



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee

1480 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 29, 1987
12:00 - 2:45 p.m.
624 Coffman Memorial Union

AGENDA

- 12:00-12:30 Open time.
(30 min.)
- 12:30-1:00 1. For information and discussion: Report of the special committee on grievance procedures (Note: report will be mailed separately). Guests: Professors Amos Deinard, Fred Morrison, and Charlotte Striebel.
(30 min.)
- 1:00-1:30 2. For information and discussion: "Report of the Special Senate Committee on the Use of the Academic Professional Class," (attached). Guest: Professor H. E. Mason, Chair.
(30 min.)
- 1:30-1:35 3. For action: Approval of October 8 SCC and October 15 FCC minutes (attached).
(5 min.)
4. For discussion and action: Naming a replacement member to the Planning Committee.
- 1:35-1:50 5. For discussion and action: Details of the November 19 SCC visit to the Crookston Campus.
(15 min.)
- 1:50-2:15 6. For discussion and action: Faculty development proposals from "Report of the Faculty Development Committee" and "Plan for Focus." (Documents were distributed previously; item is carried over from 10/15 agenda.)
(25 min.)
- 2:15-2:40 7. For discussion and action: What role, if any, should FCC play in an academic planning appeals process?
(25 min.)
- 40-2:45 8. For discussion: The Tenure Code provision for a special FCC panel to hear evidence in suspension cases (attached: Code excerpt: see Sec. 14.6).
(30 min.)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
1480 Social Sciences
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone: (612)626-1850

APPROVED 11/19/87

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
October 29, 1987
12:15 - 3:00
624 Coffman Memorial Union

Members present: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Shirley Clark, Lynnette Mullins, Ronald Phillips, Kathleen Price, W. Phillips Shively, James VanAllstine.

Guests: Amos Deinard (Chair, Judicial Committee), Fred Morrison (Past chair, Tenure Committee), H. E. Mason (Chair, Subcommittee on the Academic Professional and Administrative Class), Charlotte Striebel (Academic Staff Assistance Officer), Maureen Smith (of University Relations).

1. The FCC approved the SCC minutes of October 8; FCC asked for more detail in the October 15 FCC minutes, item 10, the Provost's 9/29 letter on tuition refund policy.

2. Revising University grievance procedures. Guests: Professors Deinard, Morrison, and Striebel, who constitute the ad hoc Grievance Committee.

FCC members had received in advance the authors' draft of a streamlined set of grievance procedures. Professor Morrison summarized the key aspects of the Grievance Committee's report:

- A structure combining the independence of a reviewer from outside the college with the expertise available within the college;
- A grievance committee in every college; no departmental grievance committees;
- Grievance panels consisting of a chair from outside the college and other members from within;
- Centralized filing, tracking, and appeals;
- A University-wide appeals body; (this might consist of a reconstituted Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility;

- A University Grievance Officer with substantial responsibility for a fair and efficient application of the policy;
- Limiting jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee and the AP&A Committee to cases involving termination of employment (failure to reappoint or dismissal for cause);
- Elimination of the quasi-judicial functions of other committees and elimination of the need for ad hoc panels. (The policy regarding sexual harassment and the early stages of procedures would be retained, but that Committee's adjudicatory function would be diverted to the central system.)

Grievance systems would be retained which have no overlap with the new one; they include the Student Conduct Code, the Civil Service system, and the procedures of the collective bargaining units.

Pending any differing directives from the FCC, the ad hoc Grievance Committee intends to start meetings with the affected bodies, the deans, and central administration. They recommend that their final document be presented to the Senate together with other consequential documents (e.g., the consulting policy).

A short discussion ensued about the best role for departments, which are seen as a good location for mediation and other informal resolution. The 30-day limit for filing a grievance would provide for exceptions to that 30-day limit.

The University Grievance Officer: Selection procedure and scope of the job; should be a faculty member what % time serve as Registrar serve ex officio on Judicial Prof. Striebel pointed out the person should be a technician who facilitates the traffic flow; Officer's decisions are all appealable to a faculty committee.

Professor Clark spoke for the whole FCC in commending the Grievance Committee for the tremendous progress represented by their clearly understandable report. The FCC thanked them heartily for their accomplishment and imposed no restraints on their proceeding as they had planned.

4. Tenure Code's provision for a special FCC hearing panel in a suspension case.

The Grievance Committee members remained for a short discussion of this provision. FCC regards itself as ill-equipped to perform this rare service because it can never become practiced at it. Professor Morrison thought it possible that a sound way could be found to make this a Judicial Committee responsibility even though both SJC and central administration rebuffed the proposal at the time of tenure code revision.

5. Preliminary evaluation of the Academic Professional and Administrative employment classification. Guest: Professor H. E. Mason, chair of the special committee on this evaluation.

(Note: The evaluation was mandated by the Faculty Senate in June of 1984, at the time that body approved the revised tenure code.)

FCC members had received in advance copies of Professor Mason's report and Appendices I, II, and III. Professor Mason distributed corrected copies of the report plus Appendix IX (a comparison of faculty protections provided by the Tenure Code with academic professional and administrative staff protections provided by the AP&A Staff Policies and Procedures). Professor Mason reminded FCC that his committee had been asked to make a preliminary investigation to see whether there was need for more study. He spoke of the complications in determining how many people are in the numerous AP&A classifications. There is tremendous diversity among the employees clustered into three categories: (1) people with faculty rank who serve for a time as academic administrators; (2) people without faculty rank who are academic professionals; and (3) people without faculty rank who are full-time academic administrators. The number of these people on probationary and continuous appointments is strikingly small. With the exception of the Libraries, University Extension, and CEE, the numbers per unit are so small that one is hard-put to find a suitable cohort for peer review. The proportion on probationary and continuous appointments has declined since the category was created and some units make it a practice not to make those appointments (H&G).

The Blue Book manual should, the Mason Committee believes, be studied and re-done. The AP&A office seems tremendously understaffed to monitor appointments and job descriptions. Professor Mason could see neither logic nor wisdom to having all this range of staff lumped together into one category.

Professor Berscheid referred to the request from EEOWC for two members from the Academic Professional category; she asked whether he thought any one or two could represent the class. Professor Mason replied that he does not think there is a community of interest in the class.

Professor Berscheid, who appointed the committee last year, found the report outstandingly lucid and clear and light years ahead of anything FCC expected could be accomplished. Professor Shively thanked Professor Mason and his committee for a marvelous job. He announced that the FCC would submit the report to the Faculty Senate, in response to its 1984 mandate.

5. Filling vacancy on Senate Planning Committee.

Professor Phillips reported for the Nominations Subcommittee on a possible replacement for John Howe (CLA) on the Planning Committee. They submitted a list of four CLA faculty members for Professor Shively to call, in order, to fill the vacancy. FCC voted to approve the list.

6. Report of the Chair.

A. Filling the position of faculty legislative liaison. One of the people proposed has asked to be withdrawn from consideration. The Chair has discussed FCC's list with President Keller.

B. The Secretary to the Board of Regents, Barbara Muesing, apologized for the fact that the letter of invitation to the FCC-Regents' November 12 dinner referred to the group as the Senate Consultative Committee. Professor Shively assured her that confusions abound over distinguishing FCC, SCC, and the Steering Committee.

7. Reconsideration of date for SCC meeting on Crookston Campus.

The intended business had been to work out details for planned November 19 travel to UMC. However, a consensus of opinion emerged that because FCC and SCC's November schedule is intense with the Plan for Focus forums and preparation of resolutions for Faculty Assembly and MSA Forum Assembly action, and since UMC was not locked into any formal preparations, the Committee should find an alternative date in the winter or spring. SCC as a whole will choose a new date.

8. Meeting of Twin Cities Faculty Steering Committee.

Such a meeting will be arranged for November 19 to construct Focus resolutions for December 3 action by the Twin Cities Faculty Assembly.

9. An appeals process for academic planning: Should Twin Cities FCC members play any role?

FCC members had no clear sense of either the nature of the proposed hearings or their functional role. They doubted any faculty body should be involved in appeals from faculty, student, staff, and community interests.

Professor VanAlstine reported concern at the Morris Campus that the Provost has been so consumed by Twin Cities planning

issues he has had to postpone attention to University-wide Academic Affairs matters. Among UMM concerns is a reported funding freeze affecting UMM's computer center services; Twin Cities members knew the freeze was supposed to apply only to the Twin Cities Campus and that central administration announced the chancellors had been allotted their proportional discretionary funds.

10. Steering the Faculty Development Committee's proposals.

Professor Berscheid observed that the proposals lack attention to the special concern of faculty development for women. Professor Shively suggested that FCC point out that concern to SCFA when it asks SCFA to address a number of the recommendations. The Chair of SCFA and, if possible, Tenure, will meet soon with FCC to divide up the proposals.

11. Campus Assembly Forums on Planning.

A packet containing the agenda for each forum together with the relevant recommendations from "Plan for Focus," and headed by Professor Shively's cover letter about the nature of the forums and the follow-up Faculty Assembly meeting, is due in faculty hands October 30. There was general agreement that speakers yielded to by senators should be limited to faculty and students, to keep this clearly identified as the faculty-student governance contribution to the decision-making.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele
Executive Assistant