

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
June 15, 1989**

Present: Mark Brenner (chair), W. Andrew Collins, Norman Kerr, Warren Ibele, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Burton Shapiro, W. Phillips Shively, Michael Steffes, Charlotte Striebel, Walter Weyhmann

Guests: Assistant Vice President Carol Carrier, Tim Delmont (MPIS)

1. Bush Sabbaticals

Because Professor Brenner would be late in arriving, Professor Price convened the meeting and welcomed Assistant Vice President Carrier to the Committee. Committee members were provided information about the Bush Sabbaticals which had been awarded during the past two years; for 1988-89 they were awarded as a flat grant of \$15,000 (which was to include travel) and in the prior year they were awarded as a percent of salary (with a minimum of \$9,000) with additional money for travel.

Asked the reason for the change which had been made, Assistant Vice President Carrier said it was to help those with lower incomes. It was argued, in response, that structuring the proposals in this fashion responded more to faculty welfare considerations than to the research needs of the University; if the percent-of-salary formula presented a problem for those with lower incomes, then perhaps an adjustment could be made, such as providing 100% of salary for Associate Professors and 80% for Full Professors.

It was also the view of several Committee members that restricting the awards to improvement of undergraduate teaching excluded entire collegiate units, some of whose senior faculty also need revitalization. The Committee also seemed to be of the opinion that some of the awards could be made for improvement of research--recognizing that how teaching improvement is defined could vary from year to year, with the committee making the awards, and that research has probably been supported despite the technical limitation to using the award for the improvement of teaching. Committee members suggested that using the only state-funded (and most attractive) sabbatical program exclusively for the improvement of teaching is not logical if teaching and research are valued equally.

The Committee, following additional discussion, voted to recommend that for 1989-90 the award should be changed so that the minimum be raised to \$13,000 and that the award be the minimum or 30% of the B-based salary, whichever was greater, with an additional grant of travel funds not to exceed \$2,000. The recommendation also included the proviso that in no event should the award exceed 100% of salary (taking into account all outside sources of funding).

2. Change in Final Exam Schedule, Winter Quarter 1990

At the request of Professor John Clark, chair of SCEP, and Elizabeth Grundner in Scheduling, the Committee took up the proposal that the Winter Quarter, 1990, exam schedule be changed so that it

* 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.

conformed to the exam schedule which had been approved for Winter Quarter, 1991: Instead of having the last day of finals fall on a Monday, there would be Friday and Saturday evening exams. Since everyone had seemed to view this change as desirable for 1991, the Committee voted to approve the change for 1990 as well because it appeared to be in accord with the spirit of the Senate action this Spring and because it would not be possible to convene a meeting of the Senate in time to formally approve the change.

3. Contretemps Between the Judicial Committee and the President

The Committee was informed of serious concern on the part of the Judicial Committee about recent actions of President Hasselmo in his disposition of a case which they had forwarded to him. After he became President, according to the Committee, he had agreed to operate by the same principle which former presidents Keller and Sauer had set forth: If he disagreed with the recommendations of the Judicial Committee in a particular case, he would meet with the Committee and explain his disagreements before finally disposing of the case.

In a very recent case, the President had disagreed with some of the recommendations of the Committee in a case. When he met with the Committee to discuss it, he told them his lawyer had advised him not to talk about it. The Committee could not understand this position, and learned later that a week prior to the meeting the President had sent out his findings and disposition.

The Judicial Committee was upset at the manner in which the President handled the case and had directed its chair, Professor Deinard, to send a letter to the President expressing its irritation. That letter was delivered to the President the day of this FCC meeting.

The Committee concluded that it would take no action at this meeting and would await the President's reaction to the letter from the Judicial Committee. It did decide, however, that Professors Brenner and Price should meet with the President to discuss his actions in the case. The Committee appeared to be of the view that the President could not cut himself off from the governance system simply because an issue was a legal matter; it also took the position that while the President has the right to overrule the Judicial Committee, the Committee also has a right to learn why it was being overruled. The Committee would then at least understand the President's views and could perhaps take them into account in its recommendations in future cases.

An additional issue, in this case, was the President's use of outside counsel. Under the rules, according to one Committee member, he was obligated to do so because the General Counsel's office had been involved in the case--so could not advise the President. The advice the President received from the outside counsel, however, was standard legal advice: Don't talk to anybody about the case. Although it used to be common for faculty to be represented by counsel in Judicial Committee proceedings, it has not been the practice recently, so this may be an isolated incident.

3. Spousal Exemptions Policy

Assistant Vice President Carrier explained that the new policy, distributed at the meeting, was a compromise between the earlier policy recommended by the Committee and the views of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women and the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women.

The present policy, which has been approved by the Special Masters, is more stringent in the requirements the University must meet to grant a spousal exemption but is more relaxed in the instance where the principal individual being recruited is a woman and the spouse is the husband.

The Committee accepted the policy; Assistant Vice President Carrier pointed out that this would be in effect only for 18 months--to the expiration of the Rajender consent decree--and the issue would need to be reviewed again at that point. She told the Committee that there is a group looking at what will occur, post-Rajender, and this issue will be a part of their examination. The Committee emphasized that its concern included homosexual couples but that it had always been interested exclusively in affectional relationships.

4. Vice Presidential Position Descriptions

The job descriptions for five of the vice presidents were distributed to the members of the Committee; it decided to take up the Vice Provost for the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the General Counsel.

Vice Provost for the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering The Committee found this to be a generally good description but developed several recommendations for changes in language which it directed Professor Brenner to communicate to the President. The principal concerns were these:

- Whether the Vice Provost was to be like the vice presidents/vice provosts for agriculture and the health sciences or if it was to more like a Dean of Students. The Committee noted the Vice Provost's membership on the Research Executive Council with approval and was of the view that the Vice Provost had responsibility for units which had major teaching and major research responsibilities. To the extent that there has been uncertainty about which role the Vice Provost would assume, the Committee believed the President needed to make certain that it was not a Dean of Students.
- That the description of responsibilities be made parallel to the other vice president/vice provost job descriptions which had been developed, making it clear the Vice Provost was a central officer with line responsibilities and that he or she participated in all institutional planning and budgeting decisions.
- That the Vice Provost had responsibility for the development of scholarship as well as undergraduate education.
- That the Vice Provost be seen as reporting to the Provost in a manner similar to the reporting lines of the other vice presidents/vice provosts, rather than in the fashion of the associate and assistant vice presidents for academic affairs.

The Committee touched briefly on the issue of the collegiate units which did not have representation at the central level (Management, Education, CEE, Law, and Public Affairs). Committee members seemed to be of the view that while four of the five had their own constituencies and ways of making their voices heard centrally, Education did not; it was thought that the College of Education might, at some future date, wish to be brought under the umbrella of the Vice Provost for the Arts,

Sciences, and Engineering.

Vice President for Student Affairs The Committee took sharp and critical exception to the position description for the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Committee found it excessively long, at four pages, and wondered if there were sufficient substance in those four pages.

The central problem seen by the Committee was the overlap in responsibilities of the Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering and the Vice President for Student Affairs. In the words of one Committee member, the Vice Provost could bring a vision of undergraduate education which could grab the attention of the State and the legislature. With the necessary budgetary authority, the Vice Provost could, with the faculty, develop a program which could include such things as curriculum improvement, the elimination of dirty halls and long lines, and, by putting money into the academic departments, cut section sizes and revitalize teaching and research. This, it was argued, could be sold to the legislature much more easily than arguing for 3rd place in the Big Ten. But it will not happen if there is a turf contest between the Vice Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Committee concurred that location of the overall responsibility for undergraduate education had to be located in one place; some Committee members took the view that perhaps the position now labelled Vice President for Student Affairs should be re-designated and report to the Vice Provost. One Committee member expressed the view that the responsibility for undergraduate education should be placed with the Vice President for Student Affairs; another responded that if the sole duty of the individual is undergraduate education then he or she will not get the attention of the University; it is only by working with the faculty and on research that the occupant will be able to lead effectively.

The Committee was also of the view that the Vice President for Student Affairs job description took the status quo far too much for granted; consideration should be given to whether or not there are duplicated services and to moving some of the units in Student Affairs elsewhere.

The Committee agreed unanimously that the President should be asked to stop these two searches until a Provost has been appointed and that the new Provost and the President should then try to rationalize the two jobs; reconciling the overlap and inconsistencies is not something that the search committees should be asked to do. The Committee also agreed that it would ask to see the two revised position descriptions--and that it would be willing to meet this summer to do so in order that the searches not be held up until Fall. Professor Brenner agreed to write a letter to the President communicating the views of the Committee, noting in particular the division of responsibilities for undergraduate education.

General Counsel One Committee member voiced a concern that an attorney coming from a background outside higher education would bring a corporate view to the University, seeing a CEO, a Board of Directors, and employees. The "preference" for experience with higher education should be strengthened to a requirement, it was argued, because the General Counsel should see the faculty as more than just employees.

The Committee generally concurred with this view, but in order not to constrict the search process too much decided to recommend that experience with a university environment be "strongly preferred." Professor Brenner agreed to write a letter to the President and the chair of the search committee expressing this view.

5. Administrator Training

The Committee welcomed Tim Delmont from MPIS to discuss the work he has been doing on development of an administrator training program. Dr. Delmont informed the Committee that he has drafted a proposal which is in Assistant Vice President Carrier's office; his statements today reflect that proposal but may be changed based on additional discussions with Academic Affairs.

Dr. Delmont said he had been speaking with knowledgeable people on the campus and at other universities to find out how an administrator training program might be introduced at a research university and how such programs are conducted. Following those interviews he convened "focus groups" to obtain additional advice.

The proposal now contains four initiatives for the next biennium:

- A series of orientation for seminars for new chairs and heads in 1989-90; they would be done across the year and devoted to specific topics. There would also be briefings for new deans and vice presidents.
- A modest handbook so that new administrators can learn how the University works.
- A sprinkling of all-University leadership seminars, of 3 - 4 hours each, which would focus on more complicated problems (such as the recruitment of minority and women faculty and staff or the leadership and management of laboratories).
- A review of the approaches used to evaluate academic administrators; this would not be a top-down bureaucratic approach but rather an attempt to work with colleges to develop ways to evaluate administrators and provide feedback.

It was suggested that those who are doing a good job as an administrator should not be ignored; Dr. Delmont said they would not, and that those who had been interviewed and participated in the focus groups had agreed to serve as mentors.

Another Committee member noted the failure to address the whole issue of "ombuds" service, people who could deal with faculty and student trouble areas. Minnesota only has a small number of people who perform this function, unlike some of its peer institutions. These people can participate in training department heads in order to avoid trouble spots. Dr. Delmont said that the program could encompass a lot of things and they decided to attend to those areas which first needed attention. If the program is successful, they will try to expand to other areas.

Asked about the time commitment, Dr. Delmont said they were thinking about 25 - 30 hours, spread across the year. There must, he added, be time for discussion; it cannot be solely information dissemination.

The real question, Mr. Delmont commented, is whether or not the University is ready to make the commitment to assessment and administrator training; are there enough in favor of it to do it? That question remains open, in his judgment.

The Committee commended Dr. Delmont for his approach to the development of the program. He noted that whatever is done, he wants to be sure it is of the highest quality so that highly able people will leave the sessions saying that it was worth the time. Professor Brenner said that the Committee would want to be kept abreast of the plans and that Dr. Delmont should return next year to provide an update.

One suggestion made was that the program should not be restricted to new chairs, but Assistant Vice President Carrier cautioned that there are few resources available and that they want to be sure they have a product that works before expanding it too much.

6. Questions for Provost Candidates

Professor Brenner asked the Committee what questions it will wish to ask of the candidates for Provost and Senior Vice President; the Committee spent some while developing a list. The questions to guide the interviews were suggested by several Committee members and will be prepared in time for the first interview, tomorrow.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota