

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
May 19, 1988**

Present: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Lynnette Mullins, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively (chair), James VanAlstine

Guests: Gayle Grika (Footnote), Geoffrey Maruyama (chair, SCFA)

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Shively began the meeting by removing the Alcohol Policy from the agenda. There was a misunderstanding about it; the policy is intended only to govern Student Affairs units and activities, not the entire campus. The Student Affairs office, however, wished the endorsement of the governance system. It was agreed that the policy should be forwarded to SCC for review.

The Committee agreed to ask Professor Maruyama to join the meeting, if he were available, to discuss the Faculty Assistance Program on the Senate agenda. (Professor Maruyama joined the Committee at 2:00.)

In response to the request that he explore the experience and background of various individuals who might be nominated to serve as vice chair of the Senate, Professor Shively reviewed what he had discovered. The Committee agreed unanimously on the nomination of Professor Michael Steffes in Laboratory Medicine and Pathology. (Professor Steffes was elected at the Senate meeting by acclamation.)

The Committee discussed the implications of recent discussions Professor Shively had had with members of the Board of Regents about the makeup of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee and the procedures that will be used. Among the issues considered were clarification and agreement on the role the advisory committee would play, the role of the Board of Regents in its creation and membership and the extent to which its meetings would be open. It was agreed that Professor Shively would contact additional individuals about serving on the advisory committee.

2. Implementation of the "Academic Priorities"

Professor Shively led off a long conversation about the implementation of the "Academic Priorities" document. He stressed that in his view, if a significant part of the Priorities initiatives were not adopted by the Board of Regents in the next two meetings, there was considerable danger that the entire effort would fall apart. He noted that CTF and Academic Priorities is not something in a box; parts of it have already been adopted and there must be progress on other parts, such as the Faculty of the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering (FASE), the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and the improvements in undergraduate education. He asked members of the Committee if they agreed, and if so,

* 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.

what FCC could do to help the process along.

Committee members agreed with Professor Shively's view. As one Committee member observed, even though they may vary on where they believe progress can be made, all Committee members think the University must make substantial progress in the next two months or CTF will die on the vine--despite strong endorsement from the Regents and President Sauer. One Committee member cautioned that the actions could be real or they could be symbolic; they would be the latter if there were no money; parts of it, however, could be acted on without a lot of money.

There was a brief colloquy among Committee members over whether the creation of the position and appointment of the Vice Provost should follow or precede action on the FASE; while no conclusion was reached, there was acceptance of the point that nothing could be done in time for the development of the 1989-91 biennial request. Concomitantly, however, the Committee appeared to agree that funds for the position of Vice Provost should be identified as quickly as possible. There was strong feeling that another biennium should not go by before steps are taken.

It was suggested that as preparation for the biennial request gets underway, the issues that are seen as important should be included for funding. One Committee member said that in staging the implementation, the first items that should receive funding are those that affect the daily lives of students, especially undergraduates. There should be no hollow organizational changes which have no impact on the lives of the staff and students.

Professor Shively announced that he and those Committee members who had been unwise enough to speak up about this were immediately constituted as an ad hoc committee to meet with the Provost and Associate Provost to determine what was being done and what FCC could do to be of help in pursuing the implementation of CTF and the Academic Priorities.

It was also observed that there were a number of programs and initiatives which were currently being funded out of the reserves and which were on a one-year notice. It would require a lot of money from the legislature to fund those efforts on a recurring basis--a lot of money just to stay where we are. Pulling back would be painful; substantial additional dollars would be required to move forward.

3. Consulting on the Biennial Request

Professor Shively asked about the nature of the joint SFC/SCC meeting scheduled for June 3; is it intended that SFC and SCC have a prepared set of priorities? Professor Clark said not; the intent of the meeting was to come with ideas, identify areas of concern, and develop some sense of the priorities. Normally, FCC/SCC would not be involved, but since Vice President Heydinger had suggested somewhat broader involvement, Professor Clark said she had brought SCC into it. SFC, however, will be the committee involved in the actual development of the request--and, she noted, SFC would be willing to meet as often as necessary to be responsive to the process.

The meeting on June 3 had been set so that the principal administrators could be present and participate.

One Committee member expressed doubt that the consultation would be continuing; after the June

3 meeting it would likely be business as usual. It was suggested that SFC obtain from Vice President Heydinger an explanation or understanding of what role SFC would play all along the way, right to the end of the legislative session.

Committee members deliberated over whether or not they should develop priorities and touched briefly on some of them. Professor Shively suggested that priorities be an agenda item on the June 2, meeting of the Committee. This initial review touched on drawing out elements of the Swan Committee report and faculty salaries. On the latter, one Committee member said one could only be pessimistic; it seems unlikely the state will do anything, even though salaries have been the top or a high priority for a long time. Another Committee member commented that the faculty should not have to push that issue; there should be a sincere effort by the top administration--they should be the leaders. And perhaps, like businesses, they should hire outside salary consultants to advise the University on comparisons and salary levels. It was also suggested that perhaps some non-salary compensation arrangements could be created--departmental payment of professional dues and journals, for example. Another related matter was the proposed cap on fringe benefits (health coverage); in the words of one Committee member, "the \$2000 cap is going to kill us."

Two other subjects which arose in the course of this exchange were the decentralization of fringe benefits (it is costing the departments money, it is affecting personnel decisions, is an administrative mess and it is not working) and consultation on capital items (the Finance Committee is more reactive than on the regular budget).

4. Policy on administrative resignations

Professor Shively distributed to Committee members a copy of the policy adopted by the Senate in May, 1987, which provides that vice presidents are to submit their resignations upon the appointment of a new president. He told the Committee that President Keller had accepted it as operating procedure, although it had not gone to the Board of Regents; he asked if it should do so, and how otherwise is the policy to be considered in place? He also explained that Assistant Vice President Betty Robinett had perceived some difficulties with the policy, although they were of a minor technical nature that could, with very little revision, be ironed out. Comments which appeared to receive the assent of the Committee were that if the President accepted it, the policy should be "in place" and that any new president cannot establish it but must have it already controlling.

It was agreed that Professors Shively and Phillips should raise the subject in their discussion with President Sauer scheduled for next week. It was left open whether or not the policy ought to be brought to the Regents.

5. Salaries of Women Faculty Members

Several members of the Committee reported on a meeting that they had attended with central administrators concerning studies of the salaries of women faculty. Various issues were discussed, including methodology and the manner in which the University might act on the studies.

One Committee member pointed out that whatever was done would be of little value if the University does not also take action on the sorts of proposals that FCC has discussed with the President

and Provost over the past several months; the University will be in exactly the same place in three years if no steps are taken on other fronts.

6. Faculty Assistance Plan

The Committee discussed briefly with Professor Maruyama the information he had gathered after FCC had asked questions about the plan that had been forwarded from SCFA. Agreement was reached that the plan should be approved in principle but referred back to SCFA for possible implementation through existing University offices and resources.

The Committee adjourned at 2:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota