

Minutes *

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 25, 1996 (Part II)
12:30 - 3:00
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

Present: Carl Adams (chair), John Adams, Carole Bland, Victor Bloomfield, Dan Feeney, Virginia Gray, James Gremmels, Russell Hobbie, Roberta Humphreys, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson

Regrets: Lester Drewes, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Steffes

Guests: Provost W. Phillips Shively

Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate); Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: various items of business, including AHC re-engineering, tenure; comments on the discussion with the regents; discussion with Provost Shively; minutes policy; Committee member conduct]

2. Committee Business

Following the departure of Regents Reagan, Bleyhl, Keffeler, and Spence, Professor Adams reported that there was a minor misunderstanding about the dockets of the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly on May 2. It appears that the FCC, on April 18, approved the May 2 agendas of those two bodies. That was not his intent, he said; he assumed that at the prior meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee those dockets had been approved, and it was an oversight for FCC to have spoken as if it were approving agendas. He said he would send a note to Mr. Bergstrom clarifying that the faculty had no intention of stepping on the prerogatives of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Professor Adams also reported that he has picked up an increasing sensitivity on the part of the students to a declining faculty interest in their issues and in their participation. The more the faculty can be aware of that sensitivity, the better off everyone will be.

* * *

He then recalled the exchange with Professor Gayle Graham Yates about appointing a group to consider revisions of the academic misconduct procedures. He said he believes this is clearly SCFA business, and asked Professor Feeney to take it up. If the press of other business requires a delay of a month or two, that is fine. Professor Adams told the Committee that the SSAB is currently constituted as an administrative group, but is not happy about its role and wishes for a connection with the Senate.

*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.

* * *

Although perhaps not an FCC issue, Professor Adams noted the great anxiety about the CSC Index contract and the re-engineering effort. He recalled that Provost Cerra is talking about this with the AHC faculty on April 27, and said that SCEP and Finance and Planning will both take up re-engineering issues. So will SCFA. His view, he said, is that those three committees should look at what is going on and be informed, and hope also that Provost Cerra will address the difficulties. Is there another view of what should be done?

Since the subject crosses all three committees, said one Committee member, it is better that FCC provide direction; perhaps there should be a three-person group, with one representative from each committee, to go to the meeting with Provost Cerra and to be sure that information is gathered for FCC and that the issue is not lost. Another Committee member observed that provostal governance will soon be getting off the ground, although one Committee member pointed out that this issue transcends one provost. It was pointed out that the AHC provostal faculty consultative committee has a tie to FCC, and it could adopt a resolution denouncing the process.

One Committee member took exception to the direction Professor Adams suggested FCC involvement should take. This is an issue that is poisoning the entire faculty-administrative relationship [an assertion that received the assent of several Committee members when made] and the entire University. It is not solely a finance problem or a SCFA or a SCEP problem; that means that if FCC has any responsibility, it should take it on. It is not solely an AHC problem. It is wrecking the tenure process, observed another Committee member; the first Committee member agreed it was wrecking a lot of things.

Professor Adams asked for an immediate suggestion for what FCC should do. One Committee member agreed it is an immediate problem, and that the issue should not be passed into three separate committees because that would delay solving the problem. This is about to explode; FCC cannot say it will set up a committee to discuss it. FCC will have to act, and act quickly; any subcommittee should be out of this Committee.

FCC is already on record charging various committees with pursuing the issue of the AHC; that will go forward unless FCC stops it. In addition, Provost Cerra is going to address this with his full faculty; what the outcome will be is unknown, but perhaps the heightened attention of FCC will be reduced. If there is another mechanism FCC should be using, what might it be?

This should be an agenda item next week, May 2. If the contract has not been terminated, then there should promptly be a meeting with the President and the Provost. It was agreed that three representatives of FCC would attend the meeting with Provost Cerra and the AHC faculty and report back to FCC. It was agreed that Professors Bland, Feeney, and Humphreys would do so. The Committee discussed the implications of the contract renewal with CSC Index, and the possibility of terminating it, and agreed it would revisit the issue next week.

One of the visitors to the Committee commented that the nature of the discussion has been that the consultant is the problem; it is the people who hire the consultants who are the problem. A meeting was held last week, after Provost Cerra met with the School of Public Health, a meeting which included all of

the AHC deans except from Dentistry, who has become persona non grata because he would not participate in the right way in the re-engineering process. At that meeting--it was Provost Brody who was conducting the meeting, not Provost Cerra--Provost Brody suggested or asked all of the other deans if they would voluntarily resign because they were not doing the job in bringing the faculty to where they are supposed to go. It is not just the consultant who is doing these things; focusing on the consultant is not the issue.

The Committee can hear that discussion, but needs a lot more information before it can come to any conclusions, Professor Adams responded. Another Committee member concurred, saying the Committee must look at the whole process that has been put in place. At the same time, Provost Cerra can be helped with re-engineering, or provide support for changes that are needed; the intent of the Committee is not to just stop everything.

* * *

What is the relationship of FCC to the three committees dealing with tenure (Tenure Subcommittee, Committee on Faculty Affairs, Judicial Committee), Professor Adams inquired? The Faculty Senate clearly indicated it wished leadership to come from those three; what is FCC's role? If there is one, it should be clear what is expected; if FCC is asked to represent its views on the subject, it should be clear who will be asked to make that representation other than himself, Professor Adams concluded.

One Committee member proposed that in light of the Faculty Senate vote, FCC designate a committee of three, consisting of the chairs of the three committees, to be the spokesperson on tenure. Since the SCFA chair is on FCC, Professor Feeney should have the responsibility for coordination. The FCC function henceforth should be restricted to the ordinary function of setting the docket. The lead person will be Professor Feeney; he will be spokesperson, perhaps after consultation with the other two chairs.

What about the legal questions that are raised? They may seek whatever staff support they wish, Professor Adams said. Professor Feeney pointed out that they already have a legal counsel: Professor Morrison.

With that understanding, the Committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal. This means, Professor Adams concluded, is that in any discussion with the Board of Regents, that is the mechanism that will be used.

3. Comments on the Discussion with the Regents

The Committee returned to the subject of the discussion with the Board of Regents. One suggested that a significant dialogue had been opened and should not be dropped. What Regent Keffeler said was encouraging: that there needs to be a joint understanding of the basic issues before solutions are identified. There is perhaps an implicit agreement to engage in discussion of those basic issues; a small committee should be set up to work with the Regents over the summer. This is tied to tenure, but it is more than tenure; there are more fundamental issues about the future of the University that "we are poised to be able to address."

Another Committee member expressed less confidence about the exchange with the Regents. There was nothing said today that had not been said before, there were no reactions today that had not been seen before, and not everyone may be completely forthcoming about what they believe.

To the extent the Committee has further conversations on the subject, it was said, the exact concerns, from a long-term point of view, must be put on the table. The University has financial problems looming on the horizon, five years out, that people cannot imagine, to the extent the University relies on state money. It has a political problem in a few years in terms of competition for state funding with MNSCU and the private colleges. One hears enough from Regents and central officers to know that some are looking out five years and then working back to today, trying to figure out what is being done today can be adjusted to avoid catastrophe in five years. There are probabilities one can attach to those expectations; some would like to put a zero probability on it, and say there is no problem. Somewhere that discussion has to be on the table.

The drift of those comments, replied another Committee member, is that the Board is not really open to discussion, so do not have them. (That is NOT intended, it was said.) The door was opened a crack; the Committee should try to open it a bit further.

The suggestion for a three-person group to meet with the Regents is a good one, said another Committee member. But the faculty are the educators in this situation, and it is clear that the process has not educated the Regents one iota on the value of tenure. One possibility would be something along the line of the Pew forums that were held one year, a more informal setting where faculty can talk about concrete instances of threats to their academic freedom, where young faculty can talk about why they go into this career and the trade-offs they make. Then one could envision another occasion where the Finance and Planning Committee prepares a white paper of its own on financial projections, one that would look very different because it would include raises for faculty--something the administration never projects, because it has so many buildings. If there were two or three such sessions, including discussion of overhead and of consulting, they might come to a different analysis of the problems.

It must also include an explanation of the value of a research university and academic freedom for the preservation not only of the economy of the state but also of the nation. Some may not have made that connection.

Another Committee member pointed out that there is a great deal of literature on the characteristics of organizations that produce the most innovations and education, and on what happens to creativity when people become risk-averse because their jobs are endangered. There is a need for stories, but there is also research, and the Board could be armed with that information so they could perhaps help others understand the situation. It may be the faculty could make a more explicit contribution to the Regents' retreat in August; it could be an opportunity to instruct, and to make clear that one need not start from scratch every time there is a problem. One of the problems with this Board, and with past Boards, is that they do not understand the history of the University of Minnesota, or of research universities in America.

The implication, if this is thought worthwhile, is that FCC members must be willing to spend some time, even over the summer and even if one is without formal appointment, to set this up and participate.

* * *

One Committee member asked that future financing be put on the agenda of this Committee, and that Committee members read the parts of the University plan that deal with future financing. This is the Office of Budget and Finance version of where problems are and this Committee should be familiar with it. It may be wrong in some of the details, but it is right in the general theory.

* * *

Professor (C) Adams, recalling the comment about the hierarchy of faculty, administration, Regents, said that there is NOT a pure hierarchy. In some very significant areas, the authority of the Senate goes directly to the Regents, and the Committee should not apologize for it. The Senate constitution says quite clearly that in educational matters and in matters governing the faculty, the Faculty or University Senate has assigned directly from the Regents the authority to interact with the Regents. The interaction is through the President, because he is the leader of the Senate, but it is not through "the administration."

What he has been trying to tell the Regents directly, Professor Adams said, and what they may not understand, is the critical significance of those provisions in certain areas, and that they should not be surprised if the faculty believe they can take a position directly on tenure or semester conversion. But their approach is that this is a hierarchy, and that is a problem about which they must be constantly reminded.

The faculty must take advantage of any opportunity they can to inform the Regents about tenure and academic freedom, but the Regents are very astute politically. They will tell the faculty nice things, and have a different opinion about those things the next week; several Committee members have seen that. One needs to manage one's expectations about what representations to the Board will lead to.

There is also a tremendous external group--the business community, some political people--who are WAITING to get in and work on the University. When Regent Reagan said he did not want to have this debate going on next January, it is because he knows there is a set of VERY STRONG forces out there that can hardly wait to have an excuse to intervene in the University. One hears that from CEOs, and while the faculty can engage in whatever debate they want, the Governor has put it on his agenda. They are simply waiting to come in and "fix" the University, from their point of view. The faculty may say that is crazy, but the Regents are under enormous pressure to respond to that kind of pressure.

The Regents are properly described as good politicians, said another Committee member; politicians respond to pressure. If they are getting a lot of pressure from one side, and the faculty do not exercise equal pressure from the other side, the faculty will most certainly lose.

Those involved should have a clear expectation about what is happening, it was said. The Board is being very nice about it, but the reality is that they are facing enormous pressure. Then they should be provided weapons, it was said.

One thing that is bothersome when one hears something like this, about this great desire to "fix"

the University, one can agree that there is much that needs to be fixed. But it is not the 10% or 12% represented by that portion of the budget taken up by faculty salaries. Why is the focus always on the faculty?

That is part of the problem, it was said. It is important for the faculty, in whatever way they can devise to do it, to behave publicly in a way that appears to take ownership of this mission, and to say and do things that appear to be responsible. The faculty know, in their heart of hearts, that they are doing what they are supposed to do. But as has been said, this is a public university and the faculty must pay attention; the cost of not paying attention could be far more than the faculty could bear. But when one says this, it sounds as though one is caving in. There must be a forthright stand taken that makes it clear the faculty are taking responsibility for the situation, and it must be done in a way that is persuasive. This was apparent in the legislature last spring; there was a lack of meeting of the minds, and that is a preview of coming attractions. That is why Regent Reagan wants something by December; something has to happen between April and December so that the message gets through and the right action follows.

One Committee member recalled speaking to two major CEOs in the last several weeks who are major supporters of the University; they both think that the inmates of the prison are running the prison, and they just can't understand it. It does not make sense to them. One can argue with them, talk to them; the reality is that a lot of significant people--who think they are friends of the University--share that view.

One of the things the Regents should be able to do--if they understood what the University is about--is talk the right language to those people, and be the University's advocates, not a channel for bad-mouthing from the outside world. But they do not do that, and do not seem to understand that it is their role. That point is important, it was said, but it is important to know the environment the Regents are in.

One Committee member recalled that when Regent Reagan spoke to the Committee in December, he [the Committee member] was not frightened. As he listened to him this time, that is changed, "and now I'm frightened," because he talks about people and forces putting pressure on. They are looking for a quick fix, and they think getting rid of tenure will be the quick fix. It is scary that the Board is getting that kind of pressure, and moves in that direction.

One Committee member commented that the faculty must help educate the Regents, as much as they can, but they must also educate the faculty. In testimony at the legislature, purportedly on an administrative matter, the Committee member was raked over the coals on how many hours he actually spent in the classroom--by someone who was a former elementary school teacher who would not accept his answer. The Pew article distributed at the last meeting summarizes the dilemma very well. There CAN be changes in the tenure code; some of the concerns expressed at the Faculty Senate meeting can be addressed (e.g., people are not tenured on soft money of any kind, so salary is decoupled). The concerns of the Faculty Senate can be solved by saying that tenured base salary must keep up with the cost of living. There are things that can be accomplished before the legislature convenes. But it will be a problem if SCFA comes back to the Faculty Senate and the Senators have not been educated.

What needs to be put BACK on the agenda is institutional relations, said one Committee member. The faculty cannot expect the Regents to do the institutional relations. If the faculty want the outside to understand the University, they have to figure out ways to do it, and not have to rely on the Regents.

There has to be institutional relations, but perhaps the faculty does not want to rely on the institution's "institutional relations" and should have something of its own from the Senate.

It has been bothersome for many years that it seems like almost the entire burden of the University falls on the faculty. The Regents should be representing the University, defending the University to the legislature, the Governor, and the state. The administration at the highest levels should be explaining to the Board what a university is; it was THEIR job to educate the Regents, if the Regents did not understand. They should be showing them, hands on, what the faculty do. That hasn't happened; now everyone says it is the faculty's job, they have to shoulder that, too, and educate the world, the state, the Regents, and the administration. What the faculty need to do is hire a public relations firm to work for it.

Professor Adams agreed with the observation about institutional relations as well as the workload on the faculty, but asked that the conversation be picked up at the next meeting, since Provost Shively had been sitting in the meeting for 15 minutes, waiting to talk with the Committee. He then welcomed Dr. Shively and asked him how he was seeing things at the University.

4. Discussion with Provost Shively

Dr. Shively began by saying that he was much more hopeful now than he was two months ago about the prospect of getting the tenure question resolved in an appropriate, positive, and perhaps even upbeat way, in the end. But get it resolved, he added, because there are some things that are very important for the University coming in the next six months that will require a lot of attention.

First and foremost, and utterly important, is the presidential search. Everyone must work very hard on it.

The development of a biennial plan to take the University beyond the current budget will be important. The President has asked the provosts and chancellors to develop, within the next month, quite a number of far-reaching proposals. Part of them are re-organizational. They also include the undergraduate initiative, a package of proposals that will be brought to SCEP for discussion; as a package, it will be an ambitious effort to improve undergraduate education, mainly on the Twin Cities campus. RCM, how to do it, and how to work with it, will be on the agenda. The next appropriation will be coming, informed by the plans.

His bottom line, Dr. Shively said, is that the University is turning the corner on a number of very positive things--but that it is also engaged in many things that do not have anything to do with turning the corner, such as the semester conversion and tenure. The University is turning a corner on how it is set up to serve undergraduates; that will be key to remaining a major and great research university: the base of support of a first-rate undergraduate program at this university is what will sustain it as a research university. Aside from the fact the University should be doing it for its own sake, it is turning the corner on undergraduate education.

The University will face a period when there will be a shortage of good faculty, and it will be in intense competition nationally for a small number of good young faculty. Just on the demographics, if the mandatory retirement age of 70 had been retained, during the 1990s nationally 40% of all social science and humanities faculty would retire. Lifting mandatory retirement may have set that back a few

years, but nature will take over in the process. There will be a point at which many will be exiting the professoriate; Associate Vice President Carrier reports record numbers of people turning up for retirement workshops. The University will soon enter a period when it will have to replace a large number of faculty members, even if it does not replace all of them. This can be wonderful for the University, in rejuvenation, but it will be happening all around the country--during a period when bright undergraduates are told that going to graduate school is not a good idea because there were no jobs. The University must prepare for this, and one way to do so is to try to get its compensation position better than it is right now, because aside from fairness to all of the faculty who are working very hard now, it is necessary if the University is to be in a reasonable competitive position in the future. The University must also look at anything it can to make its hiring process adept.

People have been doing so much, on so many fronts of change, but the message is that there are a number of very important things coming up.

The next several years will also be crucial for American universities; there is likely to be some kind of a shakeout in the system. This campus is well-placed to enter that period of turmoil. One is the faculty, which is a terrific resource. Another is the location; the University is one of the very few truly comprehensive research universities located in a GOOD big city. (It is the only one with affordable real estate, interjected one Committee member; that is not to be sneered at, Provost Shively agreed.)

One advantage the University will have in a period of intense competition for bright young faculty is that this is a place where couples can come and both can readily find careers, in contrast to universities in small towns. This is a campus that is great for students to come to, with the Twin Cities' cultural life, the availability of internships, the availability of part-time work. There are a lot of good things going for it.

As far as regional location, aside from the weather, there is Wisconsin--and not many other comparable institutions; the University is well-placed to draw on a wide population base. The University is further along in cooperation with Wisconsin than most any other two major research institutions in the country. The semester standards adopted by the Senate have matched the University's calendar with that of Wisconsin.

There are a lot of good things going for the University. But people are very fatigued from change and conflict, some of which were less important in the long run to the health of the University than the presidential search, the set of directions for the next few years, the development and implementation of RCM, and so on. In addition, he and Provost Allen have talked about development of an academy for undergraduate education; it would be comprised of faculty spanning many subject areas (e.g., a faculty of psychology, a faculty of economics, etc.) that would pull together faculty in different colleges and provostries teaching in an area, so that the undergraduate curriculum on the Twin Cities campus would be developed by all those teaching in a field, similar to an interdisciplinary graduate program. That would get the fights in RCM into one tent, rather than "in several tents loaded with machine guns." There will still be conflict, but it would be the difference between holding elections and having wars.

One thing that has preoccupied him the last few weeks is the development of a budget for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. He has developed an idea that he has worked with the deans on that has been very successful: in order to get the money for a modest salary increase and for investments in key areas,

instead of imposing the usual cut (capture empty positions, take TAs and supply budgets), he asked each college to produce a plan to make available 2.5% of their budget in productivity. The difference is that this can include generation of new revenues as well as capture of revenues through efficiencies; that is different than just cutting. In CLA, by their analysis, a dollar invested in a faculty member generates more than a dollar of tuition money; a dollar invested in teaching assistants generates almost two dollars in tuition. That works in reverse as well; cutting a dollar of faculty salary cuts more than a dollar of tuition revenue.

This suggests a new approach to cutting. It says that given the current enrollment levels in CLA, which are quite high, if there is money invested in building capacity--hiring faculty and TAs--it is possible to increase somewhat the enrollment in CLA in a planned and careful way. He asked the colleges to either provide new revenue sources or efficiencies; by the latter, he meant cuts which did minimal damage to the key missions. There are very few cuts that actually prune, but there are some that do not hurt too much.

Some of the new revenue sources include plans for about five new practitioner M.A. degrees, many taught off-site, in some cases responding to long-standing requests from the private sector. They are also looking at a staged increase in enrollment in CLA, with capacity built in up front, so faculty searches can be initiated next spring. CLA has also inloaded some courses, creating efficiencies. IT plans to implement the Berkeley rule in teaching loads, the so-called 12-8-4 rule (no lower division course of fewer than 12 students would count in a faculty member's teaching load, or any upper division course of fewer than 8 students, or any graduate seminar of fewer than 4), with the understanding that in some cases it makes sense to have a smaller course (e.g., the rule could not be imposed on the School of Music).

The efficiency savings and new revenues means they are not just grabbing faculty or TA lines or cutting supplies to meet the needs for the year. This also stimulates a lot of creative thought, and is preferable to what was done the previous year.

One Committee member, while not wanting to rain on the parade and acknowledging the importance of planning for the future, said the problem the faculty have is that they are getting mixed signals; some came from the Regents earlier at this meeting. They got mixed signals about the General College closure, about tenure, they are not getting raises, and what is coming through loud and clear is all the negative aspects of the re-engineering in the AHC. What people are feeling is that if it is AHC today, it will be CLA tomorrow. It is not that faculty are unwilling to change; they feel that a lot of what is going on is completely out of their hands and they feel they have no advocates. What faculty also hear is that there will be a big demand for faculty; in this environment, none would encourage young faculty to come here, because they don't need this kind of anguish and aggravation. The faculty are not unwilling to take their fair share of the lumps, but every time they turn around tenure is the answer to the negative budget problem. That's what coming through to faculty--the Regents are saying it, the legislature is saying it, and based on the information faculty can beg, borrow, or steal, they learn faculty salaries are 12 or 14% of the budget. Then they learn the University will spend \$42 million on consultants. This is the kind of thing that he saw as someone who was on the Consultative Committee and saw from the faculty perspective; would he, Dr. Shively was asked, please deliver that message to the administration. People cannot focus on positive things "when they feel like it is raining manure."

Another Committee member said the impression the faculty get, on compensation, is that what Provost Shively is planning is not what the rest of the University is planning. That message is coming out very clear to the faculty.

There is that difference, Dr. Shively agreed. The provosts had reported earlier in the day to the Regents about their budgets; there are clearly differences in the provostries in what they will be doing in compensation. He said he is not sure yet what he will do--he is still wrestling with numbers--but does expect to have 2% recurring raises, and wished he could do better. There will also be a 1% non-recurring increase. He said if he could do improve on those numbers, he would.

The truth is that the provostries were supposed to unleash a greater capacity for change; it has done that. All sort of initiatives have come from the different provosts, and much of that has been positive, because the provosts can be in much closer touch with the academic units than was possible with a single, central officer. There are varying conditions, however, and the provosts themselves are different. It is like federalism in the United States; it is called the great laboratory for change, and the provostal system produces that effect. To some extent, if everyone feels that they have been subject to an awful lot of change this year, that is partly due to the establishment of the provostal system--but it may also be a key to the survival of the University in the long run.

One Committee member expressed interest in the budgeting proposal, saying the spirit and philosophy were attractive but asking how a department could make budget plans based on what has to be projected from new programs. One thing that is required, Dr. Shively said, is that the payoff is a year off. Some pay off right away, but if a 12-8-4 rule is adopted and faculty time is recovered-- --something one would necessarily do in an ideal world--that gives the faculty greater capacity, and a department can enroll a few more students. The money does not come for another year, however, so he is providing a lot of bridge money to colleges. But this changes the problem from finding current money to finding one-time money for bridging.

Another Committee member commented on compensation. Ever since the report of the Compensation Working Group, it was said, it seems as though the Regents and administration say "yes, we have a compensation policy," but there is little action on it. Salaries continue to slide. Last year there was examination of what was delivered to various colleges; there certainly was variation, and one must wonder if putting the decision at the provosts' level is the best idea. What one sees is that the civil servants all got their raise, but the faculty are still dangling. It was recently reported what the state college faculty are getting, which is more than people anticipated--and their starting salaries are MUCH higher than expected. It seems that some constituencies are figuring out their compensation policies better than the faculty at the University are. When there are discussions with the deans, the faculty are amazed that the deans find it too hard to cut in order to provide raises. In one instance, there was an argument with a dean, with the faculty member arguing why merit pay was a good idea. It is discouraging to see different faculty members, who are working hard all year, get different things out of their work, and who work under those who do not see an increase as important. When people finally get their raises for next year, then things will get really bad. Faculty will not be happy. Perhaps he can raise expectations.

Dr. Shively apologized that he could not, and repeated that he was disappointed he was not doing better on compensation. They were hit with a huge fringe benefit backlog, so to deliver 2% was difficult.

It will cost as much to get to the point of delivering no raise as it will to deliver the 2%; that is part of the problem.

One Committee member pointed out that the fringe benefit problem was known at the time the union settlements were reached. The administration, however, decided to make a union settlement, for reasons of its own, and then it decided that it did not have enough money to take care of the faculty, because apparently the administration does not think the faculty are very important.

"The administration thinks the faculty are very important," Provost Shively chimed in.

One Committee member asked another question. Someone tells the University it has to re-do fringe benefit rates, because the way they are being charged is wrong. But this sounds like an accounting problem, it was said; some may get better and some worse. The University is not spending more money than it did.

There is more than an accounting problem, replied another Committee member. There is some part that is, but there is some part that costs more money. The problem is that the administration, which has always talked a good game about faculty compensation, has NEVER delivered, in the past five years. There is no substantial change this year.

And, added another Committee member, this year it is fringe benefits, last year it was mis-estimated tuition, and before that it was something else. Every year there is a "good reason." One has the impression, said another, is that the administration sees the faculty as the cushion.

One Committee noted that several times in recent months the Committee has asked what is going on with University College/CEE and its relationship to instruction generally; that would fall under Dr. Shively's jurisdiction. The Committee does not have a clear view of what is occurring, although it will speak with Dean Miller next week. What is the provost's view of this question? What are the issues that seem to be in the middle of resolving the questions?

There is a committee looking at it, Provost Shively replied. There are two issues; one is the definition of the new University College. He said he liked the report of the committee chaired by Provost Allen, which provided that the control of the regular undergraduate curriculum would be in the hands of the colleges; University College's role would be in marketing, and would have its own other activities such as the non-credit courses and the partnership degrees. That was a good report, and they are at some stage of getting there.

Since that report was issued, it was noted, the Master's Degree in Liberal Studies was initiated and now in the business of delivering a Graduate School degree. That seems to depart significantly from the intent.

One Committee member said this had been reported to Provost Allen and to Dean Miller. Deans say they see these Master's programs showing up but believe they have no leverage on the system and have to go along with things they do not like.

This is an issue registered, said one Committee member, and SCEP should take it up. This is a high

priority concern; it represents one of those mission issues that is not clearly articulated, and the lack of consistency at the Regents' level is trickling down into an unresolved set of conflicts at the college level.

What does he, as Provost, see as the lay of the land in Minnesota higher education with respect to the University's position with respect to MNSCU? One has the clear impression that the other system, along with the privates, are moving into the Twin Cities in a big way, in effect capturing more of what one may think of as the University's natural market. Not only for undergraduate liberal arts and professional education, but also Master's professional education. The University keeps circling its wagons rather than becoming more aggressive.

Provost Shively agreed. This is one reason why he was intrigued to obtain an analysis that showed that if CLA put money into capacity, it could grow somewhat. The University is trying to establish a distinctive mission in higher education and it should not change that. It is a research university with other fine graduate programs. That leaves plenty of room for other kinds of schools. But the University should not have other institutions taking students who would benefit from attending a research university.

"My impression is that they're eating our lunch, and I'm not sure why that's happening," said one Committee member. This is the first year of a small counter-attack, Dr. Shively said, such as the practitioner Master's degrees. Are these done outside the CEE model? It is a mixture, he said. The fact that it is such a mixture, responded another Committee member, is what makes one wonder what the plan is. When there are Bachelor's professionally-oriented programs taught in cooperation with community colleges--if one were a state legislator listening to the University's pitch about being a major research, land-grant university in the middle of a metropolitan area, one would ask why the University is doing this. There is no doubt an answer, but it has more to do with what is going on inside the University than in following a mission.

Why is the University sitting around watching another institution build a new campus in Minneapolis to offer new four-year degrees? Dr. Shively said the University has to very aggressively develop itself as a land-grant, research university--with the things that offers to all sorts of students--and it has to sell itself well.

Is this the provost's job or the dean's job? It is more a dean's job than a provost's job, Dr. Shively said, although he sees himself as working with the deans and providing incentives. One of the things he likes about the 2.5% productivity goal has unleashed considerable productivity; five practitioner M.A. degrees have appeared in the last month or so. It is partly a matter of incentives.

One Committee member noted that there is both UCLA and Cal State Los Angeles; what's wrong with that? Why should the University not aim for a structure like that? There is not a problem, said another, if the distinction is clear. But the University is launching professionally-oriented bachelor's degrees in collaboration with community colleges; it seems incongruous for a research university to be doing this.

It is not a question of right or wrong, said another Committee member. It is a question of clarity. The Committee keeps asking and it does not get clear answers. Provost Allen floated things by the Committee, and one knows enough to know that if things are floated by, one better pay attention. There was talk about a very general scheme in which certain things might be aggregated and other things

disaggregated; maybe there are good arguments for these proposals, but the Committee would like to hear the arguments. Does Dr. Shively have a view about splitting colleges and creating "institutes"? Is this just for conversation, or is there discussion going on that the Committee should know about so it can comment on?

Dr. Shively said there are proposals that should be taken up. These are provostal matters that need to be taken up with the appropriate provosts. One has to remember, he said, that there may be things happening in one provostal area that do not happen in the others. People have thought so long in terms of single central policy for the Twin Cities campus that it is hard to realize there could be initiatives in one area that are not central policy, such as AHC restructuring, the college merger proposals, the 2.5% productivity increases, and so on. There will be more variations in policy, which does tend to make people nervous. Some have commented that if there is re-engineering in the AHC today, is it coming to CLA tomorrow? The answer is no.

One Committee member inquired about the resignation of Senior Vice President Infante. There is a lot of faculty anger and distrust on the campus now, and one hopes the administration will take that into account as a replacement is chosen. It is to be hoped that someone who the faculty can trust will be selected. Dr. Shively concurred.

Is there anything significant in this about the structure, asked another Committee member? Part of the reason, some believe, is because of the new provostal structure, with policy and operations split; is there something the Committee should be concerned about in this light? Dr. Shively said he had no comments on Dr. Infante's resignation, but said there has been a year of experience with the provostal system--although some of the roles have remained ambiguous. It has been a good experiment, and good things have come out of it, but the University will have to decide what it wants out of the structure in the next few years.

One Committee member reported that a number of people have observed that maybe the University does not need the position of Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. It is to be hoped that there is an evaluation of whether the position is needed, or needed at that level, before a search is conducted.

"I want to thank Provost Pangloss for his evaluation of the provostal system," said one Committee member. "I think it has been a disaster," because the provosts have not worked together for the University, but have worked quite separately. They have gone in different directions. All of the interesting things are coming out of anarchy.

Dr. Shively said he would use the analogy with the federal government. A better analogy is the constitution of the new Bosnia-Herzegovina, in which each of the three presidents commands one-third of the army, it was said. The concern about the provostal system is that the position of Academic Affairs vice president may not be attractive to anyone; it is the cats and dogs of academic administration plus planning--which people seem not to pay any attention to.

Professor Adams thanked Provost Shively for joining the meeting.

5. Minutes

Professor Adams noted that the question of attribution in the minutes of this and other Senate committees has been raised again; he recalled the discussion the Committee held earlier in the year. He said he felt obligated to re-raise the issue. The Committee should perhaps reconsider the issue, refer to the prior discussion, and respond to queries.

One Committee member said it is reasonable to bring up the issue, but it is not reasonable to bring it up over and over again, after the Committee has discussed it and put it to rest. The fact that there will not be consensus on the issue is not an argument for discussing it endlessly.

The Committee rule should be that it be discussed no more than once per year.

One Committee member suggested writing a letter to the individual who raised the question; he may not know the Committee has discussed it already. "I personally am sick and tired of discussing it, and I'm tired of it being raised all the time." If the reasons haven't been explained, they should.

Professor Adams agreed to send a letter, but noted that in the minutes of the meeting the last time this was discussed, it was reported that "Professor Adams said it was his judgment that on balance the Committee slightly favored" anonymous minutes. It would be helpful to have a firmer view, he said; he will write a letter and ask for a review at a future meeting.

6. The April 18 Faculty Senate Motion

One Committee member then repeated that it had been surprising to see the names of two Committee members on the motion presented to the Faculty Senate on April 18. One can ask when it is appropriate to use one's position on the Committee; it would be helpful to have a discussion about this, so that clarification of common rules could be established.

The question is how Committee members associate themselves with particular movements within the institution, it was said. A motion would be brought for Committee consideration.

One Committee member said, so no one would be surprised, "if I were told that as a member of this Committee I could no longer speak, I would have to resign from the Committee."

That is not what is being said, another Committee member. The Committee was quite clear earlier on how Professor Adams should represent the Committee, it was said, and there should be expectations or guidelines for members of the Committee as well.

There may be two different issues, it was said. If one has a certain position--such as chair of FCC--one can believe that is a representative position, representative of something. It may be that saying things as an FCC MEMBER could also be construed as representative, at some level; it may be that it would be helpful to figure these out. But there can be a difference between a Committee member and the chair; the Committee member can talk and not be seen as representing the Committee, but it is hard for the chair to do so.

Professor Adams then adjourned the meeting at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota