

## MINUTES

### SENATE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (SCFA)

Thursday, October 22, 1998

3:00-5:00 p.m.

229 Nolte Center

Present: Kent Bales (Chair), Josef Altholz, Gary Balas, Gerry Baldrige, Avner Ben-Ner, Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Robert Fahnhorst, John Fossum, Cleon Melsa, Anne Pick, Richard Purple, Caroline Turner

Absent: James Perry,

Regrets: Carol Chomsky, Eville Gorham, Roland Guyotte, Janet Holdsworth, Marcia Pankake, Geoffrey Sirc, Thomas Walsh

Guests: None

Others: None

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.

[Meeting topics: Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents' Policy on Faculty Development Leaves, Report of the Joint Committee on Academic Appointments, B-base Appointment Dates Under the Semester System]

#### **1. Minutes**

The October 1 minutes were approved with no corrections.

#### **2. Chair's Report**

Professor Bales reported that the Joint Committee on Academic Appointments Report had been presented to the Finance and Planning, Educational Policy, and Faculty Consultative Committees. Neither of the first two committees was able to endorse the report at this time and both encouraged the Joint Committee to consult with deans and department heads to ascertain their input and address a number of other concerns they raised.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has directed SCFA to draft and approve a set of procedures for academic leaves for presentation to the Faculty Senate on November 5.

#### **3. Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents' Policy on Faculty Development Leaves**

Professor Bales distributed proposed administrative procedures and gave committee members some time to review the draft as they had not had an opportunity to do so prior to the meeting. He noted several editorial corrections and told of some changes proposed by the Faculty Consultative Committee and Vice Provost Robert Jones.

A recommendation was made to include in the "Purpose" section language that recognizes the changing times and the need for faculty to acquire new skills and knowledge in order to discharge their duties in the best possible manner. In this regard, it is in the best interests of the University to provide better means for faculty development and wider use of faculty development leaves.

Turning to the "Grievance" section, a question was raised as to whether faculty can grieve denials of sabbatical leaves. The policy, said Professor Bales, states that they can. Some members took exception to the language as written because it says that "repeated" denials are grievable, and they argued that a single denial denied in bad faith should be grievable. Thus, a motion to delete the word "repeated" in Section IV was moved and approved. Professor Bales pointed out that this does not conform to the policy that was approved by the Faculty Senate on October 15, although as an interim policy, it can be modified. The committee further amended the document to add that violations of the procedures are also grievable.

Concerns were expressed that the proposed language in Section IV does not conform to the University Grievance Policy. After some discussion, Professor Altholz was given authorization to make appropriate modifications to the grievance section and circulate the changes to members via email.

SCFA further recommended including after the "Purpose" section a description of the two kinds of leaves to avoid any ambiguity, and a reordering of the document for clarity purposes. Professor Bales will make these changes.

**The interim administrative procedures, as amended, were then unanimously approved.**

#### **4. Report of the Joint Committee on Academic Appointments**

Professor Bales reported that the Joint Committee made a brief presentation to the Faculty Senate on October 15, but due to the President's Address very little time was available for discussion. The Committee intends to present its preliminary report at the November 5 Senate meeting, at which time it hopes to have a good discussion with senators.

It appears, said Professor Bales, that the real sticking point is that the recommendations dilute, and in other ways modify, the concept of faculty as we know it. There is great resistance to modifying the job classification. Professor Bales believes much of the worry is a reflexive response. It has become clear that the Joint Committee needs to spend more time on the political and consultative process before moving for action on any recommendations.

The perception appeared favorable at the October 15 Senate meeting, said Professor Purple; however, the time was very short. The Joint Committee prepared a two-page guide that was very helpful and should be attached to the report at the time of distribution.

Professor Bland added that the Joint Committee modified the proposed areas for resolutions section to say, "all personnel who spend significant time teaching and directing research would be placed in appropriate academic appointments..." In essence, this defines "faculty." The intention, she said, is not to include employees who spend all of their time on research. She then briefly reviewed the work of the Joint Committee, including the data collected and dangers of

continuing current trends and conditions. To ensure there isn't an imbalance of people in non-tenure track positions, the Joint Committee also recommended limits for units and the University as a whole.

Some cautioned against trying to define the term "faculty" and suggested that some decisions will need to be made at the local level concerning whether a person fits the criteria. Others felt a clear definition of who will be included is necessary if faculty are to support the proposal. Questions were also raised about enlarging the faculty count and the resulting affect on the faculty-student ratio and with the legislature.

Mr. Baldrige reported that the Academic Staff Advisory Committee found the revised report more favorable, both in tone and content. He noted that there appears to be some internal inconsistencies in the document concerning whether or not someone involved in research, but not teaching, will be reclassified. He suggested that the document be amended to clearly state the intent.

#### **5. B-base Appointment Dates Under the Semester System**

Vice President Carrier reviewed the discussion from the October 1 SCFA meeting concerning the appointment dates for B-base faculty under the semester system and presented two proposals based on the feedback from the previous discussion. It was her suggestion that the University not set a specific start date but instead set a point in time, such as the Monday prior to Labor Day, in order for employees to receive a full first paycheck. Also, benefit deductions would not be affected under this model.

Under a set date model, both the size of the first and last paychecks and benefit deductions would be affected. Vice President Carrier discussed the option of prorating or delaying the benefit deduction from the first paycheck. It can be done, however, it would involve extensive programming and the University could be left in a position where benefits were provided but not paid for if an employee leaves the University.

There was some discussion about the effect on summer grants, but members agreed that under either model faculty would know well in advance of the yearly appointment dates.

**With little further discussion, the committee overwhelmingly approved the proposal to begin B-base appointment dates on the Monday prior to Labor Day.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

-- Martha Kvanbeck