

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
June 1, 1989**

Present: Mark Brenner (chair), W. Andrew Collins, Warren Ibele, Norman Kerr, Lynnette Mullins, Ronald Phillips, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, Walter Weyhmann

Guests: Assistant Vice President Carol Carrier, Senior Vice President Shirley Clark, President Nils Hasselmo, Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Open Discussion

Professor Brenner asked Committee members what questions they wished to bring up with the President; several items were mentioned:

- Whether or not there should be justification for any faculty salary increase below a stipulated minimum.
- A perception on the part of at least some faculty that the actual salary increase would be on the order of 3.5% to 4.5%; the point was made that the legislature thought it was doing something for the faculty, but with that kind of increase the faculty will not see it as acceptable--and will think that nothing will ever be done. This is a big problem.
- A concern, arising from the Task Force on Support Services report, that some of the support units are not as efficient as they should be and that they have passed on retrenchments to the academic units without changing their own operations. Professor Brenner reported that he has written to the President on this matter.
- The role of FCC in the vice presidential searches, particularly the Provost search. Committee members agreed that it should meet separately with the candidates, and so should the students (and there should be assured graduate and professional student representation during meetings with the candidates).
- The possibility of establishing a single telephone number for faculty and staff to call when there is a problem (such as a burnt-out light, no chalk, etc.)--rather than requiring that everyone know their way around the bureaucratic maze.
- The large infusion of funds into the School of Journalism in response to the recent accreditation review and the need to recruit and retain a new director; was this increase in support in accord with CLA plans and with Academic Priorities, or was it an instance of accreditation driving planning? Committee members were of the view that those departments which have outside accrediting agencies can often use those agencies as a springboard to obtain more money from the central administration--but that some of 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.

core arts and sciences disciplines don't have that advantage and that all departments should be provided with a review. It was suggested that the Graduate School reviews should be used for this purpose in such a way that all departments are treated or reviewed equally.

Committee members also conversed briefly about the proposal from the Council of Graduate Students for assured graduate student representation on SCC and other Senate committees.

2. Discussion with President Hasselmo

Professor Brenner reviewed with the President the questions that had been raised earlier.

Faculty salaries President Hasselmo began with the salary issue, noting that his letter in the Daily today was intended to clarify what would be delivered in the way of increases. Even though this plan must still be approved by the Board of Regents, he said he wanted to get the information out as quickly as possible. Even though it will not be easy, he said he felt it was of overriding importance to deliver increases implied by the state appropriation. Distributing the entire 7% for faculty and 5% for civil service staff will require internal reallocation in order to cover the increased cost of health coverage and the retirement plan contribution for civil service employees.

The President was asked why what had been a practice in the past has now become a policy: Colleges, in the past, have delivered on average about 1% more in salary increases than what central administration provided; now this would be mandated. The President replied that this step was necessary to ensure that all faculty, regardless of their unit, have access to the same salary pool, so that delivery of the full increase would not be dependent on whether or not a particular unit wishes to provide it. The units will be required to add 1% to the fund provided centrally; in the case of those units which receive market adjustment funds, it will be slightly more because the units will also be required to match a small part of those funds as well. He also said, in response to a question, that special action would be required if a unit wished to provide more than the 1 - 1.5% required.

Asked if the deans will have discretionary authority to distribute the market and merit money, President Hasselmo said that there will be no specifics in the instructions to the colleges except that 4.5% must be delivered for merit and, varying by college, some percent for market. The colleges must decide their own priorities with those funds. There will be, he added, no central retention pool so that entrepreneurship by colleges in seeking access to central retention funds can be avoided. The colleges will have to deal with retention cases with the funds provided.

The President concurred with the observation that there would be a serious problem with the faculty if the legislature appropriated an apparent 7% increase but the faculty only received 4 or 4.5%. Almost all of the colleges, he assured the Committee, will deliver 5 - 5.5%. The equity funds, he noted, would be delivered via a different mechanism; the amount of equity funds each college receives will be dependent on the number of women on its faculty.

Concern was expressed about how the funding of the equity increases would be presented; it was noted that the agreement between the attorneys was that the funds would come from the entire appropriation, not the salary pool alone. President Hasselmo confirmed that that was correct, but that because salaries constitute 85% of the appropriation, most of the money will come from those items. The

equity funds did, however, come off the top of the appropriation, not just from the salary pool.

It was pointed out that the legislature appropriated 7% for faculty salaries, but since the cost of health insurance has increased by approximately 1.75%, the University is actually delivering 8.75%. There is, however, a problem of perception which the administration might wish to address. It was also suggested to the President that it would help if the faculty were to receive two accountings, perhaps on their appointment documents, so faculty members would see not only their salary but also the cost of their fringe benefit coverage. The President responded that he did not want to play games so simply laid out the cash salaries (in his letter). He did not wish to hide salary increases in with compensation; anyone who wished to could, of course, total them up if they wished.

The President was asked about the prospects for future legislative sessions. Given where the University is going, and where it wants to be, was this "our" year? Will the legislature say it has now supported the University, or is this to be seen as a foot in the door? The President said he intends it as a foot in the door and expects that more will be done later. He acknowledged that he was torn between thanking the legislature for what it had done under the circumstances and telling them that it was not all of what was needed and that the University would be back.

Support services Professor Brenner explained the concerns of the Committee and his letter (which the President had not yet received) asking that the efficiency of some of the units be examined. The President said this was a matter upon which he intended to ride herd, agreed that academic units needed to be assured that there were no "fat cats" shielded from retrenchment and reallocation, and that he is introducing program reviews for support units which parallel those used for academic units, including the use of outside reviewers.

