



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AND
CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

APPROVED 11/18/82

Thursday, October 21, 1982
The Dining Center, St. Paul, Section C, The Grainery
10:00 - 11:50 a.m.

Members present: Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Marv Mattson, Doug Pratt, Paul Quie, W. D. Spring, Burt Sundquist, Pat Swan, Chair.

Guests present: Vice President Hasselmo, Bill Angell (chr., Ag. Extension Consultative Committee), Alice Larson (College of Vet. Medicine Faculty Council), Jackey Gold (Daily), Maureen Smith (U. Relations), Dr. Carol Pazandak.

Guests arriving at 11:00: President Magrath, Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow.

1. The minutes of the FCC meetings of September 16 and 30 were approved.
2. Setting agenda for quarterly FCC meeting with the Regents.

Members agreed there would be no discussion of Tenure Code revision because the Tenure Committee will be steeping itself in this work through weekly meetings beginning October 22, and because there are controversial questions regarding what the code should contain that the faculty have not yet resolved among themselves.

Pat Swan will sort among the continuing questions which were set aside last year to concentrate on the financial problems, and the secretary will telephone members for further suggestions.

3. Faculty Consultative Committee responsibility in naming board members to bodies outside the governance structure.

The FCC is asked to name the faculty members to serve on the President's Student Behavior Review Panel, the Board of Legal Services, the Student Services Fees Committee, and the Board of Student Publications. Pat Swan stressed the difference between assuming responsibility for these nominations and making nominations to committees of the Senate and the Assembly and to major search committees. In the latter three cases the FCC has subsequent working contact, while with the four named boards it does not. Burt Sundquist added that the FCC is at a disadvantage as the nominator in being unaware of the broad general representation throughout all such boards and committees.

Donald Spring termed the FCC's task in relation to the four boards illogical since they are committees which do not report to the FCC or SCC and over which

we have no surveillance. During revision of the Senate constitution, he explained, those Senate and Assembly committees which do most of their business in coordination with administrative offices were designated to be named by the President in consultation with the administrators closest to the respective committees.

Carol Pazandak spoke in favor of the decentralization of the nominating process, of placing it outside central administration and in a group like FCC/SCC which has an overview of the composition of all University committees.

Doug Pratt expressed interest in follow-up reports from the FCC's nominees to learn about the work of these four committees. The faculty members may feel isolated in their service from peers they feel responsible to. Pratt also recommended surveying faculty interest in these areas.

Pat Swan suggested FCC's first step might be to discuss the questions with Vice President Wilderson since all four boards are in the student affairs area.

On the Morris campus, the equivalents of three of these boards (there is no Legal Services office) are located in the substructure of the Morris Student Affairs Committee, reported Donald Spring. While discussion of Senate constitution revision included consideration of a Senate Student Affairs Committee, the idea was discarded because virtually all student affairs business seems particular to each campus. Perhaps some of the four Twin Cities boards could appropriately be Assembly committees, he suggested. If that were the case, the Vice President of Student Affairs could make nomination recommendations to the Committee on Committees.

On November 4, the FCC will name a faculty member to a two-year term on the Student Services Fees Committee.

4. Senate and Assembly business.

Pat Swan reported that the Facilitative Committees of both the Senate and the Assembly will meet next week. She intends to put a brief agenda for the year into the November 18 Senate and Assembly dockets to alert the community to anticipated business.

Pat Swan will suggest to Charles Walcott, Chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, that in his November 18 report to the Assembly he comment on the recently-completed review of the Men's Intercollegiate Athletics program and the comparable WICA review which was completed in 1981, and on the outcome of the civil rights review which should be completed by the end of this month.

5. University grievance procedures.

Carol Pazandak and Phyllis Freier. Dr. Pazandak has arranged the annual workshop for the University's approximately 65 faculty grievance officers, on Wednesday, October 27. They will also there discuss with Phyllis Freier (Chr. of SCC's Grievance and Legal Concerns Subcommittee) their views on how the system is working.

President Magrath, and Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow joined the meeting at 11:00.

FCC CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

1. UEA-University bargaining sessions will resume October 28. The mediator has ordered a news blackout, the President said, so he cannot add anything of substance.

2. Faculty workload/productivity measures and uses. Associate Vice President Al Linck initiated the administration component of the task force, but its work is temporarily suspended because collective bargaining is now consuming all of Dr. Linck's time. Vice President Keller said Dr. Linck, when he reconvenes the task force, would discuss with the Consultative Committee how to divide up the tasks. The charge of the task force is to determine what is measurable.

(which will be augmented by faculty)

Swan reminded the group that workload/productivity or "cost-effectiveness" as a criterion for planning had been added rather late in the first cycle. The Consultative and Finance Committees were therefore unsure how to relate this criterion to the planning issues.

She asked how to get the workload question down from the highest eschelons to the people at the smallest unit level who will be the ones to ultimately wrestle with the question.

Vice President Hasselmo said the appropriate vice president can raise the issue with each of his units and can share the measures and information currently available, and ask how accurately those data reflect the actual activity and productivity of the unit. The University is seeking comparative data from other AAU institutions on grant receipts which, while limited, are one indicator. (The University has previously gathered other relevant data from AAU.) Burt Sundquist asked people to bear in mind that grant awards measure only input, not output.

Vice President Keller mentioned one complicating factor which prompts questions on how instruction work-load should be measured: some units (e.g., the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics) have support from outside sources for which they do research, while other units receive funding exclusively from the instructional fund and their faculties are also expected to perform research.

Pat Swan asked if the workload study makes any internal comparisons. Keller said yes, but only among sufficiently similar units. Making the subjective classifications requires care, but finding ways to make comparisons is important.

The AAU data exchange was used in Cycle One as planners tried to construct appropriate budgets considering enrollments and credit hours, Vice President Hasselmo said. The University found it had units both above and below the norms.

Marv Mattson asked if the University ever looks at its activity through faculty daily log reporting. The President and V. P. Hasselmo said the University collected annual summary reports for a while, but found the results were open to widely differing interpretation and evoked skepticism on the part of some outsiders.

Burt Sundquist asked whether and how the planning process includes a way to look at actual demand upon each unit for services. Vice President Hasselmo noted that a weak link exists between the President's Institutional Policy Statement and the University's observation of societal trends and needs. With particular units there are some specific links to external requests.

Professor Freier asked if it might be feasible in the period before the workload task force reconvenes to ask the units themselves to state what is measurable. Vice President Keller said that when the administration has done that in the past the units have responded with informal, anecdotal information and the assertion that quantification is not possible. Central administration has to provide some direction.

3. Mode of faculty appointments: A (11/12 month) and B (9 month). Professor Swan asked how the University will decide in its program planning into which mode new appointments should be made.

The President and Vice President Keller stated that there is no explicit policy; research needs and the availability of money have produced the current operating practice. One reason why it is especially appropriate to raise the question now is because the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics is now offering salary incentives in hopes of inducing some faculty to change their tenured appointments from A to B. The move affects new hiring. Keller is asking the Institute if it would regard it as appropriate to hire new faculty on a B tenure contract, while leaving open the option to pay them for 12 months if the money is available.

Burt Sundquist said the question is broader than the 12-month appointment issue and should include asking how units address their whole responsibility. One sees various quantities and intensity of activity around the campus (as, for example, in shop hours), he said. Vice President Keller cautioned that because that issue is related to the "Outreach" and "Inloading" questions which have so far eluded consensus for about five years, they should be separated from the immediate need to resolve a policy on new A and B appointments.

Virginia Fredricks observed that since even within units there are differences in individual responsibility, the unit should not be solely responsible for determining the appropriate mode of appointment.

Vice President Keller asked the FCC's view on the suggestion that everyone hired in the future would have 9-month appointments for their tenure contract, and that some number of those people would be given untenured appointments for the other three months.

Pat Swan called attention to the fact that some units must deal with the question right now in their planning, and some must resolve it with respect to upcoming appointments.

President Magrath proposed that Vice President Keller submit the question, strictly limited to the A and B appointment issue, to a representative committee of deans; the deans' report would be forwarded to the Consultative Committee. Everyone appeared to agree to this plan.

4. Professional/administrative appointments. Pat Swan asked the administration for information on the criteria each unit is applying or will be applying as positions which formerly gave faculty titles are converted into P/A positions at the time new appointments are made.

President Magrath said it was his understanding of the process that the change is made upon recommendation of a collegiate unit that the work of an individual in a given position will be primarily professional rather than academic.

The recommendation goes to Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs Betty Robinett, who monitors all such reclassifications. Vice President Keller affirmed that the department and the unit have the prerogative of defining the categories. Beyond that, however, he added, is the budgetary question of what hiring central administration determines to allow the University as an institution. Central administration therefore retains the right to declare a particular designation inappropriate.

Professor Swan said the faculty need some understanding of the criteria by which the administration reaches such a conclusion. Vice President Keller responded that there has to be agreement between the unit and Academic Affairs on the mode of the development of each academic and service unit. Regarding University Libraries and the Office of Student Affairs, decisions on category of employment are at the policy level, he said.

Pat Swan called reclassification a matter we should continue to attend to as we go forward with the planning process. Vice President Hasselmo said information on the question can be included in his memo/agenda on the planning year which goes to the units.

5. Mandatory retirement age. President Magrath shared his concern with the FCC over legislation introduced in Congress to raise further the mandatory retirement age. The President stressed that, given the current conditions of fiscal constraint and relatively few faculty openings, the application of such a law to faculty could threaten the tenure principle. Although there is disagreement within and among the various higher education associations, they will lobby Congress to oppose application of such a law to faculty, and to argue for the need for greater policy flexibility and continued self-regulation for higher education.

The FCC's conversation with the President and Vice Presidents concluded at 11:50 a.m.

Meredith Poppele,
SCC Exec. Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

To the Faculty Consultative Committee,
Report of the Chair for October 21, 1982.

1. Agenda items for our November 11 dinner meeting with the Regents. Duane Wilson has not yet received any requests for that meeting--the Regents have had their minds particularly on University-UEA negotiations and the lawsuit brought by former Daily editors. Duane expects the faculty will want to spend part of the time discussing the biennial request to the legislature and faculty salaries. Do we want to touch upon tenure code revision, or leave that conversation entirely to the Tenure Committee, the Regents Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee and our liaison, Don Spring? Just how would we like to use this opportunity?

2. I wish to raise a policy question with the FCC as to our role in naming faculty members to committees/boards that do not report in any way to our committee or other parts of the Assembly or Senate. I am in agreement with our role in naming faculty members to serve on Assembly/Senate committees (as specified by the constitution). Likewise, I am glad to help name colleagues to serve on Search Committees or Task Forces whose work we will review in some sense. However, I am not at all sure that we should name faculty members to groups whose work we do not follow.

For example, we recently named two faculty members to the Student Legal Services Board. As a committee we have no contact with the work of that Board. We recently named someone to continue a term on the Board of Student Publications (see circulating file on 10/21); as a committee we have no contact with the work of that Board. We have been asked to replace a faculty member on the Student Services Fees Committee--why do we make that appointment? Finally, see the report following on the Student Behavior Review Panel.

It seems to me that if we make these appointments we should require periodic reports from these groups. However, I wonder if there are not more effective means for designating the faculty members who serve on these groups that are not part of the governance structure in any way. Alternatively, should they be a part? What do you think?

3. Report on Faculty Appointments. The Assembly Steering Committee is the body the President asked to be responsible for naming members to the President's Student Behavior Review Panel, whose responsibility it is to review and recommend to the President appropriate actions to take when appeals are made from collegiate hearing bodies or the Campus Committee on Student Behavior. I am relieved to be able to report that all three faculty members who accepted membership in 1979 have expressed their willingness to continue. (The workload has been light.) They are Paul Cashman, Chair; Peggy House; Dennis Hower.

Dave Lenander and the rest of the student SCC are working to identify four students for the panel; some of the students may be able to continue from past years as well.

The panel was established in the fall of 1979 and one case was waiting for it then. Procedures and provisions to protect the rights of students involved in any appeals cases were not spelled out. The panel set procedures in place. There have since been three or four cases which Cashman, as chair, has been called upon to discuss with Nick Barbatsis of the Special Counseling Office, the staff member on the panel.

4. Conversation with the President: See my letter to the President, copy attached.

PBS



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

November 10, 1982

To: George Sell, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Bob Morris, Chair, Senate Committee on Tenure

From: Pat Swan, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

Re: 9-month vs. 12-month appointments

Vice President Keller is beginning to reappraise the traditional determinations of A and B faculty appointments. The examination was prompted by considerations within the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics that salary incentives might be given to induce some faculty to change their tenured appointments from 12 months to 9 months. Were that the case, the Institute would address questions regarding new hiring as well.

In thinking about the question Vice President Keller talked with some representatives from the Institute and will talk with certain deans. In addition, he has asked for faculty reaction to this proposal: When hiring new faculty, a department would grant its tenure contract for a 9-month appointment; however, where appropriate and where the money was available, faculty would actually be hired on a 12-month basis.

The Faculty Consultative Committee requests the Faculty Affairs and Tenure Committees to express themselves on this question to Vice President Keller. We would appreciate your telling us of any recommendation you make on the matter.

:mbp

cc: Vice President Keller



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

October 13, 1982

President C. Peter Magrath
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

We, the members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, are looking forward to our second meeting with you this fall. I am especially pleased that we will be meeting on the St. Paul part of the Twin Cities Campus. In recognition of this fact, we have issued a special invitation to the seven faculty consultative groups in St. Paul to be represented at our meeting, as their schedules allow.

First, our committee will want to hear any new developments that may have occurred in the conversations between the University administration and the faculty at Duluth and Waseca who are bargaining collectively.

Second, we believe that our major discussion about the next planning cycle should occur with both students and faculty present. However, there are three issues related to on-going planning in the colleges that may be primarily of interest to the faculty and could be discussed in our meeting. They include ways in which the colleges should or could be looking at questions of faculty work load and productivity (related to Linck's committee on the subject), policy with regard to new faculty appointments on a 9-month or 12-month basis (who decides, how, when, where?) and policy with regard to the use of P/A appointments (again, who decides, how, when, where?).

Third, we are willing to consult with Coach Joe Salem should he feel in need of our advice by now. Let's hope he will be less in need after this week-end.

As always we welcome additions you may wish to make to our agenda. If you should want more than off-the-top-of-our-heads reaction to some item, perhaps you could notify us in advance.

Sincerely,

Patricia B. Swan, Chair,
Faculty Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp

Invitations to October 21 FCC meeting sent to the following chairpersons
of St. Paul Campus faculty advisory or faculty consultative committees:

Institute Consultative Committee: Terry Courneya, Pennington County Extension Office,
P.O. Box 576, Courthouse, Thief River Falls.

College of Agriculture: Vern Cardwell, Agronomy & Plant Genetics.

College of Biological Sciences Consultative Committee: Don Gilbertson,
Ecology and Behavioral Biology.

Agricultural Extension: Bill Angell, Design.

Forestry Faculty Consultative Committee: Tim Knopp, Forest Resources.

Home Economics: Diane Hedin, Center for Youth Development and Research. (last year's
chr.)

Veterinary Medicine Faculty Council: Dr. Alice Larson, Veterinary Biology.
(continuing member, last year's Sec.)

Cic. FCC
10-7-82



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612) 373-3226

October 6, 1982

To: All College Faculty Consultative Committees and Faculty Councils
on the St. Paul Campus

From: Pat Swan, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

The University Senate Faculty Consultative Committee will meet on the St. Paul Campus Thursday, October 21 at 10:00 a.m. We will meet in Section C of The Grainery at the Dining Center. From 10:30 to 11:30 we expect to meet with President Magrath. This meeting will be followed, after a short lunch break, by similar meetings of the full Senate Consultative Committee (students and faculty) - SCC with the President from 12:00 to 2:00, and a regular Consultative Committee meeting from 2:00 to 3:00.

Consultative Committee meetings are open but I wanted to issue a special invitation to you to join us for the faculty meetings in the morning. I do hope that at least one member (or perhaps all members?) will be able to attend at least part of the time. We'd be delighted to have your committee represented and would like to have your representative(s) identified so that we'll be aware of their presence.

I don't know how full our agenda will be, but we would try to accommodate items that you telephone to us by October 12 (Pat Swan, 3-1194; Meredith Poppele, 3-3226). One thing we expect to discuss will be the next University planning cycle and special issues that might be addressed in the next two years of planning.

:mbp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 12/2/82

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE AND
CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT
November 18, 1982 - 300 Morrill Hall

Members present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe, M. Mattson, P. Quie, D. Pratt, W. D. Spring, B. Sundquist, P. Swan, J. Turner.

Guests present: President Magrath, Vice Presidents Kegler, Keller and Vanselow, Carol Pazandak, Pam Coyle.

1. The FCC minutes of October 21 were approved as distributed.
2. December 16 FCC business: Naming a nominating committee for the Assembly Committee on Committees.
3. Faculty grievance procedures study and proposal. Phyllis Freier proposed that she and Carol Pazandak constitute a committee of two to gather testimony and data on the existing grievance procedures (from grievance officers, Judicial chair, etc., and from people who have taken grievances through the system) and develop a plan on the workings of a good grievance system. They would bring a proposed procedure to the SCC this year and make it public; the Senate would consider the proposal in 1983-84.

They need clarification as to the bodies certain kinds of grievances go to. Some overlapping policies complicate the question, including Senate policy, the Linck memo which reflected the now-lifted cease and desist order, and the Consent Decree, which will be sunsetted July 1, 1989.

Freier said the attributes of a good grievance system include carefully representing faculty interests, fairness, and as much privacy as possible in initial stages of a grievance. The University's system appears too complicated at the lower levels.

FCC members indicated approval of the efficient two-person committee approach.

John Turner noted that the most detailed procedures available are listed in faculty union contracts and might be a source of ideas.

Pat Swan recommended that Freier and Pazandak, when they have drafted a proposal, convene the grievance committee chairs to get their reaction, and then take the proposal to a broader group. Don Spring suggested that since what is reasonable is not always legal they check their draft proposal with University attorneys.