

Minutes\*

**Joint Meeting  
Faculty Consultative Committee  
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Thursday, February 9, 1995  
1:00 - 2:00  
Room 433 Johnston Hall**

- Present: (FCC) John Adams (chair), Carl Adams, Thomas Burk, Sheila Corcoran-Perry, Sara Evans, Virginia Gray, Kenneth Heller, Roberta Humphreys, Geoffrey Maruyama, Harvey Peterson, Michael Steffes
- (SCFA) Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Carol Chomsky, Willard Manning, Anne Sales
- Regrets: none sought, inasmuch as the meeting was called on two days notice
- Absent: none sought
- Guests: Professor Mary Lou Fellows (chair, Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics), President Nils Hasselmo
- Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

[In these minutes: The appointment of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Athletics]

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed the President. He explained that since the appointment of Dr. McKinley Boston to the position of Vice President for Student Affairs and Athletics, he and other Committee member have received calls and heard expressions of a variety of views about the process used, the goals of the University, and the pressures on the institution. Some understand what was done; other are upset. Some understand that there are emergency appointments and normal appointments. Given the concerns, it was thought a good idea that the Committee meet with him to be informed about what had occurred.

The President welcomed the opportunity and said that if the issues are not made clear today, there should be additional meetings, because he wanted no lingering doubts about what had occurred.

There are four components to be addressed: the position, the person, the process, and the circumstances.

The position is part of the reorganization of the office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; he said he was unsure how extensively this specific position had been discussed. Traditionally, athletics had reported to a vice president, most recently (until 1987) the Vice President for Student Affairs. President Keller transferred athletics to the President's Office as result of the basketball scandal

---

\*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.

and because some thorny issues had to be dealt with. When he assumed office, the President recalled, he had to finish dealing with those issues before the NCAA, and the timing seemed not to be right to make an administrative change. With the reorganization of central administration, however, reassignment was appropriate. The student affairs vice presidency was adjusted in some other ways as well, before the appointment of Dr. Boston had been contemplated. The early stages of consultation about the position were underway when the recruitment of Dr. Boston by Florida State began.

In terms of the process, the President noted that there is a provision in search procedures that gives the President the authority to hire without search in an emergency. Both Associate Vice President Carrier and EEO Director Patricia Mullen concurred in his decision to offer the position to Dr. Boston, based on his knowledge of Dr. Boston's accomplishments. The President also reviewed Dr. Boston's other qualifications and his credentials for the position, and related that he had known since he had hired him that Dr. Boston had aspirations to work in student development (although there had been no vacancy).

Before the situation with Florida State arose, he told the Committee, he assumed there would be a regular search; it had not yet begun, and Acting Vice President Imholte had agreed to stay in the position until July 1. When Florida State expressed an interest, he talked with Dr. Boston and discussed the student affairs position, although still assuming there would be a search and that Dr. Boston would be a strong candidate. Once Florida State had "upped the ante," and Dr. Boston agreed to visit them without making any decision, they put on considerable pressure, including involvement by the Governor of Florida.

As he considered Dr. Boston's accomplishments, "quiet charisma," and the way various communities in the state had responded to him, the President related, he decided to extend an offer. He had cleared the appointment beforehand with Drs. Carrier and Mullen, and made the offer when Dr. Boston returned from Florida. It was not clear until late in the week, he said, that he would act.

Are there people in the community interested in retaining Dr. Boston? Yes, in all walks of life, high and low. Did he yield to pressures in making the appointment? No, the President said; he made a judgment that he wished to retain Dr. Boston. He was fortunate in being able to get a quick reply from private sources about outside financial support, he said, and the money will come through normal University channels, so Dr. Boston will be beholden to no one--and he does not, moreover, know the source of the funds.

Somewhat unusual circumstances, the President concluded, prompted an unusual but not irregular decision.

Asked how he chose the salary, the President explained that Dr. Boston's salary as Men's Athletic Director, with the bonus provisions, was in the low \$150,000s. There should not be a bonus provision in a vice presidential salary, and with the new position, \$160,000 seemed appropriate. When Florida State offered as much money as it did, he then obtained the private support to supplement the institutional salary. Dr. Boston insisted that the private funds only vest after three years, as a way to demonstrate he would not be trying to leverage his salary each year and to demonstrate his commitment to staying at the University.

The symbolic message, said one Committee member, is that the student affairs vice president

makes more than the academic affairs vice president; one can understand market forces, but how does the President resolve the balance? There is no easy resolution, he said. Salaries vary a great deal all over the University, and there are private components to other administrative salaries that were necessary in order to meet market competition. One can make the same observation about the salaries of the law school dean and health sciences provost, pointed out one Committee member; the market demands those salaries. The issue, however, goes to faculty morale; faculty members see these big numbers and compare them with their own salaries.

The President said he was very concerned about faculty salaries; this is one example of how the University must meet market pressure if it is to keep leaders. The same thing has been done with faculty as well; the Regents Professors have private funds in their salaries, although by a different arrangement. The University is heavily influenced by market forces, which create enormous variations, even though he would prefer to see a simpler salary scale.

Is there a distinction between faculty members who have tenure, who might be appointed to an administrative position for a short term, and those who have fixed term administrative appointments but who do NOT have tenure? Most faculty would agree that the salary structure should be different if the individual does not have tenure. Dr. Carrier pointed out that there is now in place a policy which requires identification of a base faculty salary and an augmentation when a tenured faculty member is hired into an administrative post.

The President said he did not believe such a distinction now existed in administrative salaries, which are largely the result of historical accident; there is no division between administrators with and without faculty appointments, but tenure is a factor. In some cases, he pointed out, it could drive an administrative salary UP, if the faculty member were highly paid.

The most concerns heard, said one faculty member, are about this secret pot of dollars that seems to exist. He has put it in different terms today, the President was told, but the message is not getting across. What he has said is different from what gets from the news; with the private funds, there are questions about whom Dr. Boston is working for. An official statement clarifying this would help.

No one at the University is paid directly by an outside individual, the President said. They may be paid through donations, such as the endowed chairs, where the donor is known. There is no relationship between Dr. Boston and the individuals who provided the money.

One Committee member suggested that these arrangements might be more understandable if they were structured as chairs, so one might be vice president for something and chair of x. Another disagreed, maintaining that people would be more offended, because the occupants of the positions would not necessarily have the academic accomplishments that go with chairs. This financial arrangement, however, is used in government circles, more outside the University, and people understand them. The President also clarified later, in response to a question, that this arrangement is for Dr. Boston only, not for his successors.

If a professor receives an offer, it was noted, the University will not match it until it is in writing. One understands that no offer had been made to Dr. Boston; had he been selected? The President said he did not press the issue to that point, and decided to stave it off by getting agreement beforehand.

As the only student present, Ms. Sales said, her perspective about the position he is taking, in student development, is that there has been no consultation with students about it. There could have been consultation about the position; the fact that someone has also been selected without any student participation is a concern that needs to be registered.

Why was there no search begun for this position, asked one Committee member? It would help to answer questions, to think about the position. One would have preferred that the appointment would have been made without Dr. Boston having to go to Florida--that it would have been made for the right reasons. The President explained that it had to do with the stage of the consultative process. The provost searches are underway--one was completed last fall--while this position is part of the reorganization of Academic Affairs. The discussion of that reorganization had been taking place for several months, but the consultation about it had only begun, so searches for vacant positions had not started. It was his assumption, he repeated, that there would be a regular search, but then events got very compressed.

There is the impression among faculty that the central administration can avoid searches. The President pointed out that the ONLY other time he has used the emergency appointment process was with Senior Vice President Infante.

One Committee member observed that in the context of U2000, this vice presidency is very important, because it focuses on the conditions students deal with, which have an impact on learning. In the past, this office has been somewhat divorced from academic issues; the University realizes now that everything has an impact on learning and what happens to students is key. People are concerned that this very important vice presidency will be filled by a person who has not announced a vision or a program, by someone who is here because of athletics. What of the 40,000 other students in the system, and the improvement of their learning conditions?

The President said he wished the Committee could hear Dr. Boston expound on these topics. Even in athletics, he has taken a broad view of student interests and their integration in the community. He is impressed by Dr. Boston's vision, he said, and his experience and his community-building efforts are exactly what the University needs. It was, however, a judgment call on his part, the President said, that the University would benefit from Dr. Boston's presence. That was his call, and if it was wrong, the rest of the concerns are largely irrelevant.

One Committee member said it was wonderful that Dr. Boston had been retained, but the comment in the paper by one individual that his appointment would restore a balance between academics and athletics was not helpful. Nor have the comments by the Governor and others been helpful, in that respect. The sports press, the President noted laconically, was not kind to him when he voted in favor of Proposition 16 at the NCAA convention, which was one way to uphold academic values.

Dr. Boston needs to be brought into contact with the academic side of the house, and must demonstrate that he is concerned about the 40,000 students who do not have outstanding athletic ability.

Will he report to the President? No, the President replied, he will report to Senior Vice President Infante. So if there is a problem in athletics, one will see Dr. Boston with the athletic director, not the General Counsel? It is inappropriate for the General Counsel to be at a press conference with an athletic director, maintained one Committee member. If an athletic director needs to speak to the outside world with an administrator, it should be Dr. Boston. The President pointed out that in the case being referred

to, a judge had issued an injunction, and in legal matters the General Counsel speaks for the University.

Professor (Carl) Adams reported that he had been in a consultative meeting with the President earlier in the week, and had been asked if this appointment was appropriate. He had said he believed it was. The President had sought consultation on the appointment.

One must recognize, it was said, that the University must recognize the market, and that wild variations in salary can be rationalized by market forces. The faculty leadership makes that same argument in making the case to sustain faculty salaries.

It was also said that the job of a university president is not easy. It is helpful if the President can be decisive and take risks. One only hopes that he can be equally decisive in taking action to correct mistakes, if they are made.

Professor (John) Adams then related that in the short time he has been involved in the consultative process, about three years, there have been frequent occasions when the President, or Dr. Infante, or Mr. Erickson, or the General Counsel, will call to say something, to let him know something, or to ask questions. He has come to understand, he said, that this is a routine part of the job of chair of the Consultative Committee. As the events with Dr. Boston unfolded, the President had talked with him, with (the other) Professor Adams, and with others, to ask what they thought. It is being suggested that he--Professor Adams--should have let other Committee members know of what was occurring. It is a matter of judgment what kind of accounting should be provided. To the extent people feel they have been let down, he said, he regrets it; at the time, it seemed an appropriate way to proceed. In addition, he said, he believes personnel decisions are different, and there is a "fuzzy boundary" between them and the consultative process.

It was dismaying to meet with him last Thursday morning, said one Committee member, and then to see him at the airport that night, meeting Dr. Boston. The President replied that he had not known he would be at the airport.

The President had spoken enthusiastically about U2000 and the university of the future, at the FCC meeting last week, it was recalled, and he had also expressed dismay about the lack of faculty engagement and understanding of U2000. Some Committee members spoke of declining faculty morale and negative messages and disincentives. The events at the end of last week are seen by faculty as one more example of events that discourage faculty. It is important that the faculty hear from central administration that there is a strong academic commitment to the core of the University; it feels as though the arts, sciences, and engineering have been bearing the brunt of the retrenchment effort, and there needs to be action to demonstrate the commitment.

When he was speaking with FCC last week, the President pointed out, he had spoken of the lack of faculty engagement as a failing on HIS part; he had not been making accusations. He went on to reflect that when one has been at a University for nearly 30 years, it is disconcerting to hear people wonder if one has academic values. He has tried to favor the arts and sciences core in decision-making and noted that \$7.5 million went into IT and CLA in the 1991 restructuring and reallocation, which included closing a campus. He said he will not be told that the arts, sciences, and engineering have been short-changed in his administration.

One Committee member inquired what the consequences of these actions would be for women's athletics. The President said the appointment of Dr. Boston is independent of that issue, in one sense, and not linked to the question of what needed to be done organizationally. The long-term consequences, however, should be positive, because Dr. Boston is committed to opportunities for men AND women in athletics. With respect to the women's department, the President said, these are deplorable circumstances, with virtual campaigns being conducted against the women's director. He has tried to resist such pressures and make decisions in the right way.

It will be critical, said one Committee member, given the way things have unfolded, that ANY further discussions include students, because discussion of this position will be very important. The President agreed, and pointed out that the reorganization needed to go through the consultative process.

The President, noting he had to return to meetings of the Board of Regents, said he would be glad to continue the discussion at any time, because he wished the issues to be cleared up.

Before departing, he reported that in a hearing with one of the committees of the (State) Senate, there was a clear understanding of the choices put in front of the state by the partnership proposal. At least a couple of the committee members understood that if the state does not provide funding, tuition will have to increase and programs will be curtailed. He said he hoped not to miss the opportunity to make the University's case; it has taken a lot of effort to get to this position, and he did not want any festering questions to undermine the progress that has been made.

Professor Adams thanked the President for joining the Committee on short notice. After the President's departure, he asked Committee members what the next steps should be. Several comments were made:

- To be fair to Dr. Boston, he must have an opportunity to meet with the Committee to lay out his principles and plans; Professor Fellows, chair of ACIA, should also be invited. Professor Heller reported that Dr. Boston will also be asked to meet with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

Concern was expressed that Dr. Boston will take office with "a cloud over his head," thereby inhibiting his effectiveness and likelihood of success. The Committee must take whatever steps it can to make clear what occurred and provide whatever help it can to assist him.

It was noted that Dr. Boston had made a presentation to the University Senate after he was appointed; one Committee member recalled being very interested in Dr. Boston's comments, although utterly uninterested in sports. Another commented that although he had never had a conversation with Dr. Boston, everyone who has worked with him think him very solid, and one can be glad the emergency appointment was made. Professor Adams agreed that Dr. Boston should be invited to speak to the Senate again next fall, after he is in office.

- It has been tradition for Student Affairs to be thought of as dealing with undergraduates; who looks after graduate students? With the Graduate School "washing its hands" of many responsibilities, and given the structure of Senate committees, there is little time spent on graduate students or graduate education. But when one looks at the long-term interests of the University, incoming freshmen are not the only key.

- The restructuring discussion is ongoing, and there have been various presentations to this Committee over the months. The faculty's concerns about the Graduate School, and the perceived growth of the administration, should be addressed, it was said. It was pointed out that there have been several discussions here, and that Mr. Berg is developing information for the Committee about the numbers of administrators. Professor Adams agreed that the reorganization should remain high on the agenda of the Committee. As the process has been structured, one Committee member observed, administrators come and provide information; if Committee members do not like that, they will need to take a more active stance. Committee members varied in their views about whether or not the reorganization was a concern to faculty.

The two key worries, it was said, are 1) the apparent proliferation of administrators, and 2) the place of graduate education--how will it be dealt with, given separate provosts--and the place of undergraduate education. The reporting points for both levels of education are not clear, even though those are two very large aspects of University activity.

Professor Adams asked for suggestions on who might be asked to speak with the Committee on these matters, and urged that the questions be focused and specific so that the Committee does not waste time. There is also a need, he said, to invite a representative set of the deans and department heads, to obtain their views about what their faculty are telling them and how things are working. This will require extra meetings, he observed, and the Committee must remember that it does not run the University--but it does need to hear from those working day-to-day with faculty, and to express the Committee's views to the administration.

It must also be recalled, pointed out one Committee member, that the reorganization is being dealt with in a variety of venues--SCFA is dealing with tenure implications, SCFP is discussing the Finance and Operations side of the house, and so on. It is not that there is ONE document, discussed in ONE place; the process is ongoing, and includes a lot more people than this Committee.

- In the case of a public figure like Dr. Boston, private funds can be found to supplement the salary. What about faculty, when such funds are not available? Professor Adams agreed that this is a good issue. There is significant focus on the legislative appropriation, which forms a smaller and smaller part of the University's funding; attention should be put on other sources of revenue. In the last capital campaign, when the money was used for endowed chairs, most of them ended up in the professional schools. That is in part because some deans GO AFTER external funds, while others don't seem to believe it is a central part of their job. Several, however, see development activity as a routine part of their responsibilities.

Professor Adams adjourned the meeting at 2:00.

-- Gary Engstrand