



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
N307 Elliott Hall  
75 East River Road  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone: (612)626-1850

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

10:15 - 11:15

AND

FCC DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

1:30 - 2:00

May 14, 1987

Regents Room, Morrill Hall

AGENDA

FOR ACTION:

- 10:15 1. Minutes of April 16 and April 30 meetings (attached).

FOR DISCUSSION:

- 10:15-11:00 (45) 2. The faculty-student governance structure (attachment: "Open Positions" list from Campus Elections Commission; background: reviewers' letters distributed earlier). Guests: Deon Stuthman, Irv Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf.

11:00- FOR INFORMATION:  
11:15

- (15) 3. April 30 minutes of the Finance Committee (attached).
4. Report of the Chair: Grievance procedures rewrite team.

FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE PRESIDENT:

- 1:30-2:00 (30) 5. The President's items.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
N307 Elliott Hall  
75 East River Road  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone: (612)626-1850

MINUTES  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
AND  
DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KELLER

May 14, 1987  
Regents Room, Morrill Hall  
10:15-11:15 and 2:25-2:40

Members present: Ellen Berscheid (Chair), Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Joseph Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Paul Murphy, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively.

Guests: Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, and Deon Stuthman (1985-86 FCC members); Dianna Gardner (temporary assistant to SCC/FCC), Trout Lowen (of the Minnesota Daily), Mary Jane Plunkett (student government adviser), Tim Pratt (MSA President), Maureen Smith (of University Relations).

1. The minutes of the April 30 meeting were approved.
2. The faculty-student governance system: letters submitted by the external reviewers.

Professor Berscheid welcomed Professors Rubenstein, Sorauf, and Stuthman, who participated last year in the initiation of the governance review. She described the schedule for continuing consideration of governance: (a) SSCC and FCC are now separately discussing the external review letters; (b) the full SCC will discuss governance at length on June 4; (c) FCC and the Regents will discuss the question of faculty voice and the external reviewers' opinions at their spring quarter meeting, June 11; (d) the many issues involved in the internal and external reports will be more fully addressed by the SCC in the fall with a possible fall quarter Senate forum.

Meeting participants commented on observations and suggestions in the individual letters submitted by the guest reviewers at the Senate Consultative Committee's request. The reviewers were Martin Trow (Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley), Kenneth Mortimer (Vice President and Vice Provost, Pennsylvania State University), and Mark Filip (Student body president at the University of Illinois and vice president -- now president -- of the American Association of University Students) spent two days in meetings on the Twin Cities Campus in February. FCC chiefly discussed: (a) The relationship

of the faculty-student governance system with the Regents; (b) The Senate's structure.

With respect to the first, FCC discussed the fact that "end runs" to the Board of Regents are commonplace, that the student "representatives" to the Board act autonomously, and that the faculty as a body singularly lacks access. FCC also noted the extent of "end runs" to the legislature.

With respect to the second, FCC enumerated concerns about the large number of Senate and Assembly committees (some of which lack clear assignments), the amount of central administrators' time governance committees consume, and the inadequacy of resources for committees to carry out their tasks.

(Following this discussion, the FCC adjourned at 11:30 for a meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee, and reconvened with President Keller at 2:25.)

3. Discussion with President Keller.

A. Legislative update. The President summarized the University's gains and losses as indicated at the current point in the legislative session.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele  
Executive Assistant

May 15, 1987

FINAL INTERIM REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

from the

Faculty Development Committee

Review of the Report:

We expect to deliver our report on June 1st to the Faculty Consultative Committee and the President. We assume that the report will then be reviewed, and its recommendations considered, by several Senate committees and by administrative planning, budgeting and coordinating groups. We hope that committees responsible for faculty planning in colleges will also review the report. The draft version of our report, available about May 22nd, will be sent to the FCC, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee, as well as to the President. This will provide brief opportunity for these recipients to comment about any major concerns before the final copy of the report is submitted.

Faculty Salary Plan:

We hope that a recommendation on a new faculty salary plan will be brought to the Faculty Senate next fall. The recommendation that we will forward in our report will be based on goals set in relation to salaries in a group of 29 other universities (including both public and private institutions). We will provide an analysis of salary trends in recent years to substantiate our conclusion that Big Ten salaries are lagging behind those of comparable universities in other regions of the country. We will further argue that our competition for resources (faculty, students, research funds) is national rather than regional; hence, our goals must be based on national, rather than simply regional, considerations.

We will also report that a more detailed examination of our progress toward goals set by the Senate's current faculty salary plan suggests that we are lagging behind the "catch-up" pace we had set for ourselves.

Faculty Leaves:

We have not yet reached final agreement about recommendations in this area. We hope to do so tomorrow, but your comments about leave policy received before May 20th would be useful.

Support of the Faculty's Work:

We will recommend: (a partial list follows)

- (1) automation of the purchasing and accounting systems and urge that this automation be coordinated with that in the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration (ORTTA). This will greatly aid in the management of grants obtained by the faculty;
- (2) steps be taken immediately to reverse the decline in the quality of the University Libraries;
- (3) development of a periodic workshop for department heads/chairs, so that they can benefit from the experience of those who have learned/developed effective techniques for supporting the work of the faculty through such measures as wise management of civil service policies, improved resource management, improved career development counseling, etc.;
- (4) development of a handbook for department heads/chairs, providing a reference source for administrative policies and practices;
- (5) identification of desired faculty/staff ratios for academic units, incorporation of planning goals to achieve these ratios, and review of ratios when new personnel are to be hired;