Minimum salary increase required Professor Brenner recalled that the Committee had touched upon, but had discussed or reached any agreement on, whether or not there should be a minimum faculty salary increase below which justification would be required. The President informed the Committee that the instructions to the deans had not set a minimum but that that could be changed. The Committee seemed not to be of a mind to ask for such a change.

The Committee did, however, propound the view that faculty members should be told why they received whatever raise they did and what they need to do to improve it if it was below average. The President agreed; he said there should be a review system in place, without requiring a lot of paper, if the University is to distribute salaries on the basis of merit. He also commented that the obligation to explain merit increases is implied in the offices of chair and dean and if that obligation is not understood it should be made clear. Some units do have the necessary documentation while others do not; the President said he has asked Academic Affairs to look at the whole question. But faculty should have, at a minimum, the right to request an explanation of the salary decision from the chair as well as the right to appeal to the dean. The President was told that there is at present no such right; in some grievance cases the request for an explanation was denied and there is no way to obtain it if the chair and the dean decline to provide it.

Committee members made several suggestions, including an annual conference with each faculty member and the chair--with the proviso that no review system be too rigid or onerous for department administrators, the inclusion of a general statement in a letter explaining how raises were given, or even a statement from the administration that chairs and administrators are encouraged to explain the rationale

for salary increases if asked.

The President said he has asked Vice President Clark to survey the colleges to determine if they have the required evaluation procedures in place; Vice President Clark told the Committee that the survey is in process and the results will be available in the near future.

Professor Brenner concluded that the message on this matter was clear and that the Committee should revisit the issue next year.

Committee participation in searches Professor Brenner reported to the President that the Committee viewed the Provost as key to the interests of the institution and it wished to participate in the selection; it also wished to have its own session with the candidates rather than a joint interview with other groups. The President said the candidates must see the deans, central administrators, faculty, and students, and that FCC is the best faculty group for them to meet. The only possible difficulty might be the timing; the schedules of the candidates may be so constrained that it could be Fall before the interviews are completed (although there is still hope they will be done in June). If completed this Spring, the schedules will be rigid; it was agreed that the chair would be given the authority to flesh out the faculty contingent with others if there were not a sufficient number of Committee members available at the appointed times.

The Committee also urged that there be separate meetings with the students and, given the concerns about graduate and professional student representation in governance, that the Council of Graduate Students be invited to designate students to participate in the interviews.

Professor Collins, chair of the search committee, commented that they are very happy with the pool of finalists and that they will try to complete the interviews in the next two weeks or so.

3. Vacancies on the General Counsel search committee

Professor Brenner reported that the two non-lawyer faculty members on the General Counsel search committee had resigned and that FCC has been asked to nominate replacements. Names were agreed upon (and subsequently forwarded to the President's Office).

4. Membership, Task Force on Liberal Education

Even though the Task Force will not be appointed until next Fall, Professor Brenner explained, it seemed wise to provide Academic Affairs with a list of faculty nominees early so that the Task Force could be selected and get about its work early in the academic year.

In discussion with Vice President Clark, the Committee concluded that the Task Force would be primarily a Twin Cities campus effort but that representation from the Morris campus should be included--because they are very interested in what the Twin Cities campus is doing and because they have recently completed their own such review, the results of which might be useful to this Task Force. Vice President Clark suggested that the Task Force should include representation from the professional schools, as recipients of the undergraduates, and that the number of names provided be larger than the ultimate number that will be required.

Committee members spent some while identifying potential faculty members to serve on the Task Force, and also agreed to contact the curriculum committees of the units included in the Arts, Sciences, and Engineering to identify additional faculty who might be interested in serving.

5. Change in Bush Sabbaticals

Professor Brenner noted that questions had been raised about the change in the Bush Sabbaticals such that the compensation was now a fixed rate rather than a percentage of salary; senior faculty are disadvantaged by this change. Perhaps equally important, the change had been announced without consultation with the faculty--Vice President Clark pointed out that there had been discussions with Professor Gault, chair of the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA).

Committee members deliberated about the possible disincentives to senior faculty by adoption of the flat payment, the alternative combination of a minimum plus a percentage, and the possibility that with no increase in funds available, the number of Bush sabbaticals might be decreased if the award is still a percent of salary--although that would mean better funded sabbaticals.

Assistant Vice President Carrier agreed to pull together information about the current year's experience to see if there were fewer senior faculty participating; she also reported that responsibility for the Bush Sabbaticals has been moved from Educational Development Programs to Academic Affairs. The Committee decided it wished to have SCFA review the change and provide FCC, next Fall, with its considered judgment.

Vice President Clark asked if the University should stay with the present policy for Bush sabbaticals or if the change provoked such broad consternation that it should be reversed now; it was agreed that data for 1988-89 would be obtained for the next FCC meeting and that the Committee would then proffer advice.

Professor Brenner inquired of Vice President Clark whether or not the SCFA recommendation that the sabbatical program be extended; she said it had not been. The University had presented an enthusiastic statement to the legislature, with a good rationale, and had received polite attention but no discussion or response.

The Committee also decided to ask SCFA about alternative sabbatical programs which the University could consider, in light of the lack of legislative funding. Information from other schools should also be sought.

6. UROP funds

Asked about UROP funding being withheld, Vice President Clark responded that it was not. The University had unsuccessfully sought hard funds for the UROP program; there will be a short delay in providing the soft funds needed but they will be available. The UROP program will be funded from Indirect Cost Recovery money (since it is research); the administration will be recommending to the Board of Regents that \$250,000 be spent, an increase of \$50,000 over last year. This program, which has widespread faculty support and advocacy and which functions well, was never in any danger of not being

funded, nor will this use of ICR funds divert support from other activities.

Vice President Clark also reported that the University had successfully bid for a national conference undergraduate research opportunities.

The Committee adjourned at 12:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota