

Minutes*

**Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Thursday, October 15, 1992
3:15 p.m., 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Carl Adams (Chair), Carol Carrier, Ann Erickson, Ann Fallon, Audrey Grosch, Morris Kleiner, Dianne Mulvihill, Michael Sadowsky, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring

Guest: Becky Swanson Kroll

Professor Carl Adams convened the meeting at 3:15 p.m. and introduced and welcomed Ms. Kroll, 1991-92 chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee. Before turning to the agenda, Professor Adams reported that SCFA might be asked to become involved in two new issues: 1) reviewing the proposed University Smoking Policy that recommends a smoke-free University environment by August 1993, and 2) participating in some capacity with a Task Force on Internal Consulting that is being established by Provost Infante.

Stopping the Tenure Clock

Ms. Kroll presented a revised draft of the proposed policy on Stopping the Tenure Clock and recalled for new members of the committee that SCFA had initially discussed the document at its June 4 meeting. Since that time, she said, the policy has been reviewed by the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and the recommendations of the three groups have been incorporated into the revised document. They include modifying the language to include both adoptive or foster placement; identifying a clear cut-off date by which an academic employee facing the decision year with respect to tenure or continuous appointment must obtain approval to stop the clock; allowing a couple who are both probationary employees to each request a year be discounted; and providing for a "Grandparent" or retroactive application of leave section. SCFA suggested the language be further modified to indicate single parent eligibility and to clarify that it is not necessary to take a leave in order to request the tenure clock be stopped.

Further, it was suggested a specific time be identified after which individuals would no longer be eligible for retroactive participation. Dr. Carrier said she would see that an "effective date" is included in the policy's cover letter.

Discussion turned to the changes that would be required in the Tenure Code should the policy be adopted. Dr. Carrier said the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee is preparing the amendments to the Tenure Code which will be brought to the Tenure Subcommittee and SCFA for review. Some committee members expressed concern about the process and encouraged bringing the proposed changes to the Tenure Regulations to the Faculty Senate before the policy, or at least simultaneously with the policy, noting that it is much more difficult to modify the Tenure Code than to

*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.

change a University policy. One member argued that endorsing adoption of a policy before knowing if it can be implemented is not appropriate procedure.

The committee then approved the following motions:

- to endorse the policy statement on Stopping the Tenure Clock
- to refer the Tenure Code amendments to the Tenure Subcommittee
- to recommend the policy statement on Stopping the Tenure Clock and the proposed modifications to the Tenure Code required as a result of the policy statement be brought to the Faculty Senate simultaneously

Lastly, the committee suggested the document be restructured to separate the resolution and rationale portions.

Health Care Subcommittee Resolution

SCFA moved to its next item of business which was consideration of a resolution presented by its Health Care Subcommittee. The resolution read:

The SCFA Health Care Subcommittee expresses concern that the proposed merger of Group Health and MedCenters will increase costs and may decrease options available to employees. This concern should be conveyed to the University administration and to appropriate State officials.

Speaking on behalf of the subcommittee, Professor Seltzer said the resolution was adopted after it came to the subcommittee's attention that an official alliance had been formed between Group Health and MedCenters effective October 1, 1992. The negotiations were conducted without consultation among affected individuals and without disseminating information on the potential impact to users. The Retirees Association, Professor Seltzer said, also had an opportunity to discuss the potential ramifications of the alliance and similarly adopted a resolution expressing its concern. The primary concern of both the subcommittee and the Retirees Association is the potential for increased premiums and decreased options for users. Group Health has been the low cost provider for many years while MedCenters has been one of the highest, Professor Seltzer noted. Both the subcommittee and the retirees recommend, at the very least, that University employees and retirees 1) be advised of the impact the affiliation will have on users, and 2) be given an explanation as to why there were not timely opportunities for University employees and retirees to provide input during the negotiation period.

Ms. Mulvihill, also a member of the subcommittee, said the administration first became aware of the possible affiliation in April 1992. At that time, the University asked Group Health to provide information on the implications for both cost and quality. Group Health's response, she said, did not lead the University to believe their would be increased costs or decreased quality. Group Health further advised that University employees would continue to be offered a Group Health product separate from a MedCenters product for as long as the University desired. The University, Ms. Mulvihill added, does participate in the negotiations with Group Health which allows it to stay abreast of potential cost changes.

From a quality point of view, she believes bringing the Mayo Clinic into the network will positively affect the quality of both Group Health and MedCenters. Ms. Mulvihill pointed out that there could be a potential conflict of interest for the University should it become involved in negotiations related to the alliance because of its association with the University Hospital.

SCFA agreed to continue the discussion at a subsequent meeting and asked Ms. Mulvihill to provide the committee with information regarding the impact of the affiliation between Group Health and MedCenters, to include cost, network, and quality implications.

Faculty Workload Task Force Report

SCFA continued its discussion of the Faculty Workload Task Force Report from its previous meeting. Professor Adams reminded members of the October 22 Faculty Senate Forum at which time the document will be discussed. Crookston, Duluth, and Morris will be linked through teleconference communication. After the October 22 forum, Professor Adams said, FCC and SCFA will both have an opportunity to review a revised draft of the document before it is forwarded to the Faculty Senate for action on November 17. The Task Force has received a number of letters and comments from faculty throughout the University. Some have expressed opposition to developing a document that focuses on faculty "inputs" rather than "outputs" and others are opposed to the document for philosophical reasons. The Task Force, Professor Adams said, agree in principle that the University is a professional environment and that pay and promotion should be based on performance. However, it believes the University needs to be concerned about public perception and accountability. Recognizing that it is difficult for individuals outside the University to judge outputs, the Task Force focused on inputs.

One member questioned the wisdom of departments, divisions, or colleges developing faculty workload principles as suggested on page 5 of the document.

Professor Adams responded that the Task Force chose to specify a "process" of workload determination that is guided by a set of general principles that apply to all University faculty. Departments, colleges, or divisions could, but are not required to, refine those principles as appropriate to their unit. The intent was to allow for flexibility without violating the basic set of principles. SCFA recommended the document be modified to more clearly indicate the intent of the Task Force.

Lastly, SCFA recommended adding the words "and teaching" to the last sentence in the second principle listed on page 2 in which service obligations for non-tenured faculty is addressed. The sentence would read: *For example, some departments reduce the service obligations of their non-tenured faculty so that they can devote additional time to research and teaching in order to reach the threshold for tenure.*

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

-- Martha Kvanbeck