

Minutes*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Thursday, April 7, 1994

3:15 - 5:00 p.m.

626 Campus Club

Present: Carl Adams (chair), Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Daniel Feeney, Morris Kleiner, Richard McGehee, Michael Sadowsky, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, Yang Wang

Regrets: Daniel Canafax, Ann Erickson, Roger Feldman, Audrey Grosch

Absent: Rose Brewer, Judith Gaston, Dianne Mulvihill, Roger Paschke, Phuong Phan, George Seltzer, James Stone

Guest: Robert Fahnhorst

1. Approval of Minutes

A motion was approved to accept the March 17, 1994 minutes.

2. Chair's Report

Professor Adams said that V. P. Erickson had received SCFA's letter addressing the its interest in exploring health care coverage separate from the current state plan. The senior officers are now aware of the committee's initiatives in this direction.

The pursuit of developing a separate health care plan for faculty and P&A could cost over \$100,000 according to the chair. Therefore, the committee will need to develop a substantive rationale, including a rough estimate of cost, which proves that the project would be worth the physical and fiscal expenditure. Such a proposal would need to be directed toward V. P.s Infante and Erickson who would be responsible for determining to fund such an endeavor. Professor Adams has proposed to meet with Carol Carrier, and the vice presidents on April 22 to talk about this issue. Assoc. V. P. Carrier previously told Dr. Adams that the administration will need to be convinced that this initiative is necessary. This is especially the case because there are not a large number of faculty outwardly complaining to the administration said the chair. He continued by saying that the problem exist because people with substantially different values with respect to health care are combined into one plan. Several committee members mentioned their dissatisfaction with the punitive measures distributed to those using physicians outside of their plan. One SCFA member recommended assembling a focus group to determine the level of dissatisfaction among faculty and P&A on this issue. One committee member recommended presenting the issue to the vice presidents as an improvement based solution as opposed to dealing with it as a problems. At the April 22 meeting with the vice presidents, Professor Adams said he would work on determining what level of argument would satisfy the administration on this issue.

*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.

The Research Committee would like to have a joint meeting on May 26, the last scheduled meeting. Therefore, the chair expressed a desire to schedule a final meeting for the committee on June 9. He said the University Senate Office will supply more information on the meeting.

There is lots of discussion about reorganization of administration (which SCFA may not need to address, but should be aware of) including the "strong president model" which involves the use of many direct report officers (either chancellors or provosts) and a strong supporting president's office to support the head position. In other words, all the current provosts and chancellors would report directly to the president, said Professor Adams. One SCFA member asked if this would change the number of high paid administrators. The chair said that this could reduce or modify the numerous amount of vice presidents. The administration hopes that creating a clear and direct line to the president will strengthen the University's academic units and allow for better communication between units. The chair added that this is not the only model being discussed, although this one presents the most significant change from what exists. The President has discussed this matter with FCC and "**McKenzie and Company**" for consultation. Two members expressed that the President should seek consultation from academic organizations as well as those with a business emphasis such as McKenzie. Associate Vice President Carol Carrier said that the University has been observing Indiana University's application of this model.

3. Discussion of Proposed Caregiving Responsibility Policy - Mary Dempsey

Professor Dempsey described that the committee had proposed a redefinition of "family member" at the March 17 meeting along with clarification of the term "domestic partner." The note explaining this reads:

The term "family member" is meant to include a blood relative, or a marital partner, or a domestic partner (registered with the University), or an adoptive/foster child.

Dr. Dempsey also added that a probationary faculty member would need to submit a written application to the head of their academic unit, who would forward the document through the "appropriate University channels." **SCFA approved a motion to accept all of the items listed above as changes to the caregiving policy.**

4. Discussion of Amendment to Sections 14.1 and 14.2 of the Tenure Code - Mary Dempsey

Professor Dempsey explained that the existing tenure document lists all references to completing reporting in "days." The committee had discussed using "working days" which would require correcting the language of the entire document when referring to "days." Therefore, Dr. Dempsey expressed that a legal consultant (Fred Morrison) had recommended the committee express an time for reporting in "days." Dr. Dempsey recalculated the references to "days" in sections 14.1 and 14.2 of the tenure code. She also told the committee that the legal consultant had understood "days" to refer to include weekend and week days. The chair recommended that the meaning of "days," referring to all calendar days, be defined for the entire document to eliminate any confusion. **The committee approved a motion to accept the amendments to the tenure code as recalculated by Professor Dempsey. A note is to accompany the changes as they are passed on to the FCC that SCFA presumed that "days" refers to calendar days.**

5. Discussion of Meeting With the President - Carole Bland

The committed continued discussion in regards to its perception that the senior decision making officers of the University are not appropriately sensitive to or sympathetic to faculty values. The chair expressed that FCC has developed a blue ribbon committee which is addressing with the President the attitude and style of senior administrators among other issues. The President is interested in meeting with SCFA according to Professor Adams. The items discussed by the committee in relation to the meeting and the overall perceived problem included:

- **the meeting should be approached to achieve constructive results for a reasonably acknowledged problem**
- the meeting could occur in the context of a retreat
- SCFA agreed that they want to proceed with the meeting
- some of the problems may need to be expounded on for the President
- the use of an outside facilitator may be recommendable
- bombarding the President with perceived problems should occur
- solutions should be presented along with the problems
- **there is a perception that the core values of the faculty and the senior administrators are different**
- suggestions could be offered in the areas of style and core values
- the administration keeps the campus off balance and reactionary
- because the matter is dealing with perceptions, both faculty and administration are correct, yet some differ and need to be reconciled
- faculty need to develop trust for the administration through mutual understanding of core values
- faculty feel that they are not being included in decision making
- administration's values are evident through their actions
- faculty feel that they are expendable
- values of administrators are as varied as those of faculty
- the perceived problems are not related to the immediate connection of SCFA to the administration
- FCC may not share the same level of frustration

The chair communicated that he was interested in determining how long the initial meeting should be (1 hour, or 1 day), and how should the expression of problems and feelings be balanced against the attempt to create constructive consequences. The committee decided to look into arranging a 1.5 hour meeting with the President to clarify issues and problems by focusing on style, communication, and perceptions of values. The chair recommended that the first meeting not be oriented towards presenting solutions. Professor Bland was requested by the committee to continue drafting the proposal for the meeting along with Associate Vice President Carrier.

-- Kevin Gormley