

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
March 3, 1994  
Room 238 Morrill Hall  
10:00 - 2:00**

- Present: Judith Garrard (chair), Carl Adams, John Adams, Lester Drewes, James Gremmels, Kenneth Heller, Robert Jones, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Irwin Rubenstein, Shirley Zimmerman
- Regrets: Mario Bognanno, Toni McNaron, Cleon Melsa
- Absent: none
- Guests: Professors Ellen Berscheid, W. Phillips Shively, and Thomas Scott (past chairs of the Committee), Associate Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter
- Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate), Rich Broderick and Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: Cooperation with Wisconsin, salaries, administrative reorganization, post-tenure reviews, U2000 financial planning]

**1. Cooperation with the University of Wisconsin**

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 10:00 and welcomed the three former FCC chairs to the meeting to discuss relationships with the Board of Regents. Before taking up that topic, however, she asked Professor Shively for a report on the development of relationships with the University of Wisconsin.

Professor Shively said that on the basis of his political and economic analysis of the position of the University in the state, the single most promising strategy for it to follow to remain a premier research and graduate university (put in the extreme) would be to merge with the Universities of Iowa and Wisconsin. A state such as Minnesota, with 4 million people, is an over-achiever in that it has a far better university than would be expected from its size. It is no accident that perhaps the three best public universities are in heavily populated states--California, Illinois, and Michigan.

In addition, this is a state that favors the diffusion of resources, which makes it even more difficult for the University to remain first-rate.

The same problem confronts the University's two neighbors as well (Iowa and Wisconsin)--both have over-achieved for what could be predicted in the states, given the population bases. Both states, like

---

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.

Minnesota, are also populist, making it hard for the campuses to maintain their status.

Professor Shively recalled that he had made the statement, at a conference at which Vice President Petersen and others were present, that Minnesota would effectively have to merge with Iowa and Wisconsin in 20 or 30 years and that it would be best to get about the business of doing so now. (Recognizing, he added, that the merger would not be de jure, nor would the football teams or introductory undergraduate education programs be conjoined.) Effecting the "merger" could lead to a number of efficiencies.

The proposal was well-received and Vice President Petersen asked him to work part-time for her for a year to work on furthering the cooperation. For several reasons, the efforts have worked best with Wisconsin; the biggest success thus far has come with the libraries (by no means solely due to his efforts, he pointed out). There is now a daily courier between the two institutions so that inter-library loans occur very fast. The software is being developed that will merge the two collection on computer so that anyone using LUMINA would know of books in the Wisconsin library--and with a few keystrokes, could borrow them. A major payoff will be that the two libraries, now totalling over 10 million volumes, can be developed by the librarians as a single collection.

Other prospective developments include about six pilot programs involving integration of graduate programs in Minnesota and Wisconsin departments. Seminars could be taken by interactive television; funding for setting up small conference rooms for this purpose is being sought. Some Graduate School rules may have to be adjusted so that a graduate student in one program could take a seminar from the other and so that faculty members could serve on graduate student committees without barrier.

The prospects, all told, are quite exciting, he concluded.

## **2. Relationships with the Board of Regents**

Professor Garrard asked for consent to close the meeting to discuss relationships with the Regents with the three former chairs of FCC. The Committee voted unanimously to close.

## **3. AAUP Salary Data**

One Committee member expressed strong dismay at the AAUP data produced by Professor Sloan that appeared recently on FacultyWrites; the issue should be brought up at the next meeting, it was said, to register a protest to the Regents, the administration, and the legislature that have allowed this to occur. (The data place professorial and associate professorial salaries 30th out of 30 among the top 31 research universities in the country--one does not report salaries.) This did not happen overnight, and it isn't clear who should be blamed, but the University cannot live with the results. And if the data are wrong, the administration should say so. "These are atrocious results."

## **4. Central Administration Reorganization**

Professor Garrard next reported to the Committee that following the discussion with the President about reorganization at the last meeting, she had been prepared to schedule an extra meeting if the President proposed to act quickly. He said that would not be necessary. Apparently the administration

has not settled on what it might propose to the Board of Regents; a number of models are being discussed, as are related issues.

One related issue for this Committee is possible reorganization of the governance structure. Professor Bognanno, Professor Garrard recalled, had appointed a committee to consider governance issues, with himself as a co-chair; it was put on hold because Professor Bognanno also agreed to serve as chair of the Working Group on Compensation and compensation was seen as a higher priority. The possible reorganization of the administration, she commented, is another reason to wait on reviewing the governance structure, because that reorganization could have implications for governance arrangements. Another reason was that with strategic planning implications for possible reorganization of the University, Ms. Kvanbeck reported, it seemed logical to await the outcome of the planning process.

One Committee member inquired why central reorganization would affect governance. Would there be three assemblies, with three provosts, asked Professor Garrard? It would not be in the interests of the faculty, it was said, to divide themselves up to reflect the administrative structure, which is itself artificial. There are already enough problems communicating across Washington Avenue.

## **5. Post-Tenure Reviews**

Professor Garrard reported that Senior Vice President Infante has expressed an interest in developing a post-tenure review system. There are already four major initiatives being dealt with; this would be a fifth. She would prefer, she said, that the University wait on this issue; there is so much on the plate already, and morale is so low, that taking on post-tenure reviews would only exacerbate the problems. If, however, the question is not addressed by the faculty, the Regents may do it for them.

It was suggested that a post-tenure review system could be tied into the work of the Compensation Working Group being chaired by Professor Bognanno. Another Committee member agreed, noting that while the University cannot change the market-driven norms, it can affect HOW MUCH it lets the market drive decisions. If it is ONLY the market that determines compensation, the University is in a difficult situation; it is missing the boat if there are not alternative opportunities for faculty to increase their salaries, such as through post-tenure reviews.

As U2000 and the next 25 years are being discussed, said one Committee member, the terms of employment must be considered. Failure to raise the question generates flak from the community because faculty work is not scrutinized as is the work of others. Faculty certainly need protection for academic freedom--that is essential to the University. But there is a conflict between 100% job protection and competitive salaries, especially when there are alternatives to academic work. It would be better to address these issues rather than have an answer forced upon the faculty, and they should be linked to long-term planning for the University and how the administration deploys resources.

Perhaps the University should distinguish between a level of compensation attached to tenure and supplemental compensation for other things. Why do we continue to have A (11-month) and B (nine-month) appointments? Many B faculty would be happy to have A appointments. Why not have it possible to negotiate with faculty to do additional things the college or University wants, which faculty could do or not, as they wished. Then the need for post-tenure reviews might disappear, while the financial resources could be better matched with department, college, and University agendas.

The Compensation Working Group, Professor Garrard reported, has been asked to look at administrative augmentation and the fact that the administrative salary has not always been reduced when an administrator returns to the faculty. That has bothered people for years, commented another Committee member; if it is retention issue, that is one thing, but the administrative salary should not automatically follow the individual back to faculty status. If the faculty ARE the University, it is the faculty who should talk about this issue. Tenure is at the heart of faculty appointments, it was said, and consideration of post-tenure reviews is part of compensation--and should be considered by the governance system, not an outside body.

Related to this is the proposition that faculty change jobs as their career progresses; they may peak and then tool down--and perhaps salary should as well. But it should not have to be an all-or-nothing proposition over the entire career so that a faculty member must do everything or get out. This is a matter of concern to older faculty, another agreed, who are shown the door at retirement even though their professional life continues. They are provided no support; many would retire more quickly if they were to receive it. That should be a matter of University policy.

Professor Carl Adams, chair of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, reported on a recent effort to "facilitate transitions for maturing faculty," an ad hoc task force initiated by SCFA to nudge the administration to take a number of relatively easy steps. It was a low-key effort, a sort of "get the job done" approach; the report is now in the hands of Senior Vice President Infante. It contains a number of proposals for beneficial things the University could do to encourage transitions and suggested it should be University POLICY to facilitate the connection of retired faculty to the University.

As for post-tenure reviews and the Compensation Working Group, that may be more tied to workload than compensation, it was suggested. There is distinction, another pointed out, between workload, evaluation of work, and compensation, although they all overlap. The Compensation Working Group is struggling with how to approach compensation at the macro level--for example, how, in resource allocation, does the University think with respect to compensation? Is it a major element in the strategy to be in the top 10? How does that translate in operation--using something like the 75th percentile of peers for salary comparisons? The micro level, by comparison, is deciding what Professor X will be paid this year. Some people would like a compensation policy to address micro level considerations; the Working Group does not. To add post-tenure reviews to its charge would bog it down.

It may be that a sequencing of tasks is in order, observed a Committee member--first the Working Group should deal with the macro-level issues, as outlined; then it, or another group, could develop policy on what individual should be paid. This would open up the question of incentives. This issue should be tackled by the faculty, added another Committee member, rather than as a response to planning initiatives or items on the agendas of outsiders; the faculty should act so it is not blind-sided by Regents or the legislature. If the recommendations are thoughtful, and deal with the concerns of 30-year-old as well as 60-year-old faculty members, they should be accepted. If they do not deal with the problems of middle-aged professors, of which there are a lot, there will continue to be a negative impact on morale.

If the University is to retain public credibility, argued yet another Committee member, it must incorporate workload and post-tenure reviews in its compensation structure. The University must do

what is best for it, given its culture and traditions, and not expect to find an optimal solution elsewhere in the country; it must invent its own best solution.

Several other points were also made in the discussion, some related to the data provided by Professor Sloan indicating that Minnesota's salaries for full professors are 30th of the 30 top AAU institutions reporting data.

- One way to increase faculty compensation is to decrease the number of faculty.
- In comparing faculty salaries with other institutions, one must also look at the mix of people. The cost-per-student at Minnesota and Michigan is about the same, but Michigan pays much higher salaries; the reason may be fewer faculty or more TAs. The Working Group would like not to get bogged down in the micro questions.
- The coordinate campus faculty are also interested in compensation issues and are concerned about fairness, not necessarily equal salaries. It was noted that one of the members of the working group is a faculty member from Morris. It was also pointed out that the question of fairness is one shared among Twin Cities campus faculty as well.

The message from this Committee, it was said, has been made: Get at the macro questions quickly so that the other issues can then be taken up. The issues are complicated, Professor Carl Adams, and the Working Group wants to develop clear guidelines and benchmarks, along with a reasoned discussion. An early draft, without implementation details, it was said, would be helpful before fall, because these issues will require extensive discussion.

## **6. U2000 Financial Strategies**

Professor Garrard next welcomed Associate Vice President Pfutzenreuter to discuss the financial data and assumptions being developed for the U2000 planning process. [Note: Inasmuch as the presentation to FCC was based on the same slides as the presentation to the Finance and Planning Committee on February 28, these minutes will only record points different from the ones summarized in the 2/28 minutes. One should read those minutes first. This discussion lasted well over an hour.] Mr. Pfutzenreuter began by reaffirming the need for early consultation on these numbers, giving the dictate of the calendar of events that lead to the preparation of the 1995-97 biennial request.

- With respect to the University's situation today, and a structural budget problem that arises with the additional recurring costs of six new buildings coming into operation in the next two years (no pun intended), one Committee member inquired if some of the problem might be resolved by TEARING DOWN other buildings to achieve savings; Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed that could be one possibility.
- Although the possible increased University costs from changes in permissible indirect costs are not certain, it is clear that there will be timing and sequencing problems and that the changes will be more than accounting entries, Mr. Pfutzenreuter assured the Committee.
- State funds will drop in 1995-96 for K-12 and higher education; the state budget will then look

balanced on paper while all the other budgets are in bad shape.

- In reviewing the principles that guide financial planning, Mr. Pfutzenreuter reported that it has been suggested that another principle be that tuition is market-based. That means, observed one Committee member in response to a query by another, that if the University is a high-quality institution, it can increase tuition because the market will pay. Other Committee members expressed sharp reservation about that proposition, noting that it is contrary to the idea of a state university that education should be rationed by ability to pay and that that is a University and state policy decision that should not be simply inserted into the principles without discussion. It may be, observed another Committee member, that the source of the idea was the Committee itself, which has earlier suggested examination of the tuition levels of peer institutions.

Two other principles suggested were that compensation be competitive and that there be access irrespective of economic circumstances. These principles need to be given thought, said one Committee member, not added without discussion.

- In the discussion about the source of the \$9.7 million (on average for the period) to be retrenched or saved, it was pointed out that the portion attributable to administrative efficiencies is a cause for concern. Administrative efficiencies are often bought at the expense of academic programs because responsibilities are pushed off on them, creating additional workload while reducing funding. The results for faculty and staff morale are not positive; especially for staff, added another Committee member. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said the administration hoped to do better than that. The tremendous effort that staff members have put into the system in recent years, it was said, must be acknowledged.

Of the annual reductions, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said about \$3.6 million per year are projected to come from academic programs, and that means instructional costs. That will require elimination of departments or parts of departments, responded one Committee member--things will not be taught any more. For all units it will be mean change, said another Committee member, but with the Strategic Investment Pool available, for some units the net change could be an increase in funding. It must nonetheless be realized, replied the first Committee member, that there will be real costs and things will be eliminated.

Funds will go back into programs, Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed, and also into academic infrastructure needs. He commented, though, that with some budgets consisting of 85 - 90% salaries, it seems clear that PEOPLE will be affected. Some will be fired, said one Committee member; Mr. Pfutzenreuter said he hoped that could be avoided.

- The funds for training and development are 1/2 of 1% of payroll, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, and that may be inadequate. Asked if they could include improvement of teaching, he said they would apply to instructional innovation. It may be necessary to put funds into other professionals, such as teaching assistants, or into innovative ways to provide services to students, as the number of faculty could decline. Faculty turnover will also cause an increase in demands on training funds, it was said.

It was suggested that it be noted explicitly that the funds identified for recruitment and retention

could be used to address the problem of compensation levels. It may be that that item should be combined with the compensation amount into a "competitive compensation" entry.

- Questions were raised about the recurring items in the supplemental legislative request; why are not other sources of funds sought for those, rather than recurring state support? Could not those state funds better be used elsewhere in the institution? Those questions, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, needed to be addressed to the academic officers.

There then ensued a discussion of "financial strategies." One Committee member maintained that this was an important document but that it identified the pieces of the financial puzzle and how they fit together. If the Regents were to ask where the strategy is--what actions will be taken to get the results being sought? The point has been made all along, Mr. Pfutzenreuter noted, that state funds will be key to the plans. Strategy means how to put the legislative request together in order to obtain those funds. If the administration responded to a regental request for strategy information with this document, it was then said, the Regents should ask the administration to resign. This is not a strategy. A strategy is doing something to get the resources needed, it is a better legislative request. It identifies where the dollars will need to come from; it does not identify how they will be obtained. Absent planned action, the document is not a strategy. Discussion along these lines continued for awhile.

One's gut instinct says that the improvements to undergraduate instruction proposed in U2000 will cost \$50 million. The University will not get those funds by sending a bill to the legislature or by restricting tuition increases to 2% over the rate of inflation (as suggested in the financial planning documents). One might say that tuition will be much higher than it is now--THAT would be a strategy to raise the money for what the University is trying to accomplish. True, said another, but that ignores political reality.

The planning parameters do provide some strategy, said another Committee member. They call for keeping tuition increases low, for obtaining some money from the state, and for taking some money from programs. That could be acceptable as strategy, it was said; the next question is then whether or not the strategy matches with what is trying to be achieved.

This document, said another Committee member on the question of strategy, says that the state must either put up or shut up--it gets to the role of the state in funding higher education. That could be a strategy, it was conceded, that the University could use--it is unlikely to succeed, however.

- One Committee member inquired about the absence of private funds and endowments. Endowments are held by the Foundation, Mr. Pfutzenreuter told the Committee; income comes to the University when requested; that income does appear in the tables. The endowment balances, however, remain with the Foundation. Asked if those should be included, when one objective is to strengthen academic programs, he said that the budget process includes reporting the principal and income.
- Virtually all of the items identified as major categories of critical investments would include the coordinate campuses.
- It is early to raise the question, said one Committee member, but the University must be mindful of

what all this would buy--what will the University be at the end of the six years if everything proposed were to be done? That vision must be known so that people can see it; there will be much pain involved in the process and there must be a sense that there is a reward coming.

Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed. He also noted that as the budget hearings are taking place, the administration is learning of other systems problems that will need to be addressed, for example, so the expenditures proposed may be too low.

- What if the six-year projections of revenues and expenditures turn out to be inaccurate and, for example, some of the revenues do not materialize? What will the priorities be? Or, said another Committee member, there must be a decision to make the University smaller faster. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said those decisions were not for him to make. Everyone knows what the choices have been in two of the last three years (i.e., salaries).
- The sources of funding for U2000, totalling \$120 million, would come in part from tuition, in part from the state, and in part from internal reductions. No decision has been made, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, whether or not U2000 would proceed if the state funds were not obtained.

It was suggested that the graphic depicting the simulated state funds versus potential expenditures be labelled differently so that its point be clearer: There remains a \$73 million gap between what the simulation calls for in budget/expenditures and what the state is projecting in appropriations (after the University has raised tuition and made internal reductions).

Following Mr. Pfutzenreuter's concluding comments about the last two slides, one Committee member expressed astonishment that this kind of planning has not occurred before at the University. One reason, observed another, is because the data have not been available.

The budget hearings are suggesting there may be a bigger problem in the future, Mr. Pfutzenreuter reported: units are showing they need to spend their balances. Deans and department heads have believed they did not have the power, or were not inclined to exercise it, over the budgets; some deans have had budgets with unauthorized red ink for three-four-five years, argued one Committee member. What is going on? Why are they continued in their posts? In part because the quality of managerial reporting has been low, Mr. Pfutzenreuter replied.

It is hard to see how the state can avoid confronting the funding issue, observed one Committee member. Another commented that it will have deal with such questions as "what size University does the state want?" and "what services does it want?"--and if it does not, it must be prepared to have a lower quality and smaller institution.

Another question, added yet another Committee member, is "who should have a chance to go to school here?" There are a lot of students who do not belong here, who are not good students, and who do not want to be here; why are they being subsidized at this very expensive institution? The legislature, agreed another Committee member, must remain quiet when the University tries to close units down.

Several quick follow-on observations in this vein were these:

- The University can downsize and be much better.
- That could mean longer lines but higher quality.
- Quality will increase only if funding is stable while size decreases.
- It is possible to get bigger, and increase revenues, without increasing expenditures.
- It is not established that money equals quality.

Noting at this point that some close relationships do not last as long as this meeting has, Professor Garrard forthwith adjourned it at 2:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

### **Unpublished Excerpt, FCC Minutes, March 3, 1994**

#### **2. Relationships with the Board of Regents**

Professor Garrard thanked Professor Shively for the report and then asked for a motion to close the meeting to discuss faculty relationships with the Board of Regents; the Committee voted unanimously to do so. [Although closed, the Committee agreed that record of the discussion should be made and distributed.]

The issue was joined, Professor Garrard reported, when she was contacted by Regent Keffeler last summer about the possibility of regular meetings between Regent Keffeler and her. After consulting with a number of people, she reported, she concluded that meetings ought to include President Hasselmo and the vice-chairs of both the Committee and the Board of Regents.

She has since then initiated no meetings; the meeting the Committee had earlier with Regent Keffeler came at Regent Keffeler's invitation after the Board of Regents' action on the administration's budget proposal (i.e., reducing the proposed tuition increase from 5% to 3%).

One point she made with Regent Keffeler, she recalled, was about the imbalance of having a student regent and student representatives to the Regents' committees. At a later date, Regent Keffeler suggested that the faculty should lobby the Regents on issues of importance to them. Her belief, Professor Garrard told her colleagues, is that the faculty view is represented by the President. She makes a quarterly report to the Board, and FCC meets with the Board once a year. As a response to these developments and discussions, she said she had asked the former chairs to meet with FCC to gain an historical perspective and to discuss what its relationship with the Board should be.

Professor Berscheid then related her experience with the Board. When she came on FCC, the relationship between the Board and the faculty was not healthy. The FCC at that time, met quarterly with the Board at dinner, a largely social gathering which tended not to be useful. Thus, the faculty sought business-like relationship and suggested that the Board and Committee meet for lunch at the Campus Club, with an agenda; the Board agreed.

The Committee at that time wanted to pursue the imbalance in representation, Professor Berscheid recalled, and the weak faculty voice at the University of Minnesota in general, and with the Board of

Regents in particular. The Committee wanted--and made it known only after discussions between her, vice-chair Shirley Clark, and President Keller--simply to have a faculty member at the table at the Board committee meetings. The faculty member would be without vote, would not attend full Board meetings, and would speak only if spoken to. The Committee was concerned that faculty-bashing was occurring at the time and that the presence of a faculty member would change the tone of the dialogue--as well as provide a resource person at the meetings. It was clear that the Board was not receptive to the proposal. There remained an imbalance in the faculty and student voices at the Board, an imbalance that was not healthy for the University.

At the same time, Professor Berscheid recalled, the Senate Consultative Committee had been examining the governance system and had called in outside experts [Professors Kenneth Mortimer and Martin Trow, nationally-recognized scholars of higher education]; those experts were asked to look at the question of balance as well. Their opinion was that both the student regent and the student representatives to the Regents' committees were very unusual and that the system was unbalanced, and that the faculty voice was indeed weak. But their view was that to redress the imbalance, the Board should do away with the student representatives rather than add faculty. To add more representatives would undermine the authority of the President.

When Professor Shively became chair, there was also a change in the chair of the Board of Regents; he was able to establish early a good relationship with the chair of the Board.

Professor Shively then related the events of his tenure. He said the Committee was convinced by Mortimer and Trow; they made sense. His view, he said, is that the biggest structural problem for the University is that it is ridden with state politics. Student governance, departments, colleges, and campuses have their own agendas and lines to the legislature and Board of Regents--and it is hard for the President to lead. It was the view of Mortimer and Trow that the faculty should not add to that problem.

The Committee nonetheless pressed for representation and had meetings with the Board of Regents about it. The faculty emphasized they simply wanted a representative--not a regent, not two at each committee. The Board remained unreceptive to the proposal, even though the faculty believed it would create a more level playing field. The proposal, at all events, went nowhere and the entire issue was dropped.

It isn't clear what wisdom the three former chairs can offer, Professor Shively concluded, but the direct lines to the Board that many groups have, including the student line, are damaging to the University. The governance structure should advise the administration; the administration, in turn, should go to the Board with recommendations. If there are problems with that system, they should be dealt with by the governance system and the administration.

At one university, deans and other administrators are not allowed to talk to legislators and the Provost disciplined deans who went around the administration. But that happens here time and time again.

It is problematic whether or not to try to correct the problem by establishing a competing faculty line to the Board. The Board is unlikely to question the student representation, but it might not be healthy to add a faculty line to the Board.

With all due respect to Professors Mortimer and Trow, Professor Berscheid remarked, they did not understand the political setting of the University. It is not just students who are connected to the Board; there are many groups, and the faculty voice is lost.

Professor Scott then told his colleagues that the issue of representation had never been on the FCC agenda while he served as chair (his term followed that of Professor Shively by three years; preceding him were Warren Ibele for two years and Mark Brenner for one).

Professor Shively recalled that the practice of the quarterly reports to the Board of Regents by the FCC chair had begun during Professor Brenner's tenure. It continues, Professor Garrard noted. The dinners did not continue during his tenure, Professor Scott reported, although there were occasional lunches. They were sometimes meetings of substance, sometimes not.

The more general point, Professor Scott observed, is that this discussion has been interesting in that it illuminates the political role of the University in the state and how that role differs from other institutions. It is unfortunate that there is student representation and the other features of the system, but that will not change.

What the faculty have achieved over the last ten years is a lot of consultation with the administration; it has taken place in a variety of ways and forms. The communication is also very important, especially the wide distribution of the minutes of the Committee. There has also been acknowledgement over the same period of the need for a faculty relationship with the legislature. That has been effected in two ways: with the creation of the UMFA (University of Minnesota Faculty Association) and the appointment of the faculty lobbyist. As a result, the faculty ARE directly represented at the legislature.

One worries about the faculty lobbyist being co-opted by University lobbying activities, observed one Committee member. That is always a potential problem, Professor Scott agreed. But the faculty have said that they need representation, given the way the world is, and the administration has agreed to fund it. His own view, Professor Scott said, is that the one place the faculty have not gone a good job is with the Regents; the faculty almost IGNORE the Regents. There have been pro forma relationships in the past but they have not worked well. The faculty has not helped the Board understand what faculty do, and it may be the Board does not like the faculty because they do not know the faculty--in any event, that's been a big hole in faculty relationships. Faculty have been more successful with the administration and the legislature.

Perhaps FCC could be more effective in establishing relationships with the Board, because it will probably not support a faculty regent, Professor Scott said. Perhaps FCC members should attend Board meetings on a regular basis so the Committee is aware of what the Board is doing. The Committee spent some time discussing other steps it might take to better advance faculty views with the Board and external groups.

Professors Mortimer and Trow felt strongly that what was needed was not dinners or lunches but quarterly meetings of the President and Board with FCC at Eastcliff; they believed breaking bread together in a pleasant setting would help the relationship. That has not occurred. There have been such

meetings, observed one Committee member, but the results were not what either the faculty or the Board desired.

A dilemma has been presented, observed one Committee member. On the one hand, the faculty's position is weakened because to be represented on the Board would weaken the President, and thereby their own position; on the other hand, if the faculty do not act politically, they do not serve their own interests, and thus also weaken their position. FCC has not been consistent in its position. What should it do to strengthen relationships with the Board?

A related question, chimed in another Committee member, is that faculty have two sets of concerns. One is a set of short-term interest group concerns about salary, benefits, working conditions, and so on; those concerns are shared with civil service employees, professional staff, and some student interests. A second faculty concern is its long-term responsibility, its worry about the University in the next 10 - 20 - 30 years. Since many other groups do not share this longer perspective, if the faculty do not advance those concerns, they are not expressed as forcibly.

There is often confusion, it was said, about which agenda the faculty is pursuing at any one time. The Board is supposed to take on long-term concerns, but often gets dragged into short-term issues. Can the faculty help the Board understand the difference?

The point about the two different agendas, said one Committee member, is a valid one, but since the one person representing the faculty (the FCC chair) wears both hats and talks about both agendas, it naturally confuses the Board.

What has changed over recent years, Professor Berscheid warned, is that increasingly the faculty has been lumped, in the eyes of the Regents and the administration, with civil service and professional staff--they are increasingly simply part of "the staff" in every way. Faculty members are seen as no more than employees like all others. The problem is that administrators, Regents, civil service staff, and students come and go; only the faculty remain to bear the consequences of decisions and it is primarily the faculty who are concerned about long-term consequences.

What this Committee could do, she said, is try to help the administration and Regents to make a differentiation between faculty and all other employees. The faculty are NOT like civil service and other employees--all of whom want to be lumped with the faculty. But there is a BIG difference among them, a difference that should NOT be blurred.

What should the Committee do, inquired Professor Shively? Several at this meeting were involved in the founding of UMFA, an action taken to bring the faculty directly into the fray, but it is an interest group with a difference. The faculty come closer to embodying central University purposes than any other and can add strength to the President's position at the legislature when it lobbies for central University purposes. That even includes faculty salaries, because faculty strength is the most important part of the University, but faculty also lobby for assistantships, for the libraries, for research, and for infrastructure, for example. The effect of UMFA has been to strengthen the President. There is always the danger that it can be co-opted.

The Board meetings and retreats are open, Professor Scott was noted, and if there is an issue of

concern, the FCC could send someone to the meetings. It should also be kept in mind, it was pointed out, that the University faculty are the only ones in the state not organized into a bargaining unit. People don't understand that, and it puts the faculty in an unusual position; they must protect that status but it does mean relationships will be different.

There appears to be a tension between lobbying with the Board to advance faculty positions, along the line suggested by Regent Keffeler, and the views of the three former chairs, who think that may not be a good idea. Faculty might do so, said Professor Scott, but on a case-by-case basis. Professor Shively agreed there is a tension. The situation does present the dilemma noted earlier: either there is a direct faculty voice in a political process--which weakens the President--or there is not, leaving others with a direct voice, also weakening the President--but then the faculty voice, central to the University, is missing. In any event, the faculty must stay in close contact with the administration. The relationship with the Regents should be kept formal and structured. The President has been at all meetings, recalled one Committee member; another observed that it is necessary for full communication and so that if the faculty disagree with the President, he knows. Faculty meetings without the President, all appeared to agree, would be unwise.

It might be politically hard to reorganize the representation to the Board of Regents, said one Committee member, but would it be a waste of time for the Committee to say what it thinks the situation should be? It is necessary, said another Committee member, is to establish a continuous and consistent FCC position vis-a-vis the Board. It may also be naive, but it would be worthwhile articulating what FCC sees as the ideal structure. It may not be achieved, but FCC could say it believes the current process is too political and there is too much lobbying. Concrete changes are needed to eliminate end runs and to keep a strong role for the President of the University for the long-term.

The ideal structure should be considered, concurred another Committee member. All seem to agree that the faculty ARE the University--even the Board members say it--so that battle is won here (unlike at some institutions). The administration is part of the faculty, it was said, and works for the faculty. "They are us." To the extent the administration does not involve faculty in events, the faculty's problem is with the administration. The job of this Committee is to avoid a rift with the administration. The Regents are a board of directors and do their job reasonably well. By national standards, Minnesota has good regents indeed. But the administration is part of the faculty--there should be only one voice--and if there are to be faculty at meetings with the Board, it is up to the administration to see that it is accomplished.

There are two divergent proposals in front of the Committee, it was said. One, create parallel mechanisms and a separate voice for the faculty; two, continue to work through the President and with the President to ensure the faculty voice is heard. Those are very different, and one hears that FCC has been bouncing between the two. It should decide on one and see if it can be made to work.

It would NOT be a bad idea to increase the social interactions with the Board, argued one Committee member, and to have no agenda.

It is the job of the FCC, said one Committee member, to consult with the President and to convey the faculty view about the University. Some get confused about the faculty interest as employees; it is easy to mix together the employee interests and the faculty concerns about the future of the University, so

it is not surprising there is confusion when faculty speak to Regents and legislators and the President. Are the faculty lobbying for better health benefits? Or for a new laboratory? Those are not the same. Which hat is being worn? The agendas are different. Since the faculty are the University, one could argue that anything the faculty want is best for the University, but with other groups also making arguments, it is not clear to listeners which message is being sent. The faculty must distinguish between their roles.

An FCC strategy has not been identified. Should the Committee lobby for the faculty because they did not receive a raise? Salaries are linked to building the faculty so that the University is competitive in five or ten years and it can be where it should; salaries cannot be ignored. But when the faculty say they want a raise, and students say they want tuition kept low, they all sound like the same petitions to the listeners.

The strategy that has been pursued this year has been clear, Professor Garrard pointed out. She met with former chairs when she was elected; she also served as vice chair last year so saw things operate. She was advised to attend Regents meetings, so has done so, usually with another faculty member in tow. She has reported to the Committee of the Whole, although has usually not attended Regents' committee meetings or their retreats. In addition, the chair and vice chair of FCC have met regularly with the President and with the Provost prior to their meetings with the Committee to discuss concerns and to review the agenda. She has been concerned about the co-mingling of the faculty and student voice. She has tried, this year, to clearly delineate the role of the Faculty Senate so the faculty voice is clear.

Committee members agreed it would be helpful to meet with Barbara Muesing, Executive Director of the Board of Regents, to help understand the selection and operation of the Board.

About the question of what hat the faculty wear, said one Committee member, there are not many hats. The University is the faculty--they are its heart and soul, without which the University does not exist. Whatever benefits can be gained for the faculty--whether compensation or something broader--benefits the University. If one believes that, said another--and most do--then compensation is not independent of building the University. But the faculty also need show a concern for tuition; building the University also means attracting good students who have time to study. That is an issue here because students work too much; to the extent they are required to do so because of tuition rates, there is an impact in the classroom. Committee members heartily agreed.

One Committee member expressed appreciation for the hard work of Professor Garrard in systematically strengthening the role of the faculty with the President and Regents and in attending Regents meetings. One must be concerned about adding more responsibilities to the role of FCC chair; it will make it impossible to get people to take the job. The position must be manageable. The faculty has enough trouble eliciting the volunteerism necessary to operate the governance system; it must be sure it remains open and flexible enough so that faculty are not driven away, leaving only a small oligarchy who participate.

Professor Garrard inquired if Committee members wished to request quarterly meetings with the Board of Regents, and if so, whether they should be social or business. There are benefits to both kinds, pointed out one Committee member; some should have some business, but it is useful to have social

functions as well. Perhaps a social dinner and business lunches would be appropriate, suggested another. No schedule of meetings should be sought, it was agreed, before Ms. Muesing could join the Committee.

Discussion turned to the role of the legislative liaison, who has not been included as an ex officio member of FCC, and therefore has not had the benefit of on-going Committee discussions. One Committee member said he should come to all FCC meetings so that he knows the issues; it is too easy to get isolated.

The possibility of co-optation was also discussed. One Committee member noted that the legislative liaison has taken positions different from those of the administration, but usually not on big issues. The liaison is in a funny position, because the released time and expenses are paid by the President and the person gets little guidance from the Committee. It is easy for the individual to be co-opted because the University arranges all the events and the individual is always involved with University people--who want a united front. If the person is the faculty's liaison, however, he or she should do what the faculty want.

The search for the external relations vice president is drawing to a close, one Committee member pointed out; presumably the appointment of that individual will help to clarify relationships among those representing the University at the legislature. That person should be invited to speak with FCC, and Professor Kleiner should be included in the meeting.

There was no Committee sentiment for any regular meeting between it and the chair and vice chair of the Board of Regents and the President. Informal meetings of a smaller group were thought more desirable. It should, it was said, be a rare event for members of the Board of Regents to meet with this Committee.