

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
September 22, 1988**

Present: Mark Brenner (chair), Warren Ibele, Lynnette Mullins, J. Bruce Overmier, Ronald Phillips, M. Kathleen Price, Burton Shapiro, W. Phillips Shively, Michael Steffes

Guests: Robert Bruininks (chair, Research Committee), Gayle Grika (Footnote), President Richard Sauer, Kelli Ann Schuster (Daily), Maureen Smith (Brief)

**1. Report of the Chair**

Professor Brenner began by noting that he thought the Senate Finance Committee retreat held the previous Friday had been useful and also reported that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy had also held a retreat on the preceding Monday.

Professor Brenner reported on a conversation he had had with Pat Swan in the Graduate School; she, along with Provost Clark, are setting up an administrative committee to draft policies to cover allegations of fraud in academic research. The University has no policies in place at present to provide for hearings for someone accused of fraud. The administrative committee, with representatives from the Research and Faculty Affairs committees, will develop ideas; their proposals will be then sent to the Senate for review. He said he thought this was a reasonable way to proceed. One question raised was whether the proceedings would be run centrally or by the departments; some areas are so specialized that professionals need to be involved. Professor Brenner suggested that is one issue which the committee should deal. Another committee member noted that Medical School Dean David Brown is an expert in the field and that he has previously made proposals to the Research Committee, so they should not be starting at ground zero. Professor Brenner said he would keep track of what the administrative group is doing.

**2. Agenda items for the year for the Committee**

Committee members suggested the following items that should be addressed:

1. Task Force on Mandatory Retirement (ready to be appointed and given charge)
2. Task Force on Support Services (ready to be appointed and given charge)
3. Representation of P/A appointees in the Senate
4. Comparable pay/equal pay for equal work issues
5. Indirect Cost Recovery, especially issues of overhead
6. Discussion of activities and plans with Dolores Cross
7. Recruiting minority and high-ability students
8. Fringe benefits, especially the matter of graduate student tuition remission
9. Student enrollment in low tuition colleges with intent to transfer later

---

\* 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.

10. Civil service
11. Streamlining the grievance procedure
12. AIDS Task Force recommendations
13. Faculty salaries, especially trying to change the target or comparison group
14. Problems of the University Press
15. The University running private businesses

On salaries, the idea is to set the scene for a comparison group beyond the Big Ten; President Sauer has suggested that the new president be given the chance to identify the actual group that would be used. It was suggested that one way to proceed would be to look at research institutions and research funds; another proposal was that departments be asked, first, if they have lost faculty, where they went, and second, if they did not get a faculty member, where that individual finally went. While this might fall in the province of SCFA, it is something that FCC should watch. Another element of the salary issue is whether or not the University is doing the best it can with the merit system.

### **3. Discussion with President Sauer**

President Sauer said he wished to comment on a couple of items. The financial review committee he has appointed will have its first meeting on October 10. He has asked two questions of the group: What are the state of the University's finances (not financial management, which is being addressed by the Governor's commission) and what is the appropriate amount of legislative oversight of University finances. He felt that if the University did not take the initiative on the front it would continue to have audits and other steps continually taken which would not necessarily be beneficial to the University.

The other matter he brought to the Committee to inform it that he has made a request of the Vice Presidents and Chancellors that they set their objectives for the year; those objectives will be shared with the Board of Regents at their October meeting. The objectives could be programmatic, financial, educational, or of some other sort; he also asked that they be measurable in some way. He meets with each individual to come to agreement on the objectives; they are then used at the end of the year when salaries are to be set. The President was asked if these objectives are set in consultation with the faculty; he replied that when he was Vice President, he asked the same of the Deans and assumed that the objectives reflected the direction of the college and the faculty. Consultation with the faculty, however, was at their discretion rather than mandatory. One committee member cautioned that it should not be assumed that the faculty had been consulted about unit goals; the same ennui that affects the deans and directors can also affect the faculty. The survey of faculty members last year about the planning process had suggested that the extent of consultation had varied greatly among units.

The President also reported that he had recently concluded 22 one-day meetings around the state; they were usually a combination of public forum, speech to a service club, a meeting with the editorial staff of the newspaper, and an alumni function. He said he believed that they had help with the press statewide and in preparing for the legislative session. After the elections he will start a series of 19 meetings around the state which will be focussed on the Biennial Request; each will be hosted by alumni and friends of the University. He hopes to have these meetings completed between the election and Christmas.

The President told the Committee that the overriding message he had received from the recently-

completed meetings was that the people of the State care very much about the University and that is why they have been so angry. The University is a big part of the life of the state and people want it to continue that way. Specific questions, he said, depended on the most recent headlines; he no longer receives any questions on Eastcliff and only rarely on the reserves. The meetings were usually quite friendly; the overwhelming message was positive.

In private conversations with legislators from around the state, the President added, he has been repeatedly told that they want to help. They are not, now, saying so publicly; one Committee member expressed dismay at learning that. The President said they will not make public their support until after the election; there may still be a few votes to be gained by University-bashing. But there is a good chance to improve the environment for the University in the next three months.

One major misconception he has been trying to address, he told the Committee, is that prior to Commitment to Focus everybody could go to the University of Minnesota and that with the implementation of CTF it will be closed off. He has been explaining that there has been no real change in admissions standards and that of the reduction in undergraduate enrollment, 6,000 is to come from demographic changes. Asked about those projections, he said that it is more likely that the total reduction will be closer to 7,000 than 8,000. The behavior of high school graduates has changed: They are attending post-secondary institutions in record numbers and they are shifting toward collegiate rather than vocational programs. We could not have predicted that, he pointed out. Moreover, the University has absorbed about 1000 more students from Wisconsin than had been expected--mostly because of enrollment caps on Wisconsin institutions. Right now enrollment is on target; the question is whether or not the University can stay on target without taking additional steps. Should, for instance, Wisconsin students be treated differently? There is a need to clarify with the legislature the enrollment question; the intent has been that the reductions would be taken on the Twin Cities campus. Does that then mean that the other campuses can grow--requiring even further cuts on the Twin Cities campus? Should enrollment on the various campuses be decoupled? Should the figures be revised? These questions need to be addressed.

The President was asked about the recruitment of high ability students; he responded that the University has been doing things but there has not been much change in the numbers. Whatever we are doing, he said, it doesn't seem to be right. It was pointed out that the Times has noted that all elite private colleges are increasing their share of high ability students; another committee member observed that if the University is holding its own that may itself be a tremendous accomplishment. Furthermore, the University tends to come in very late with offers and recruitment; other colleges do it much earlier. President Sauer added that the same is true of recruitment of minorities; the Big Ten presidents are frustrated because all ten institutions are competing for the same pool. They agree on the need to identify a college cohort much earlier than is now the case.

Committee members commended the President on his response to the recent proposal by two members of the State Senate and his distribution of information to individuals who might be contacted about it. The President commented that the question of a president or a chancellor has been discussed by the Regents; some Board members want to act on it now but the majority want to wait to discuss it with the new president. He expressed his belief that it was not appropriate to tie the hands of the new president. Part of the problem, he added, is frustration at the extent to which the Chancellors have (not) been involved in decision-making with the vice presidents. These proposals could perhaps have been

avoided if the structure of meetings had been different. It was also pointed out that if the chancellors are more involved in institution-wide decisions, they should also be expected to take a broader interest in the problems of the institution; the President concurred, and said that recent meetings in which they were included has permitted them to become more informed about the Twin Cities campus as well as the others. The Committee concluded that the issue of president/chancellor and system decentralization were ones that it should take up in the near future.

A question was raised about goals in hiring for members of protected classes; it was recalled that Associate Vice President Foster, at the Finance Committee retreat, had mentioned that specific numbers would be used and administrators would be held to them. It is important how those numbers or goals are established; if they are not being met, departmental searches could be invalidated. President Sauer said he did not disagree; in managing the Institute, he met monthly with unit heads to discuss objectives, and he had done the same with individual faculty when he was a department head--and in each case, the individual must sign off on the objectives. How the matter of hiring would be approached would have to be left up to the new president; he has, however, managed to preserve some flexible funds which can be used.

The Committee discussed briefly with the President several issues related to the pending class settlement for women. It was agreed that the Committee would take up these issues at its next meeting in order to provide some advice to the administration.

#### **4. Students on Search Committees**

Professor Brenner called the attention of the Committee to the memo from Vice President Clark, which reported that the Regents have asked for a policy covering student membership on search committees. Questions raised at the meetings included whether or not there should be students on every committee or if there were those where such representation would be inappropriate and the possibility of including an escape clause if no students could be found who were willing to serve. Professors Steffes and Phillips agreed to serve on an ad hoc committee, to be appointed by SCC and which would include students, to promulgate recommendations and to report back to the Committee in December.

#### **5. Task Force on Mandatory Retirement**

Professor Brenner reported that the charge would be drafted shortly and the Task Force would be appointed.

#### **6. Role of the Committee in the Presidential Search**

Professor Brenner suggested it would be important that the Committee have a plan or a vision of how the interviews with finalists would be conducted, especially the interaction with faculty and students. It should be done in such a way that faculty involved represent the Committee and that a set of questions be devised ahead of time. It was agreed that this question should be pushed hard, and that the faculty and students should meet separately with the candidates. Committee members also discussed the possibility of a public forum; the substance of the remarks are included in the minutes of the Senate Consultative Committee for this same date.

## 7. Indirect Cost Recovery recommendations from the Research Committee

Professor Robert Bruininks, Chair of the Research Committee, joined the Committee for a discussion of the recommendations the committee had formulated and passed to FCC last spring. This discussion, it was agreed, would be preliminary, in order that Professor Hamilton, last year's chair, could be present for the principal review.

Professor Bruininks reported that management of ICR funds was a topic that the Research Committee had addressed annually for the past several years; it was an issue upon which there was a difference of opinion. The amount involved, he pointed out, has grown substantially in recent years, which has caused more attention to be given to its uses; it could reach \$30 million if the legislative offset is removed.

The Research Committee has scrutinized the expenditures of ICR money and has argued about items designated for system-wide recovery. Asked how peer institutions spend the money, Professor Bruininks reported that all put money into grant administration and all put some into utilities; some put money into library acquisitions, or shop services, or hazardous waste removal--it varies. Changes in the distributions, he added, always seem to have unintended consequences. The whole issue of system-wide recoveries should be revisited. University of Minnesota rates are on the middle to low side; they should be kept as low as possible. While having no criticism of any central officer, Professor Bruininks said, there have been a lot of decisions made on an ad hoc basis. On the other hand, the ability of central administrators to make creative decisions should not be lost.

The principles recommended would not replace prior actions by the Senate but would change the distribution of the money. The collegiate distribution would be 1/3, 1/3, 1/3--to principal investigator, department, and college. The Deans oppose it; the investigators like it. Professor Bruininks said he would personally benefit from it but that he thinks it is not good management; the accounting systems to handle \$30 million would need to be too complex.

Committee members discussed various percentages that might go to the central administration, the colleges, and the departments, the amounts for new projects and matching funds, and so on. It was agreed that more information about how other institutions distribute and use the funds was needed; Professor Bruininks agreed to try to pull such information together and that he and Professor Hamilton would return, probably in November, to discuss the issue further.

The Committee adjourned at 12:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota