diversity of the membership of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA). She said she had asked the representatives about the proposal, made by an ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Burton Shapiro (to be on the agenda in the near future) that ACIA become an all-faculty body that deals only with academic issues; they had responded that such an arrangement would be very unusual and they did not understand what the strength of such a structure would be. When asked about the weaknesses of the existing arrangements, the NCAA representatives declined to identify any.

9. Discussion with Senior Vice President Infante

Professor Bognanno next welcomed Senior Vice President Infante to the meeting to discuss a number of issues. Dr. Infante touched upon a number of topics.

-- The Higher Education Coordinating Board had, earlier in the day, approved only 4 of the 12 new baccalaureate degree programs proposed for the Crookston campus; the University was asked to return later for discussion of the other 8. The University would wait, he said.

- The Governor's revised budget, while an improvement, still leaves the University considerably short of the funding it requested. The additional funds recommended, moreover, are soft, intended to "buy down" proposed tuition increases, including those proposed for the practitioner-oriented Masters' programs. While it may be possible that the legislature will treat the University better than the Governor has recommended, the result will still be an essentially "flat" budget.

It is his sense, Dr. Infante told the Committee, that the legislative leadership wants to rethink the entire question of the funding of higher education over the next two years and that budget actions for this biennium may be stopgap measures while that reconsideration takes place. Such a rethinking is welcome, Dr. Infante said, because it will mesh with the University's own strategic planning efforts. It is likely, however, that there could be radical changes in the funding patterns; one issue to be carefully considered is the use of funding formulas related to enrollment. It is also possible that the legislature will insist that if tuition increases beyond X percent, any additional tuition revenue beyond that stipulated percent will be deducted from the state appropriation--reflecting the interest of the legislature in keeping tuition increases down. Dr. Infante declined to speculate what "X" might be.

If the renegotiation of the state's "contract" with the University is to occur, one Committee contended, the University will have to begin the process immediately after the budget for this year is set; there will no time to sit back and "catch our breath."

There will, in all probability, be no funds appropriated for inflationary increases for any state agency for the first year of the biennium (including salaries). Any salary freeze, however, will likely not be mandated; the legislature, Dr. Infante surmised, is only looking at the budget numbers. Meantime, the University will negotiate in good faith with the unionized segments of its workforce. Certain University's expenses will certainly increase (e.g., utilities), observed one Committee member; if the unions negotiate an increase, which would then be general, the University will get hit twice with increases. The budget situation in some ways is simple, Dr. Infante said: The University will receive an appropriation, and then must consider the "three legs of the stool" (tuition, recognition of inflation, and programmatic cuts) to arrive at a final budget.

The probable funds available for the 1993-94 budget do not, Dr. Infante affirmed in response to a query, provide for salary increases. The base may remain about the same, but there will be \$18 million in increased facility expenses, and there are other potential increases that must be dealt with--some of which may be brought down. "Back of the envelop" calculations made during the meeting suggest that each 1% increase in tuition increases revenue by about \$1.8 million; each 1% increase in salary, for all University employees, requires about \$6 million.

Some basic issues to be considered, as the "contract" between the state and higher education is renegotiated, include whether or not Minnesota will become a high tuition/high aid state, perhaps with vouchers; if the state will continue to allocate funds to institutions, with tuition paying part of the cost, perhaps on a formula basis; if incentive funding is to be adopted, where a percent of an institution's budget (e.g., 5%) will be dependent on achieving certain measures (e.g., increased graduation rate). Institutions could react very differently, in profound ways, to incentive funding, and those reactions could be adverse to student interests as well as to the role of the University in higher education in the state.

The administration has encouraged the programs that offer the practitioner-oriented Masters' degrees to gather information in order to advise the legislature about the impact of the tremendous tuition increases proposed by the Governor, although, Dr. Infante said, there appears not to be a great deal of support for the proposal in the legislature. The PRINCIPLE of differential tuition, one Committee member observed, will likely return, even if this particular proposal is not adopted. This is a method of curriculum control, said another Committee member; if those rates were adopted, the programs would be priced out of existence. Dr. Infante pointed out that there are a number of indirect curriculum controls exercised by the state, and any approach to the question must be carefully thought out.

Dr. Infante cautioned the Committee that in all of these budget discussions, he, like everyone else, is "reading tea leaves," because no one can be certain what the outcome of the legislative session will be.

- Concern was expressed about the conduct of the management review of the Medical School. Dr. Infante told the Committee that he will direct the review; by direction of the Regents and the President, the responsibility is his. Others will be involved, but ultimate direction will rest with him. There will be two committees, one external and one internal, to advise him. The external committee will probably consist of 5-6 people, half who are deans or vice presidents of medical schools, half from respected local leaders in the field. The internal people will be selected on the basis of recommendations he received and he invited recommendations from FCC. It is expected that the review will be completed within a few months, because he will make a report to the Board of Regents at their July meeting.
- The Committee discussed briefly with Dr. Infante the impact of the increase in graduate assistant fringe benefit rates, and the differential impact the increase will have, depending on the source of funds used to pay them. One can expect significant changes in parts of the institution as a result of the change, Dr. Infante told the Committee; he fears there could be a reduction of 10% in the number of graduate students in IT, for example. The change could lead to an increase in the number of post-docs, who will be cheaper than graduate assistants. Dr. Infante said he has asked Vice President Petersen to look into how the University should respond to the problem.
- Dr. Infante and the Committee discussed the relative standing of faculty salaries. The University has gained slightly in the past three years, compared to its Big Ten peers, but is still very low. The point that must be made, said one Committee member, is if the legislature wants the University to be world-class, how can it compete? Data on faculty salaries has been provided to the legislature, Dr. Infante told the Committee; the University was also asked about administrative salaries and the percent of expenditures on administration. In salaries, the University is low at the top and higher on the bottom; in terms of administrative expense, the University is very close to that spent by peer institutions. Is there any possibility the University would consider doing what Michigan did, which was to provide salary increases to those at lower levels? Talented junior faculty can move; even if they are loyal to the University, they frequently cannot afford NOT to move.

There appears to be little legislative sympathy with the fact that the University, alone among state-funded organizations, had a salary freeze two years ago.

- The steam plant issue is being considered by the legislature. If the legislature acts to stop steam plant construction, the \$120 million in federal funding will be lost.
- Mandatory retirement ends on January 1, 1994. There is a class of people, Dr. Infante noted, who will reach their 70th birthday between July 1, 1993, and December 31, 1993. The University has informed those individuals they will be retired effective January 1, 1994, but they will be offered special contracts for the period January 1 to June 30, so no one will be forced into retirement at mid-year.

Professor Bognanno thanked Dr. Infante for joining the meeting.

The Committee adjourned at 2:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota