

MINUTES***SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS****Thursday, April 21, 1994****3:15 - 5:00 p.m.****238 Morrill Hall**

- Present:** Carl Adams (chair), Carole Bland, Daniel Canafax, Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Robert Fahnhorst (for Dianne Mulvihill), Daniel Feeney, Judith Gaston, Audrey Grosch, Morris Kleiner, Richard McGehee, Michael Sadowsky, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, James Stone
- Regrets:** Rose Brewer, Roger Paschke, Yang Wang
- Absent:** Roger Feldman, Dianne Mulvihill, Phuong Phan
- Guests:** Sara Evans, Eric Klinger, Albert Yonas, Martha Kvanbeck

1. Continued Discussion on Compensation Subcommittee Report

Ms. Judith Gaston, subcommittee chair, reminded committee members that the subcommittee had examined several issues related to compensation, including the clarity of the compensation plan instructions, the notion of equal treatment of all employees, and the issue of merit versus across-the-board decisions. Associate Vice President Carol Carrier met with the subcommittee to discuss the rationale behind the salary increases. The subcommittee realized during the course of its deliberations that one aspect of the compensation policy had not been implemented. It involved the establishment of a standing administrative and faculty compensation committee (including representatives of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee) to examine and make recommendations on policies such as salary levels in the University as a whole, salary disparity among units, minimum salary levels for associate and full professors, and salary compression.

The subcommittee urged the SCFA to encourage the administration to implement this portion of the policy. Ms. Gaston noted that a policy similar to the Faculty Compensation Policy had been developed for academic staff employees and the corresponding P&A committee had not been established either. One person said he understood compensation review was occurring at the departmental level. Others, however, expressed concern that some departments may be ignoring such directives and should be monitored.

The committee agreed that Professor Adams would prepare a letter to President Hasselmo and the FCC encouraging the establishment of the committee as outlined in the Faculty Compensation Policy. The letter should include a notation that the option for faculty contribution in the process may not be

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at 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.

consistently heeded. A request that the administration assess the adherence to the policy would be appropriate.

Next, the committee discussed the issue of the 2.5/5.25% salary increase for civil service personnel versus the 6% faculty/P&A increase. Professor Adams said it was his understanding that the rationale for the difference in the percentage increases was to provide an equal increase to the total salary base over a particular period of time for both groups. The subcommittee was not convinced that the salary increase differences were equitable. Chair Adams said the faculty increases were decided by the administration based on what the University could afford given the current financial environment. The civil service increase was primarily determined by the collective bargaining process. SCFA members felt that if the compensation committee had been in place, faculty would have had greater involvement in the process.

The subcommittee also discussed the desirability of faculty to be involved in decisions concerning merit versus across-the-board increases. One person asked at what level decisions about across-the-board pay increases are determined. Professor Adams responded that they are made at the all-University level by central administration and not by academic units.

Further concern was expressed about the disparity of salaries between faculty at the University and the State University System. It was agreed that Dave Berg (Management Planning and Information Services) will be invited to the next meeting to present information on this issue. The chair said that he would also include this matter in his memo to the President.

2. Minutes

A motion was approved to accept the minutes from the April 7 meeting.

3. Chair's Report

Professor Adams reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilitating Transitions for Maturing Faculty was scheduled to meet the next day with Vice Presidents Infante and Erickson. Professor Adams will also raise at that meeting issues concerning health care-- particularly, the level of argument that may be needed with respect to the SCFA's suggestion to explore an independent health care plan for University employees.

A number of position searches, said Professor Adams, are nearing completion. One obstacle in the search for a Health Sciences Provost was meeting salary requirements. The candidates for Vice President for External Relations and Associate to the President are expected to be announced soon.

In response to a question about the reorganization in central administration, Professor Adams said he also thought that was close to resolution.

4. Continued Discussion of Meeting with the President

Professor Carole Bland distributed copies of a revised draft proposal for the SCFA's meeting with the President. [Refer to previous minutes for prior discussion.]

The committee's attention was drawn to the final paragraph of the proposal, "meeting format," in which the subcommittee recommends the meeting with President Hasselmo and senior administrators be held in a location outside of Morrill Hall. The proposal recommends using a nominal group process or an affinity diagram approach to reach a consensus on the problems, as opposed to presenting action items. A number of committee members recommended using an outside mediator for this meeting.

Issues related to determining the success and content of the meeting included:

- The goal of the meeting should be to reach agreement with the President that a problem does exist
- All should acknowledge that the administration and faculty currently have different visions, goals, and values
- The meeting should be considered successful if the administration considers the issue important enough to maintain an ongoing dialogue
- The SCFA needs to consider the importance of administrators' opinions and their related actions
- Individual incidents help to add substance to the problems perceived by faculty
- The committee wants to clearly communicate that Associate Vice President Carrier has more than adequately represented the administration on the committee and it should be clearly understood that the quality of her service is in no way associated with the need for the meeting with the President
- The President should limit his contingent of senior administrators at the meeting to 3-6

Professor Bland recommended that the values and perceptions listed on the "Attachment" be reordered, and mentioned that these items are symptoms and not issues the SCFA wishes to address.

The committee decided to approach the meeting by alluding to specific incidents to develop consensus that a problem does exist.

5. Discussion of the University's Research Mission in Workload Policy

Professor Adams welcomed Professors Sara Evans, Erick Klinger, and Albert Yonas of the Senate Research Committee to discuss the University's research mission in workload Policy. Professor Yonas directed the committee's attention to the draft Resolution on Research Climate distributed with the agenda. The resolution was developed, he said, because the Research Committee believes there are a number of impediments for faculty to conducting research at the University. One of them is workload. Some faculty schedules do not adequately permit time for research activities other than during the summer months. As committee members know, the Tenure Code requires assistant professors to prove quality scholarship and research to receive tenure, but in reality there often is not enough time during the normal work week to adequately perform research activities. The proposed

resolution addresses this concern. As the University works to strengthen undergraduate education, the Research Committee does not want the institution to lose its reputation as a facility that creates new knowledge.

One person suggested the phrase "rule of thumb" in the final paragraph of the resolution weakens the document and recommended different phrasing. Professor Klinger responded that precise criteria could not be applied to all departments because of variations that exist. The development of departmental workload policies which do not give some faculty sufficient time to conduct research inspired the Research Committee to draft the resolution. It was not crafted to imply that there was a minimum amount of research each faculty member should conduct. The proposal does recommend that time to conduct research be allowed for those who want and/or need to do so. In response to other comments, Professor Yonas recommended that specific suggestions be sent to him via e-mail (yonas@vx.acs.umn.edu) before the joint SCFA/Research Committee meeting on May 26. Some of the comments included issues of unfairness and maintaining the heritage of a research university.

The joint SCFA/Research Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 26, 3:15 - 5:00 p.m., 238 Morrill Hall.

- Kevin Gormley