

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, October 24, 1996**  
**1:30 - 2:45**  
**Room 475 Law School**

Present: Virginia Gray (chair), Carl Adams, Carole Bland, Victor Bloomfield, Gary Davis, Sara Evans, Dan Feeney, Russell Hobbie, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Korth, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson, Michael Steffes, Craig Swan

Regrets: W. Andrew Collins, Matthew Tirrell

Others: Nicole Boldt, Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate); Maureen Smith (University Relations)

**1. Introductions and Closed Session**

Professor Gray convened the meeting at 1:35, welcomed the new FCC member from Duluth, Professor Gary Davis, and then noted that the first portion of the meeting would be a strategy session; she invited a motion to close the meeting. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to close the meeting.

During the closed portion of the meeting, the Committee considered the three resolutions from the committees about tenure and the merits of proposing a separate motion from FCC itself. Reports on meetings with legislators and with the President were also made.

**2. Various Items of Business**

Professor Gray reported that she had received a letter from Vice President Boston telling her that the Committee was misinformed about the Coke contract and the uses of the money, and that no action will be taken in response to her letter. Professor Hobbie has volunteered to serve on the committee to review proposals for use of some of the Coke funds; Professor Gray accepted his offer.

Professor Gray reported that the Committee has been asked to nominate someone to serve as chair of the Grievance Advisory Committee (which advises the administration on the process, rather than hears grievances). Committee members considered several names, and it was [subsequently] agreed that the issue should be brought to the Senate Consultative Committee for action.

**3. Faculty Seat on the Board of Regents**

Professor Gray said that she and a number of faculty members had discussed the possibility of now seeking a faculty seat on the Board of Regents; if anything is to be done, it must be done promptly.

---

\*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.

She has thought about this for a long time, she commented, because where she went to school the faculty had more than one seat on the board of regents. Several public institutions do have faculty members on their boards, she reported. Moreover, all of the faculty groups appear to favor the idea. Some suggest it could be a conflict of interest; the Group of 19 points out, however, that the faculty bring in more money to the University in research funds than students do in tuition, and faculty therefore have a great stake in how the University is operated--and that stake is jeopardized by the way the Board is now doing things.

Her view is that a faculty member on the Board could help the Board understand and appreciate the role of the faculty. The President is theoretically the head of the faculty, and is to represent the faculty on the Board, but he is pulled in too many directions. This would not, she said, be a threat to the President, however.

The Alumni Association is conducting a study of the selection of Board members; it would be best if they were to conclude that they should recommend appointment of a faculty regent. She has also discussed with Professor Swan the work that would be needed to get a statutory change through the legislature.

Committee members discussed briefly several issues associated with the idea, and concluded that they wished Professor Gray to pursue the matter.

#### **4. Big Ten Faculty Meetings**

Professor Gray reported that Professor Chait, the Regents' consultant on tenure earlier in the year, recently told faculty leaders at Michigan State University that he did not support the tenure proposals the Regents issued at Morris in September, and that he had advised them not to make the proposal.

The faculty from several of the Big Ten schools also reported that they had been told, by their Boards of Regents and presidents, that they--the regents and presidents--were not considering any changes in tenure along the lines that Minnesota has been proposing. This seems to cast doubt on the idea that Minnesota is the first domino to fall, Professor Gray commented. Professor Swan noted that the University of Colorado is waiting with great interest to see what happens at Minnesota; Professor Gray responded that the problems at Colorado go back a number of years and that it is not in the mainstream.

#### **5. Closed Session**

Professor Gray again invited a motion to close the meeting, which was unanimously voted. The Committee discussed at further length their visit to the Crookston campus.

#### **6. 1995-96 Faculty Salary Increases**

Professor Gray recalled that the President, last spring, had said faculty received 3% salary increases; the Committee had said they did not.

The Committee on Finance and Planning, during the summer, was presented data on salary

increases delivered, and it appears, Professor Morrison concluded, that only about 50% of the units complied with the President's guideline of 3%. The Finance and Planning Committee had planned to ask for consultation with the President on the issue, but that was "before tenure blew up." They have postponed consideration of the issue.

Professor Koch pointed out that compliance appeared to be at less than 50%; a number of units did not even deliver as much as was reported. Faculty in CLA and General College, for example, appear not to have received the 1% non-recurring salary increase that was supposedly delivered.

The Committee concluded, after short discussion, that the issue should be raised again next year, but that this was not the time to pursue it. Professor Morrison concluded that the President has never delivered what he promised on compensation during his term of office, and that the provosts paid no attention to the President when it came to delivering compensation.

Professor Gray adjourned the meeting at 2:45 in order for Committee members to attend the Faculty Senate meeting.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota