

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Minutes

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Tuesday, September 26, 2006

2:30 – 4:15

238A Morrill Hall

Present:

Geoffrey Sirc (chair), Matthew Bribitzer-Stull, Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Vladimir Cherkassky, Tom Clayton, Janet Ericksen, Erin George, Kathryn Hanna, Morris Kleiner, Theodor Litman, Steven McLoon, Jane Miller, Kelly Risbey, Oriol Valls, Larry Wallace, Timothy Wiedmann, Virginia Zuiker

Absent:

Dann Chapman, A. Saari Csallany, Luis Ramos-Garcia, Roderick Squires

Guests:

Richard Howard (Director, Institutional Research)

[In these minutes:

(1) faculty salaries; (2) division of labor between committees on tenure code changes; (3) policy on evaluating endowed chairs]

1. Faculty Salaries

Professor Sirc convened the meeting at 2:35 and welcomed Dr. Howard to discuss faculty salaries. He noted that the first recommendation of the Faculty Culture Task Force is that "the University must commit substantial new funds in support of faculty compensation to make salaries more competitive with those of the institutions we hope to join as peers. This should funds for merit and market-based compensation after rigorous review." In addition, Professor Clayton sent a message, provided to the Committee, raising the question of whether the University should stick strictly to merit-based salary increases or should include some cost-of-living adjustment as well.

Dr. Howard thanked Professor Sirc and said he would provide to the Committee the presentation he made to the Board of Regents in the spring. He will present salary data for peer groups for Morris, Duluth, and the Twin Cities (the contract with the Crookston bargaining unit had not been settled when the salary data were compiled), and he explained the definitions that are used to create the data. He emphasized that there has been a great deal of work over many years on defining salaries for the purpose of comparison with other institutions. These data reflect 9-month salaries (with 12-month salaries equated to 9 months), no medical schools, only full-time faculty at the time the snapshot was taken, including heads and chairs, and are institution-wide.

The goal of the analysis was to address two questions: (1) is the University positioned competitively to recruit and retain faculty of the quality necessary to move to a top-three position, and (2) is the University using the appropriate universities against which to compare compensation and salaries? The comparative data exist in two categories:

compensation and salary; the former includes fringe benefits (retirement contribution, health, life, disability, etc., insurance, social security, worker's comp, unemployment comp, tuition for dependents (at some institutions)).

Dr. Howard explained that "average compensation and salary for faculty members across different universities vary primarily for three reasons:" mix of disciplines on a campus, cost of living and local taxes, and variations in fringe benefits.

Dr. Howard reviewed the comparison groups for the three campuses. The Morris group includes both public and private institutions (more private than public), including many of the private 4-year liberal arts campuses in Minnesota (St. Olaf, Gustavus, Carleton, Hamline, etc.). The Duluth group includes a number of public institutions such as Colorado-Denver, Maine-Orono, Nevada-Reno, U of New Hampshire, NC-Charlotte, etc. The Twin Cities has three different comparison groups that can be used: the Top 30 research universities (both public and private), the top 14 public research universities, and the Big Ten (which must be used for political reasons). These lists were created about nine years ago and, for the Twin Cities, reflected previous NRC rankings; the schools on the lists are being reconsidered.

For the Twin Cities, the Metrics & Measurement Task Force proposed establishing a set of comparison institutions that reflect the goal of being among the top three public research universities. The group would include all of the public institutions in the Top 30 and all those in the top of the Florida study. His suggestion is to use the task-force-recommended group, plus occasionally look at the Top 30, and use the Big Ten as needed.

Dr. Howard then reviewed the data for each of the three campuses for 2004-05 and 2005-06. For all ranks, 2005-06, compensation (not just salaries), UMM was \$3200 below the mean of its comparison group, UMD was \$2500 below, and UMTC was \$17,000 below (Top 30) or \$700 below (top 14 publics). On salaries alone, UMM was \$9100 below the mean, UMD was \$8100 below the mean, and UMTC was \$18,500 below (Top 30) and \$4800 below (top 14 publics). The differences varied by rank on all three campuses. Dr. Howard commented that UMM is doing better than the other campuses (because, he said in response to a question later, it at least improved its comparative standing vis-à-vis its peers while the other two campuses did not, or did not by much). The Twin Cities is about in the middle of the top 14 publics in compensation, at 11th in salary. For the top 30 research universities, the Twin Cities campus is 27th in salaries. The Provost has told the Board of Regents that this is a fundamental issue that must be addressed.

Professor McLoon noted that the University's total compensation comparisons look better than the straight salary comparisons. Has Dr. Howard analyzed the non-salary data and are the differences real? They are, Dr. Howard said, and the difference is primarily due to the University's retirement plan.

The rank of the Twin Cities campus vis-à-vis the Top 30 research universities has not changed much in the last 10 years. In compensation, for full professors, the rank has fluctuated between 20th and 23rd (dropping from 20th in 2000 and 2001 to 23rd in 2005 and 22nd in 2006. For associate professors the rank was 17th in 2001 and has since slipped to 21st. For assistant professors, the rank has been about 17th plus or minus for the period. The ranking on salaries is lower, 27th for full professors and 25th for both associate and assistant professors. Dr. Carney noted that there was a special legislative appropriation for competitive salaries last time and there was still essentially no movement in the University's salary rankings. It will not be a cheap fix, Dr. Howard observed.

Professor McLoon asked what percentage of the legislative appropriation went to administrative raises outside the colleges. None, Dr. Carney said; the increases were delivered only to faculty.

Professor Kleiner said that University faculty seem to be more productive than their salaries would suggest, if one compares salaries with other institutional measures, such as the Florida rankings; administrators could say "keep up the good work!" Professor McLoon inquired if anyone has done a study of the correlation between rankings and salaries. Dr. Howard said there is a correlation; that is contrary to what Professor Kleiner pointed out, Professor McLoon responded. Professor Kleiner said that the University faculty here are like the Minnesota Twins: their overall salaries

are low but they do well. In terms of productivity related to salaries, University faculty here are very efficient. Professor McLoon contended that one would have to have an overall assessment of quality and salary to reach that conclusion. Professor Kleiner pointed out that the University is ranked between third and sixth in the Florida study but is in the bottom third in salaries. The argument here is with the administration, Professor Valls maintained: it will cost a lot of money to bring the University to a competitive point and the administration should do it. Professor McLoon observed that the University was about 22nd in the last NRC rankings, very close to its salary ranking.

Professor Ericksen asked if the question of location mattered; UMM is one of only two campuses in its comparison group who are a long way from a bigger city.

Dr. Howard said location is not considered in the cost-of-living indicator, but Professor Britzter-Stull noted that (on a different slide) location is mentioned as one factor that affects faculty recruitment and retention in addition to salary. Dr. Howard said that they have learned, both from faculty the University has hired and those it was unable to hire, that qualitative issues (e.g., small town versus big city) do matter in some cases.

The future faculty salary and compensation strategy, according to the Provost, will consist of two elements: a multi-year approach of using "targeted merit program dollars" to retain the best and brightest and "strategically making dollars available in areas that have been identified as central to the University moving to one of the top three public research universities in the world."

The major question, Dr. Howard said, is whether there will be funding available over the long term to significantly affect the rankings.

What was the reaction of the Board of Regents to this presentation, Professor Wiedmann asked? They accepted the report, asked questions to clarify, and try to understand the role of faculty in teaching, research, and the reward structure (how does one know someone is doing high-quality research or teaching?), Dr. Howard said. There is a concern that these data do not reflect the competitive position the University must be in if it is to reach the top three.

Professor Hanna said she assumed the University was in early stages of biennial budget preparation; how will the request address this problem?

There will be a compensation item, Dr. Carrier said, but the specifics have not been discussed. Professor Wiedmann said that the University does not receive a cost-of-living adjustment, like other state-funded agencies, which hurts it. Dr. Carrier said that MNSCU does not receive cost-of-living increases; they must ask for any compensation increases, just as the University must.

The collective bargaining agreement at MNSCU does provide for both merit and cost-of-living/step increases, Professor Kleiner observed—a fixed increase and a merit increase. That used to be the case at Minnesota as well, and is true at some research universities.

Professor McLoon said that the University had a fixed component in the past, called cost-of-living, but it never was actually cost of living; it might have been half cost-of-living and half merit. Dr. Howard said he could envision the legislature providing 3% for increases, but he doubted it would provide 3% for merit and 3% for cost-of-living increases. Do step increases increase the base salary, Professor Wiedmann asked? The University can structure its salaries any way it wishes, Dr. Carrier said; the legislature will fund salaries to the extent it wishes and the University then decides what increases to deliver.

The University has funded salaries by cutting corners, Professor McLoon said, and departments have cut as much as they can. If units are told they must find the money themselves, that will be hard to do.

The bigger question is whether it is time to ask the legislature for catch-up funds, Professor Hanna suggested. Who decides what strategy to use?

Is it time to think about a compartmentalized request, with part of the salary increase based on cost of living?

How does the Committee wish to respond, Professor Sirc asked, if it wants the University to be competitive in recruiting faculty?

The salary issue should be tied to the strategic goals the University has presented, Professor Kleiner said. Usually the administration says "here's what we're asking for salaries"; at this point, the Committee should go to the administration and say "this is what we believe you should ask for."

Dr. Carrier said that there is a biennial request working group; the Committee could hear from it.

Professor McLoon said that in any event the increment should be called across-the-board, not cost-of-living, because it's never been at the level of cost-of-living increases.

Professor Sirc thanked Dr. Howard for his presentation.

2. Division of Labor between Committees

Professor Sirc next said that there needs to be a division of labor between this Committee and Academic Freedom and Responsibility in terms of revising the tenure code.

The Faculty Culture Task Force recommended revising parts of the code, and that sure is a "faculty affairs" matter. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is interested in hearing from this Committee. He and Professor Clayton have agreed that SCFA members should review carefully the minutes of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and that they will receive drafts of tenure code language revisions as they are prepared; Committee members should offer suggestions as the process moves along.

Dr. Carney said that the projected timeline calls for departments to provide to the Provost their revised 7.12 statements in the spring, the latest ones due in March.

The Provost's office will look at the statements from across the University in light of the new Section 7.11. The longer it takes to revise the 7.12 statements, the further out it pushes their applicability. If the new 7.12 statements can be completed by May, new faculty hired in the fall of 2007 will have the option of being judged by the new 7.12 or by the one they were shown while being recruited.

Current probationary faculty may decide within a year whether they wish to be judged on the basis of the old or the new 7.12 statement.

Professor Wiedmann asked if the 7.12 statements are being revised so the University can recruit better faculty. That is only one reason, Dr. Carney said. Some of the statements are very old. There were a lot of faculty interviewed during the work of the task force who felt that their department 7.12 statements did not reflect the values of the department—nor did they reflect public engagement, interdisciplinary research, and so on. The point is not just "tougher" 7.12 statements, it is about the values of the faculty in 2006 and reflecting the work that faculty do.

Professor Sirc said that the Provost also told departments that the 7.12 statements should be reviewed every ten years. This Committee, it was agreed, will NOT review all the 7.12 statements.

3. Policy on Evaluating Endowed Chairs

Professor Sirc turned now to Professor Wiedmann, who had led a small subcommittee last year to develop a policy on evaluation of lectureships, fellowships, professorships, and [endowed/funded]chairs; the other members of the subcommittee were Professors Kleiner and Zuiker. (Professor Wiedmann noted that Professor Frazier, formerly on the Committee, also contributed significantly to the development of the draft.) Professor Sirc quoted from a letter that Professor Fossum (a previous chair of this Committee) wrote to (now Senior Vice President, then Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs) Robert Jones:

We [SCFA] are interested in knowing that extent to which actual appointments (both those at the university level like McKnights, etc., and those handled within collegiate units) are made consistent with the [new Regents' policy on honors and awards], the extent to which there are clear and written agreements regarding the term of the appointment, the review procedures to be used to determine whether a reappointment is made, and what the length of notice will be in the case of non-reappointment. (This is particularly important if the appointee has made longer run commitments to graduate research assistants, etc.) We recognize that endowed positions are important to the university and collegiate units in providing levers to signal important changes to faculty and to substantially increase the capabilities of particular units. At the same time, we believe that

having regular and transparent review procedures protect the academic freedom of position-holders and are consistent with our well-thought-out tenure and promotion guidelines.

The overarching issue, Professor Kleiner said, and the reason the subcommittee was appointed, was that there have been unilateral appointments made without faculty participation. These are positions of excellence, used to attract and retain faculty, and faculty should have a voice in the appointments in the same way that they do with regular faculty appointments.

The text of the policy Professor Wiedmann presented is this:

There are more than 700 Endowed Chairs at the University of Minnesota. The expenditure of dollars to those holding endowed chairs and professorships exceeded \$30 million in fiscal year 2003. The number and dollar expenditures are expected to grow due to shrinkage of historical means/levels of support coupled with expansion of charitable campaigns.

Currently, there is no policy that requires faculty oversight or involvement in the development or implementation of review processes for faculty holding these positions. In fact, there is no requirement of a review.

The faculty compensation policy does not recognize the existence of this form of compensation and the Tenure Code makes no mention of these factors.

Therefore, it behooves the Faculty Senate to provide clarification to the Tenure Code and Post-Tenure Review process as well as to develop a policy to require review of those faculty that receive awards, honors, and recognition and the inclusion of faculty from the appropriate academic unit in the review process.

Section 7a.1 of the TENURE CODE requires that

"faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty."

According to the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW
Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee January 5, 1998
Revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998, the implementation of Section 7a of the tenure code requires the following:

The faculty of each academic unit should adopt two policy statements. One is a statement of goals and expectations for all faculty members in that unit (Section 7a.1). The other is a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews (Sections 7a.2, 7a.3). Many Academic Units already have these (or similar) policies in place for compensation review purposes. If so, the faculty need only make any modifications it feels necessary and identify them as the policies applicable to post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a.

The two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. If existing policies are being designated for this purpose, there should be a vote of the faculty designating them as such. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

The Subcommittee of SCFA asserts these policies must be applied to those that receive special awards, honors and recognition.
This would include lectureships, fellowships, professorships, or chairs (referred more generally as endowed

chairs to distinguish the appointment from administrators) as defined in the Board of Regents Policy ,
AWARDS, HONORS, AND RECOGNITION.
 The special recognition, honor or compensation bestowed upon the faculty must be considered in establishing the goals and expectations for that faculty in a manner analogous to taking into account the different :
 professional development of faculty.

Pursuant to the Tenure code (Section 7a.1), each unit must have a statement addressing the goals and expectations for all faculty including those that receive special recognition, honor, or compensation. Each unit must also have a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews of all faculty, including those specially recognized faculty. In keeping with the **RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW** Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee, the two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

For the recognition, honor, or compensation that is awarded by an entity other than the academic unit (for example, the college, university, or outside entity), rules and procedures for timely review must be developed by the awarding entity. These procedures must have a component involving the review conducted by the academic unit of the faculty.

Professor Wiedmann recalled that there was considerable discomfort with the earlier draft of this policy, presented to the Committee last spring. Part of the problem is that these appointments include everything from Regents Professors to faculty who get to add a couple of words to their title. At the time, there was no agreement on the policy, but if departments are working on their 7.12 statements, it might be timely to have a policy like this in place.

Professor McLoon said he was not prepared to vote on the policy now, but virtually all the other Committee members asked that it be voted on. Professor Valls said that the issue has been around a long time and that the subcommittee has worked on it and produced a document that reflects a consensus.

Where does it go once the Committee acts on it, Professor Wiedmann asked? It goes to the Faculty Consultative Committee and then to the Faculty Senate, Professor Sirc said, after which point the President either approves it or not; if he does, it becomes University policy. Dr. Carrier suggested it be made part of the faculty compensation policy. Professor Kleiner agreed and said that policy provides the model: if the faculty want to be involved, they can be, or they may choose not to be. This policy will not affect anyone's tenure status, he pointed out.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the policy. Professor Sirc said he would bring the policy to the Faculty Consultative Committee and then adjourned the meeting at 3:45.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota