

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, September 18, 1997
1:00 - 4:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Victor Bloomfield (chair), Kent Bales, Carole Bland, Gary Davis, Mary Dempsey, Gary Gardner, M. Janice Hogan, David Hamilton, Russell Hobbie, Laura Coffin Koch, Leonard Kuhi, Michael Korth, Harvey Peterson
- Absent: Virginia Gray, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Matthew Tirrell
- Guests: Chief of Staff Tonya Brown; President Mark Yudof; (from Finance and Planning, invited to join the discussion with President Yudof: Cynthia Gillette, JoAnne Jackson, Gerald Klement, Robert Kvavik, Charles Speaks)
- Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate); Associate Vice President Robert Kvavik; Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: Major issues for 1997-98 before the committees on Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Research; discussion with President Yudof about the capital and supplemental requests and about the committee's priorities for the year; individuals to work on the priorities]

1. Priorities for the Year

Professor Bloomfield convened the meeting at 1:00 and asked for comments on the list of priority issues for the year that he had proposed. Committee members accepted the list as reflective of discussions held earlier and by email. (The list is itemized in the discussion with President Yudof.)

2. Reports of the Chairs

Professor Bloomfield then turned to Professor Koch for a report from the Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP).

Professor Koch's comments included the following:

- The SCEP retreat on Incentives for Managed Growth led faculty present to be more comfortable with IMG, and said that the issues raised were important and needed follow-through. FCC will need to keep abreast of IMG issues, SCEP will do so, and the oversight subcommittee will work on them.

*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.

- There is a need for a curriculum committee for the Twin Cities campus, but there is concern about the role of the Council on Liberal Education. The latter has been seen as isolated, not reporting to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly or the Assembly Steering Committee (as it is required to do), and having a relationship with the administration that needs to be examined. SCEP will review the role of CLE; Professor Bloomfield said it needed to be reminded that it is to report to the Steering Committee [the Twin Cities representatives on the Senate Consultative Committee].
- Other issues that SCEP will take up include distance education (what is done, to be done, and how academic integrity will be retained); continued review and revision of Senate policies on educational issues, action and reaction with respect to an administrative group looking at academic and student policies in the colleges (with an eye to increasing uniformity), with any changes brought to the Senate for action; grade inflation; and student evaluation of teaching; the change to semesters.

Professor Koch affirmed that SCEP concerns itself with graduate and professional as well as undergraduate education; it was suggested that because the National Research Council rankings largely reflect the status of graduate programs, it would be unwise, in planning, to leave those programs unattended.

Professor Bloomfield next asked Professor Bales to report for the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA).

Professor Bales outlined the issues that SCFA would be taking up:

- The Tenure Subcommittee will report to SCFA, and there will be issued, guidelines for post-tenure review so the deans can begin to construct them. Professor Dempsey reviewed the actions that will be necessary (there must be a vote on changing the probationary period length; departments must outline expectations for faculty, including beyond tenure)
- The policy on consensual sexual and romantic relationships; the policy will be redrafted to try to respond to objections from the administration.
- Health care; there is a SCFA subcommittee that deals with this issue.
- Term faculty appointments and principles to define, differentiate, govern, and reward those who hold such appointments.
- The benefits subcommittee will consider sabbaticals, flexible benefits, tuition benefits for faculty, and how to improve the institutional treatment of emeritus faculty.
- The intellectual property policy will be returning; it appears that most of the objectionable parts of it have been removed.

Professor Hamilton reported that the Academic Health Center FCC has been working on development of an early retirement package and will bring it to SCFA. He commented that had former Provost Brody done this, he could have bypassed the entire tenure issue.

Faculty indemnification needs more exploration, Professor Bales said. Questions about the deductible on the departmental insurance policies has arisen (it is now \$50,000); that amount has increased from \$10,000 primarily because of sexual harassment suits. The Committee discussed the issue with Professor Bales, and agreed that SCFA should take up the issue. It was also agreed, however, that FCC should have a discussion with representatives from Risk Management, in order to convey faculty concerns.

There was extended discussion of the changes in health care coverage. Professor Bloomfield noted the message that had been sent to all faculty from him, Professor Bales, and Professor Williams (President of the Twin Cities AAUP chapter), and reported that there had been a torrent of replies. He said a number of steps are being taken: the SCFA subcommittee is trying to identify long-term solutions; Professor Hamilton is leading an effort to deal with short-term solutions (i.e., this year).

Professor Hamilton explained that the long-term effort is very important, because the University is not at the table when decisions are made about health care, so must take what is given. With Medica Premier dropped, the only way a University employee can see University doctors is through the State Health Plan--which means an enormous increase in cost to University employees. About 6000 employees were in Medica Premier; in some cases, the increase in cost to change to the State Health Plan (to retain access to University physicians) will be greater than the salary increases individuals received. One option being considered is a one-year subsidy from the University. He reported that the AAUP strongly supports the work being undertaken by FCC and SCFA.

Suggestions were made that the University again explore establishing its own health plan, and that the way carriers manipulate rates to obtain contracts. Professor Bland noted that research suggests outcomes are best in teaching hospitals, and now the best site has been removed for University employees.

Professor Bloomfield said what is desired is stable, long-term options, year after year. The email messages suggest there is a need for coverage for faculty on leave and who retire early; the problem is that the University can provide service, at a comparable cost, but it is not an insurer.

3. Discussion with President Yudof

Professor Bloomfield now welcomed President Yudof and his Chief of Staff, Tonya Brown, to the meeting. The President reviewed the capital request and various academic initiatives associated with it. He said the plan was very inclusive, with good effects for many departments, and that he wished to sell it as a package. The package reverses the usual proportion of funding for new construction and renovation; the current plan calls for 70% of the funding to be for renovation. He said it is not a plan for the entire University; he will deal with improving the humanities, because it has not proven easy to obtain improvements for them. With respect to the NRC rankings, he observed, the University's position has declined because of a decline in the rankings of the humanities and physical sciences.

The President emphasized the small amount of general University funding that would be required, and assured the Committee that if the revenues required for the University parts of the request could not be generated, he would not recommend the request to the regents. Operating expenses in new and

renovated buildings will be higher than he had expected, but it is his view that if the University can obtain \$733+ in capital improvements for a cost of about \$17 million annually, it would be worth it.

He then reviewed the supplemental request, of which the first priority is obtaining funding for faculty salary increases of 8.5%. Other funds would be sought for faculty support for the academic initiatives contained in the capital request, classroom renovation, and non-recurring funds (to be used as a trust fund) for faculty start-up costs.

The President also explained that Executive Vice President Bruininks and Associate Vice President Kvavik are making progress on developing planning and performance contracts with the colleges. He said they wish to see a process where priorities come from the units, through consultation with the deans and department chairs, where objectives are set for departments (they define what it means to be better), and then compacts written. One point is to talk about the future of a college; another is to make the process not consume a great deal of time.

The President also reported that a number of searches are underway, including for the Vice President for Human Resources and Vice President for Research.

Committee members asked President Yudof a few questions about the requests (the timing of the new building for biology at the molecular and cellular level given the reorganization of the biological sciences [a complex building, the occupants of which required serious study], possibly changing the law requiring the University to pay 1/3 of the debt service on new buildings [the President will look into it], impact of the request on the University's bond rating [none, or he won't recommend the request as presently structured], and if there would be cross-subsidies to fund the buildings [no]).

Professor Bloomfield then turned the discussion to the priorities the Committee had discussed earlier. He emphasized that these were not points of conflict with the administration, but rather issues of importance to the faculty and on which the faculty wished to work with the administration.

- Maintaining the upward movement of faculty salaries: the previous administration had made a commitment on this issue; the sense of the commitment was that the first dollars in the budget would go to faculty raises each year until the target was met, a three-year process.
- Health insurance, especially affordable access to U of M providers: this is a hot-button issue, and includes the stability of care as well as care for faculty who travel and who are on leave. The President observed that the increase in cost to stay with University physicians was "staggering" and said it was on his agenda. He said he also wished to look at employee options for disability and life insurance; at many institutions, additional insurance can be purchased cheaply without a physical examination. The lack of a University voice in establishing the State Health Plan options was noted, as was the fact that the University is paying huge premiums to other providers while its own health center faced severe financial constraints. The President promised to look into the issue.
- The trade off between O&M and ICR funding, and its consequences for the stability of the research enterprise: part of the problem is that this is not well understood by faculty, and part is that there is a real concern that while state dollars are stable, units with more grant funds are being forced to put more of their operating expenses on ICR funds, which is an unstable situation. The President said

he wanted to look, later, at IMG, that he was concerned about ICR and O&M funding and wanted to look into the issue, and that careful thought was required about hard and soft funding.

The question of the use of, and the need to keep track of ICR funding was raised, as was the need for ensuring there was continued support for research, irrespective of the source of funds. The question of attribution of ICR funds, when multiple departments are involved in a project, was also raised.

- Assuring proper consultation about the core activities of the University: there is a task force at work on how to ensure that appropriate issues get attention and that concerns of the previous provostries are aired; there is sensitivity to the time required of consultation on the part of senior officers. President Yudof said FCC must think about its relationship with other committees, but that the administration would respond favorably to any structure the faculty thought appropriate.
- Reversing the slip in NRC rankings over the past 20 years: the President said he has asked for an analysis of the rankings in U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, which seem to be "voodoo social science." The only way to increase the University's rankings there would be to cut 5000 students and be coercive on graduation on 4-5 years. Despite the bad public relations, it would be unwise for the University to set policy based on the rankings, because they leave out, for example, General College and outreach; it is best to take the bad PR and do what the University does best. With respect to the NRC rankings, the President said, the humanities must be improved and he is talking with Dean Davis about improving the physical sciences.
- How to balance tenure track faculty with term/P&A employees: this is a big issue, profession-wide; who should the faculty talk with in the central administration? President Yudof said that Dr. Bruininks would handle this issue; there is no obvious solution, and he would like the faculty's help on the matter. He added that it does not work well to have second-class citizens.
- More effective public relations: The Committee is actively thinking about this and would like a briefing at a future meeting. The question of central versus collegiate versus AHC activities was mentioned by Professor Bland; it may be that the units are doing a lot because they do not see central administration doing enough. President Yudof said public relations may have been a casualty of retrenchments and there may be insufficient resources available. Historically, Professor Gardner pointed out, PR has been seen by the administration as immoral, and the institution has suffered from that. This is an area where the faculty could help, Professor Bloomfield observed; the President agreed.
- Repairing shared governance and trust between faculty and regents: The President noted he had proposals from FCC about more interaction and ex officio representation on the regents' committees, and said he wished to think about them.
- Faculty indemnification policy: Insurance policies seem to be "glaringly inadequate," Professor Bloomfield told the President. There is a real lack of trust that the General Counsel will stand behind faculty if there are other University interests at stake; in a litigious environment, this is a matter of increasing concern. The President agreed the issue needed examination; he noted that there is a question of trust, and another of reimbursement of the winning side (which is not a part of

U.S. law). He cautioned that there could be some disagreement on this matter.

- Mistrust of the finance and operations bureaucracy in Morrill Hall: There is a natural tension here, Professor Bloomfield observed; what is seen as the common good may differ. This issue needs to be on the table. The President said this needs creative thinking; Senior Vice President Jackson is thinking about ways to address it. Professor Hamilton pointed out that issues go through consultation, but the way they are handled lead to mistrust and anger. He agreed with the President that the faculty position would not always prevail; the President also said that there must be full and elaborate consultation to be sure a policy is appropriate, and that they will try to be as right as they can. Part of this is public relations, and how the faculty are educated, Professor Hamilton pointed out. By the same token, there will be a benefit to taking action on health care, even if the effort does not succeed.

Professors Hamilton and Gardner maintained that many decisions come to departments as burdens and without notice. Professor Gardner said such obligations (e.g., salary increases) reduce the funds that can be used for faculty support. Professor Bloomfield observed that faculty have the responsibility for striking a balance between the number of faculty, salaries, and support services-- and they invariably choose to add faculty, rather than make the lives of those already here more productive. It is a logical strategy to protect funds, when everything else can be retrenched. The President said he has heard a lot about the lack of supplies, and learned that there have been voluntary cuts in the face of retrenchments. One could tell units they cannot cut below a certain level, which is paternalistic; there have been funds added this year. He agreed that this is an issue that needed attention. He also asked that Professor Bland provide him research. Professor Bland suggested that this was an area, perhaps, in which it would be appropriate for the University to set guidelines as to the expected support staff, supplies, etc., per faculty member and ask departments to justify cuts below this level.

Professor Bloomfield thanked the President for joining the meeting.

4. Miscellany and Report of the Senate Research Committee Chair

Professor Bloomfield announced that he was canceling the meetings on October 16 in order to permit FCC and SCC members to attend the panel on "The Future of Large Research Universities" in Rarig Center at 2:00.

It was agreed, apropos the faculty indemnification issue, that the Committee should meet with a representative of Risk Management at its next meeting.

At this point Professor Kuhi reported for the Senate Research Committee (SRC). Issues of concern will be:

- Several issues associated with ICR: the intermingling of funds and loss of identification of ICR monies; the impact on units; the huge variation in overhead rates on different parts of the campus and from different funding agencies.
- Intellectual property rights: a draft policy is coming.

- The "exceptional status" of the University with respect to NIH.
- Continuing positive progress on conversion of paper to electronic records.

Professor Bland inquired about the role of SRC in training for investigators; Professor Hamilton said it was an independent activity receiving very bad press. Others did not agree it was quite so bad, but there was agreement that the narrow, picky, auditor-like focus of the training was annoying and that it could be much more positive. Committee members agreed the training needed attention, and that the roles and responsibilities document needed substantial revision. The possibility of a faculty handbook was raised in connection with this matter; it was thought that a well-edited index to the web might be as helpful. Professor Gardner cautioned that SRC needed to be careful about treatment of ICR funds with respect to the Experiment Stations.

5. Committee Discussion of Priorities for the Year

Professor Bloomfield then reviewed the assignment of issues to various individuals and committees:

Health care: SCFA, AAUP, with support from the Senate office for Professor Hamilton's working group.

Consultation: the task force, with several FCC representatives on it

Intellectual future of the University, including distance education: Senate committees, plus Harvey Peterson, Matthew Tirrell, Laura Koch, and perhaps Kenneth Keller, if he is willing.

Balance between tenure-track and term faculty: Senate committees plus Carole Bland, Russell Hobbie, and Michael Korth.

External public relations and internal communication: Carole Bland and Gary Gardner.

Repairing shared governance and regental/faculty relations: Victor Bloomfield and Matthew Tirrell.

Forums for discussing departmental post-tenure review standards: SCFA and the Tenure Subcommittee. There is need for a broader perspective than simply the rules; FCC should sponsor forums to discuss appropriate post-tenure expectations. Professor Gardner suggested the primary responsibility belongs to SCFA, which should look at the Senate policy on annual merit evaluations and perhaps reconsider allowing a department to opt out (thus having no peer review); if there are effective annual reviews with peer participation, those could form the basis of post-tenure review and avoid a lot of committees and faculty bureaucracy. Professor Davis urged that the faculty take the initiative on this, and bring a proposal to their dean, rather than vice-versa. There appeared to be Committee assent to this proposition, and that FCC and SCFA should clear about faculty empowerment rather than accepting imposition of a system by the deans or chancellors. Professor Bloomfield said he would speak with Professor Bales about proceeding promptly.

After brief discussion, the Committee concluded it would not become involved in the allocation or assignment of space.

Professor Bloomfield then adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota