

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
September 26, 1991**

- Present: Thomas Scott (chair), Mario Bognanno, Amos Deinard, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, Stanford Lehmborg, Karen Seashore Louis, Charlotte Striebel, Shirley Zimmerman
- Guests: Associate Vice President Carol Carrier, Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), Maureen Smith (Brief), a Daily reporter

1. Eligibility for Bush Sabbaticals

Professor Scott called the meeting to order at 12:40 and began by reviewing the process which had led to the proposal that individuals be eligible to receive a Bush sabbatical more than once; he then turned to Associate Vice President Carrier to explain the concerns of her office.

Dr. Carrier explained that there are limited funds available for the Bush sabbaticals and inquired whether it is better to provide opportunities more than once to some individuals or to spread the opportunities among more faculty by limiting eligibility to once per individual. She then reviewed the process by which applicants are chosen (eligibility limited to tenured faculty who are eligible for a sabbatical; the proposal must demonstrate an impact on undergraduate education; an all-University committee examines the proposals, ranks them, and the top-ranked proposals are awarded a Bush). The award is \$15,000 or 30% of the B-based salary, whichever is greater. It was noted that this award, in combination with regular sabbatical support, brings the sabbatical salary to 80% of the B-base. Dr. Carrier pointed out that the financial issue is critical for a lot of faculty who go on sabbatical, and for many this is the only supplement they can readily obtain; to restrict eligibility will ensure that more faculty are able to take advantage of the opportunity.

The Committee discussed briefly the status of those who apply more than once and whether or not it is appropriate for the review committee to take that factor into account.

A larger question, it was said, is whether the Bush should continue to be linked to undergraduate education; that link was necessary in order to obtain the original Bush Foundation funding, but inasmuch as the University now provides all the funding, it may be time to inquire if it must continue. If the goal is to maximize the number of recipients, and the impact on undergraduate education, then no repeat awards should be permitted. If, however, the award were to be based on research productivity, then repeat awards should be permitted based on performance.

This question, it was suggested, is linked to the other changes in sabbatical policies recommended last year by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, approved by this Committee, and endorsed by Academic Affairs--with the caveat that funding is not currently available to implement them. Several Committee members concurred, and expressed the view that there should be no change in the

* 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.

Bush eligibility this year; any changes proposed should be in the context of a larger review of changes in sabbaticals.

It was argued that the change should be adopted, however, because at present the policy encourages those who jump among universities and against those who stay at Minnesota for a long time. Moreover, it is procedurally unwise to override the recommendations of the two other Senate committees that reviewed the proposal and acted favorably on it; such action by this Committee undermines their work. Professor Scott agreed and said he would apologize to the two other committees; he also pointed out that the action proposed here was to delay action for one year.

The Committee voted 8-1 in favor of recommending no change in the Bush sabbatical eligibility for 1991-92.

Professor Scott thanked Dr. Carrier for joining the meeting.

2. Senate Committee, Staff, and Budget Matters

Professor Scott next reviewed with the Committee members the discussions he had with Senate and Assembly committee chairs in a recent meeting. He noted the changes in the budgeting and staffing of the Senate and Assembly and their committees, observing that the objective of providing staff support to all committees will now be met.

He also explained that all committee chairs have been asked to provide a tentative agenda for the year, in order to better coordinate activities, and they have also been invited to the first Senate meeting to be introduced and to present the agenda items.

Professor Scott also told the Committee that the SCC will have to develop a process for reviewing special requests from committees for projects which require funding. He reviewed the general outlines of the Senate budget for the Committee.

3. Use of Footnote

Professor Scott then sought suggestions from Committee members for articles for Footnote (several were suggested). He said he would ask for invited columns and would also like committee chairs to use it as a medium for making interim reports on issues they are considering. He noted that Footnote is an organ of the governance system and is distributed to all 5800 faculty and P&A appointees and appears to serve as an important vehicle of communication.

4. Discussion of Budget and Personnel Items

Professor Scott at this point asked that the meeting be closed for a discussion of personnel and budget matters. Committee members discussed the role of the Committee in the development and presentation of the budget and the quality of its interaction with senior administrators.

It was agreed that a "mini-retreat" with senior administrators to audit the various program changes that have occurred would be useful: What has happened in the units that have gained and lost funds over the last several years? What programs have been affected?

It was agreed that there would be no FCC meeting on October 3; the SCC meeting would be held as scheduled.

Professor Scott then received advice from Committee members on a matter concerning the search committee for the Director of Men's Athletics.

It was agreed that Senior Vice President Infante should be scheduled to meet regularly with FCC; he has expressed an interest in doing so and the Committee would welcome him.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota