

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Thursday, December 17, 1992
3:15 p.m., 606 Campus Club**

Present: Carl Adams (chair), Daniel Canafax, Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Roger Feldman, Steve Laursen, Richard McGehee, Michael Sadowsky, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, Michael Wade

Guest: Robert Fahnhorst, Senior Vice President E. F. Infante

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m. and immediately turned to the first item on the agenda.

Health Care Subcommittee Report

Professor McGehee, chair of the Health Care Subcommittee, presented an interim report. The Health Care Subcommittee, he said, was appointed early Fall quarter by SCFA to study the question of whether such a subcommittee should exist, and if so, to recommend its charge and composition. The subcommittee was unanimous in its recommendation that:

1. A standing subcommittee of SCFA should be established to monitor University employee health care benefits. The subcommittee should be appointed by the chair of SCFA and should represent the constituency of that committee.
2. The charge to the subcommittee should be:
 - a. to review and monitor the health care benefits and to report important issues to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs,
 - b. to articulate the position of the University community and to communicate this position to the University administration and, through it, to the State agencies which determine the health care benefits,
 - c. to investigate ways to increase the University's ability to influence health care decisions at the State.

The subcommittee, Professor McGehee said, had no difficulty determining a charge and realized during its discussions the importance of establishing such a committee to address the many pressing issues facing the University. One example, Professor McGehee cited, was the merger between Group Health and MedCenters. While the subcommittee may have had no effect on the outcome, its members believe the comfort level of faculty would be higher had the subcommittee existed last spring and been given an opportunity to discuss the issue.

The subcommittee made no recommendation regarding the breadth of representation, but

*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.

suggested that issue be addressed early in its deliberations. The unionized employees, Professor McGehee said, are already well represented at this time. The subcommittee needs to address its limits of responsibility (i.e. should it represent non-represented groups?) The subcommittee's initial idea, Professor McGehee said, was that it should represent the same constituency as SCFA and develop liaisons among other constituencies.

The subcommittee will evaluate the issue of representation further and bring a recommendation to SCFA.

With no further discussion, the report was accepted.

Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy and Grievance Advisory Program

Professor Adams reviewed developments with regard to the closing of the Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy and Grievance Advisory Program. With the resignation of the director, Dr. Maurine Venters, and the Grievance Policy and Procedures under review, SCFA recommended the program be placed on hold pending completion of the grievance review. The office was officially closed on November 30, and calls and mail are being taken by the Senate Office. Individuals seeking assistance will be referred to either Professor Fred Morrison, University Grievance Officer, or Mr. Jim Meland, director of the Faculty Assistance Program.

In response to a question about the existing network of advocates, Professor Adams said he did not know the extent of the network but would contact Dr. Venters to discuss it. In any event, a letter will be sent to faculty and academic professionals apprising them of the changes in the program.

As the grievance policy is reviewed, SCFA will be expected to make a recommendation regarding the continued need for a grievance advisory office. There was strong sentiment for keeping the office, if renewed, independent from central administration.

It was also agreed that some funds should be retained pending a decision on the program's future.

Faculty Compensation Policy

Professor Adams reviewed the development of the Faculty Compensation Policy which was adopted by the Faculty Senate on May 21, 1992. The policy was subsequently forwarded to central administration for consideration and a number of concerns surfaced. To address these concerns, central administration has proposed amended language for SCFA's review. Professor Adams then welcomed Senior Vice President Infante to present the amendments and answer questions.

Dr. Infante said he sees two areas of difference between the policy adopted by the Faculty Senate and central administration's amended document.

- The first involves the language relating to the level of faculty involvement. Dr. Infante said there was concern that the language in the original document could be interpreted to mean faculty set salaries and the amended language was intended to offer clarification.

- The second involves the language relating to across-the-board increases. The amended language again was intended to offer clarification. The vice presidents, Dr. Infante said, interpreted the original language to mean across-the-board increases would be mandatory. While they do not want to rule out the possibility of across-the-board increases, they do not want to be tied into a mandated situation.

The amended language under Allocation Format appears to rule out an across-the-board increase, noted one member. Dr. Infante responded that there actually could be two "increase pools"--one for merit and one for across-the-board adjustments. The administration did not feel it was necessary to include language concerning the increase pool for across-the-board adjustments because dollars set aside for those increases must be used for that purpose and as the term suggests, must be given "across-the-board." There is no flexibility in how that money is distributed. SCFA then amended the language, as follows, to clarify that only the increase pool for meritorious performance is being addressed in the policy. A footnote will be added to clarify why the across-the-board component is excluded.

"Each year the annual salary increase pool for meritorious performance received by the unit will be distributed based on the criteria specified in the University's Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure and appropriate departmental faculty evaluation documents."

The Faculty Involvement section received considerable attention. Central administration's language requires faculty be given the opportunity to participate in the salary determination process "through normal faculty consultative processes," however, it was noted, many departments do not have such processes in place, and some that do are inadequate, thus leaving decisions to the department heads. The original language gave faculty an active role in constructing the format or guidelines for salary determination and annual reviews.

Dr. Infante said he believes that by requiring the documents describing the criteria and process to be shared, faculty consultation is guaranteed.

Professor Adams said he did not believe the Faculty Senate envisioned faculty making the final decisions with regard to salaries, but did want to ensure the opportunity for faculty input into the process. He did not think the faculty would find normal consultative processes to be a good substitute for faculty having responsibility for determining what appropriate processes should take place.

The deans, Dr. Carrier said, were concerned with the term "salary determination" because they did not want a mandate that faculty be involved in individual salary determinations. There were no objections to faculty participation in establishing a process, however.

SCFA agreed the policy was not intended to give faculty the authority to set individual salaries. The key objective was to develop a mechanism for information sharing and to give faculty the opportunity to develop the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which the annual salary increases are determined. Normal consultative processes might not allow that. Involvement should be an option and some faculty will choose not to take advantage of the opportunity.

Discussion turned to the sentence in the Faculty Involvement section dealing with outcomes . . . The format for making salary decisions must assure that salary determinations are carried out in a

consultative manner, and that faculty members within the unit have the opportunity to participate in the salary discussion and determination process as a committee-of-the-whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members. . . .

When Dr. Infante was asked if a department proposed such a committee, would the administration consider that acceptable, he said he believed it would, and in fact, believes many departments already have such committees. Some members felt that if the process was agreed upon, it should not be necessary to prescribe outcomes. One individual said his recollection from the May 21, Faculty Senate meeting was that that sentence was specifically discussed. To delete it, he said, may mean the policy will not be accepted by that body.

Dr. Carrier was concerned that the sentence prescribes process, and conflicts with the earlier language relating to "opportunities for involvement."

SCFA agreed to leave the sentence out of its amended motion and to prepare an amendment giving the Faculty Senate an opportunity to discuss and possibly reinsert the language in the document.

A motion was then approved to amend the Faculty Involvement section as follows:

Faculty input into the discussions surrounding criteria and procedures for salary increase determination is essential to maintaining an equitable and collegial environment. With the administrator of each unit, the faculty must have the opportunity to develop the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which annual salary increases are determined. The documents that describe these criteria, formats, and processes shall be shared with the college dean, the appropriate vice president, and finally the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. This process must include the provision that the department chair (unit leader) meet with each faculty member individually, at least once per year, to review his or her performance. The sessions shall review the past year's performance and offer suggestions for enhancing productivity, where appropriate. Units may choose to conduct more in depth evaluations on a periodic basis (e.g. 4 or 5 years) that would include outside evaluations.

A final amendment in the Promotion Increases section changed the funding source from central administration to the colleges and clarified that the promotional increments would be in addition to the annual salary increase award related to meritorious performance. The amended language was accepted with little discussion.

The policy, as amended, was then approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

-- Martha Kvanbeck