

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
April 7, 1988**

Present: Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Warren Ibele, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, W. Phillips Shively (chair), James VanAlstine

Guests: none

**1. Report of the Chair**

Professor Shively reported that he had several items for the Committee.

-- The "lame duck" committee (outgoing Committee members plus the outgoing chair) has nominated Shirley Clark to serve as chair of FCC and SCC for 1988-89 and Mark Brenner to serve as vice-chair. The formal election will be held at a future meeting.

-- The Committee needs to make an immediate decision on whether or not to do a readership survey for Footnote. It was agreed that rather than do a survey, an issue of Footnote in the near future would include a tear-off slip to be returned to the chair of the Committee; the slip would ask questions about whether or not Footnote responds to reader interests and ask for suggestions for additional topics. Footnote will be coming out more quickly next year because of a move to desktop publishing.

-- The Committee agreed that its minutes should be sent to heads of departments and the deans as a way to better communicate with the faculty.

-- Professor Shively handed out copies of a document which had been distributed to legislators which proposed spending from the reserves in fashion and amount quite different from the way it had been generally agreed would be the case after the joint meeting of FCC and Senate Finance on April 4. The origin and use of the document seemed to be somewhat of a mystery, so the Committee agreed that Professor Shively should monitor the evolving financial proposals and, if necessary, register a strong written protest should the disparity in figures cause political damage, or should the eventual figures deviate significantly from the consensus that had evolved between the two committees and central administration.

It appears that the most recent version of the budget principles for 1988-89 will recommend a 4% faculty salary increase and an additional .25% held for retention. The 4% will be delivered to the colleges, not the departments. The source of the funds will be the SEE monies; according to Professor Shively, President Sauer will recommend that SEE increases be targeted rather than delivered across the board. The Committee asked Professor Shively to write to President Sauer and tell him the FCC believes the 4% should be delivered to the filled line items.

---

\* 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.

The Committee also asked Professor Shively to remind President Sauer that FCC and Faculty Affairs had always been consulted on the principle of delivery of salary increases and that the lost 1/2% of faculty salaries (from the last unallocation) should be memorialized in writing.

-- Professor Shively informed the Committee about conversations he had had with the Regents about the procedure for conducting the presidential search.

## **2. Search Committee Membership, Vice President for Finance**

Professor Phillips distributed a list of names that had been assembled by the nominating subcommittee. He said they had assumed that the search committee should be small, no more than 6 - 8 people; FCC members concurred in this view. The Committee also agreed that in the case of this particular vice presidency, constituent representation on the search committee was less important than on others; it was more important that the appropriate technical expertise be present.

After discussion, the Committee agreed on a list of individuals to be forwarded to President Sauer.

## **3. Nominees for Vice Chair of the University Senate**

The Committee discussed various individuals and agreed to a rank-ordered list of three people who would be approached about accepting nomination as Vice Chair of the Senate.

## **4. Membership on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee**

Before considering the membership of the advisory committee, Professor Shively was asked if there would be any role for the Faculty Consultative Committee in the search once the advisory committee was appointed. He said he believed that FCC would be included among the groups who would interview any finalists brought to the campus. Other than that, it would not be involved other than to try to ensure that the procedural integrity of the search is preserved. He also said he thought one of the current members of FCC should be appointed to the advisory committee, although with the clear understanding that the individual chosen would respect the confidentiality of the search even with FCC.

The Committee reaffirmed its view that the membership composition of the advisory committee should be the same as it was structured for the last search: 8 faculty, 3 students, 1 civil service member, and 1 professional/administrative member. The Committee was also of the view that the student membership should include a graduate student (as was also the case with the last search) and a student from a coordinate campus.

As for the faculty to be appointed, there was accord that one or two regents' professors and a representative from a principal coordinate campus Faculty Consultative Committee should be included. The Committee also agreed that no one serving in an administrative capacity above the level of department head would be considered for appointment as a faculty member to the advisory committee.

Professor Shively asked Committee members to bring to the next meeting the names of faculty members who should be considered for appointment to the advisory committee.

**5. Miscellaneous**

In response to a question, Professor Clark said she had no confidence that the Finance Committee would be kept apprised of numbers concerning the University's budget.

There was brief discussion again of the spending from the reserves, including the deletion or omission of money for several items of concern and the smallness of the allocation for Commitment to Focus.

The Committee agreed to continue the discussion of personnel items at its next meeting.

The Committee adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota