

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, October 22, 1998**  
**12:45 – 3:45**  
**Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Sara Evans (chair), Kent Bales, Mary Dempsey, Stephen Gudeman, M. Janice Hogan, Roberta Humphreys, Michael Korth, Judith Martin, Fred Morrison, V. Rama Murthy, Matthew Tirrell

Absent: Linda Brady, Gary Davis, David Hamilton, Leonard Kuhi, Marvin Marshak

Guests: Professor Richard Purple (on behalf of the Twin Cities AAUP)

Other: Rich Broderick (University Relations), Linda Johnsrud (ACE Fellow)

[In these minutes: AAUP proposal for workshops with young faculty; report on Biological Sciences Policy Council activities; sabbatical leaves procedures; academic appointments subcommittee (structure and nature of faculty appointments); policy review group; access to information]

**1. AAUP Proposal**

Professor Evans convened the meeting at 12:55 and welcomed Professor Purple to the meeting to discuss a proposal for an endeavor entitled "Focus on the Future." This activity would consist of joint sponsorship of a series of workshops to be held with young, tenure-track faculty. The purpose of the workshops would be to learn what the concerns of young faculty are and to furnish them information about the University community and its governance system. One result would be identification of issues which the Senate would take up; another would be to embrace young faculty in the community of scholars. The results of the workshops would be published and distributed to the University community.

Professor Purple suggested that either FCC or the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs could designate individuals to design the workshops and participate in them. There are a variety of ways the workshops could be conducted, including with or without a professional facilitator. It would also be helpful to work with the administration, because Human Resources also offers a number of programs that need not be duplicated.

Committee members were generally supportive of the proposal, and offered several suggestions and comments.

-- First-year faculty should not be included.

---

\* 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.

- Within broad areas of the campus, faculty concerns may be different (that is, AHC faculty may face different problems than faculty in the arts and sciences); it would be useful to have workshops both for these groups as well as workshops drawing faculty from across the campus.
- Creating a record of the sessions should NOT include the use of tape recorders.
- The purpose is not mentoring (which should take place in the department); the focus would be on campus/institutional issues and on discussion about problems. The sessions could also focus on governance at the college level. (Professor Evans remarked, apropos mentoring, that the Committee should know what is going on and what message it and the administration should be sending about mentoring.)
- The contacts established would be important both for the AAUP and the governance system, but as envisioned they would only be one-time contacts. It may be appropriate to have these sessions routinely, with frequency to be determined by need and experience.
- Young faculty do not know about the governance system or what FCC is; one goal would be to teach them that there is a governance system that benefits them. At the same time, young faculty fear becoming involved with governance because of troubles it might cause them at the time of the tenure decision.
- Focus groups and workshops should be conducted by faculty, not professional facilitators.

The budget for these workshops could be shared between the AAUP and the Senate. The administration also has an interest in seeing that these effort are successful, and would perhaps be willing to support them, Professor Evans suggested.

It was agreed that Professors Hogan, Murthy, and Purple would spearhead the development of the workshops, with assistance from the FCC staff.

Professor Evans thanked Professor Purple for bringing the proposal to FCC.

## **2 Flowers**

Members of the Committee extended best wishes for a speedy recovery to Maureen Smith, the editor of BRIEF and a regular visitor to Committee meetings.

## **3 Biological Sciences Policy Council**

Professor Tirrell next reported on the activities of the Biological Sciences Policy Council (BSPC), on which he sits as a representative from FCC.

The BSPC has existed since 1995, is chaired by Dean Elde, and was charged to start the reorganization of the biological sciences (which is now largely complete). It now includes representation from all colleges which have an interest in the biological sciences, as well as a representative from FCC and Drs. Victor Bloomfield and Norma Allewell.

As the molecular and cellular biology initiative became real last spring, there was a felt need to have outside expertise to assess whether reorganization was the right way to go and if the University's aspirations were realistic. The University brought in eight experts – top-notch faculty who spent a full day consulting with the BSPC, administrators, faculty, and department heads. The written report has not yet been received, but there was a briefing on the reactions of the visitors. Some of those reactions were positive, but not obvious.

- They strongly endorsed the reorganization of the biological sciences; the group expressed admiration for the magnitude and results of the reorganization, and commented that it should occur at other institutions as well.
- They strongly endorsed the faculty scholarly and intellectual base at the University from which to build, and in which new investments can be made.
- The BSPC is not the right group to make decisions about hiring and making research investments; they will recommend that strategic investments need be made by a “small group of sophisticated and altruistic” faculty who can bring expertise to the decisions; committees do not make good decisions.
- They heard a lot about hiring blue-chip faculty, and cautioned that the University should do so only opportunistically. It is better to hire junior faculty, set them up well, support them, in order to build stability and continuity.
- There will be a strong recommendation that investments be in the basic sciences, in molecular and cellular biology and the basic biology departments, rather than in clinical activities. The decisions should be made on the basis of the work.

Professor Tirrell related that one of his concerns was what this would mean for the frontier of research in the physical sciences and engineering; he was assured that fundamental research in these fields falls within the umbrella of the recommendation while health care falls outside it.

- They will caution that the University needs to set aside funds to make things work, and not spend all the money on people. There has to be funding for infrastructure and facilities.
- There is an informal feeling that functional genomics should be the focus of work in the biological sciences. At the same time, that is only a starting point, not a goal in itself. It is a huge area. The full human genome will be known soon, and functional genomics is the next step.

The report will be delivered to the BSPC; the most important task will be to assemble the group of “sophisticated and altruistic” faculty to make decisions about investment of resources.

A number of questions and comments were made.

- The four new departments will largely guide the decisions about where their fields are going. In some cases, they are already considering where new hires will be made.

- To whom is the case for making investments made? The mechanisms need to be worked out. The principle of the BSPC is representation for all, and has worked well so far; the principle of the new group would be the best scientific decisions. The two groups must work together, and the departments have to play a central role.
- The University has had joint departments before; lessons from those examples should be learned, such as about shifting focus while keeping core department functions intact. It may be necessary to think beyond the traditional chain of command organization, and to encourage the administration to explore new kinds of multiple relationships for departments. It is not clear how this would work vis-à-vis resources or IMG. The latter may require that these units be treated differently, as separate entities; the traditional structure based on the division of knowledge may not be correct any longer.
- There is not a budget item per se in the biennial request, and the last thing anyone wants is funding for four positions, with each college receiving two. Any new positions need to put in the best place. The BSPC will supervise the process, but will not decide on where the best places to make hires will be.

The consensus of the consultants was that there is need for a scientific advisory committee in addition to the BSPC.

Professor Evans thanked Professor Tirrell for his report and asked that he ask for time on the agenda whenever he had anything more to discuss. The substance is central to the University, and the Committee will also be interested in the lessons about interdisciplinary work and the implications of IMG.

#### **4. Procedures for Development Leaves (a.k.a. sabbaticals)**

Professor Evans asked Professor Bales to provide an update on the leave procedures. Professor Bales began by noting the Senate had approved the leave policy at its meeting on October 15, so procedures for obtaining a leave had to be established. He and Professor Chomsky thought that the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) should write new procedures, but that would delay their approval until the February Senate meeting. The alternative that seemed more desirable was for FCC and SCFA to quickly review the procedures drafted by the subcommittee of SCFA and then to ask the Senate to approve them on November 5.

Professor Evans agreed; not only would delay make the Senate look bad, more importantly, it would make it difficult or impossible for faculty who want leaves NEXT YEAR to apply for them. Professor Morrison pointed out that the leave policy is only interim, so quick action on procedures for an interim policy is defensible.

One issue that has arisen is whether someone who is denied a leave, when choices must be made among worthy applicants, may grieve the decision. Professor Morrison said that the interplay of factors in selecting leave recipients is judgmental, and cannot be subject to rules.

## **5. Academic Appointments Subcommittee Draft Report**

Professor Evans now asked Professor Bales to report on the draft report from the Academic Appointments Subcommittee and the reaction it had received from the Committees on Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Finance and Planning.

There is hesitancy about what the Subcommittee recommended, Professor Bales said. One touchy point revolves around the definition of a faculty member. That gets to the heart of the issue – is there a desire to increase the number of tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty, to correct what seems to be an imbalance in appointments and to restore greater robustness to the faculty? At the same time, the Subcommittee does not want heads to roll, and knows well that much work could not be done without part-time and temporary faculty, and with loyal and very effective P&A staff. The difficulty is that these latter groups are not classified as faculty.

There is both a policy question and a self-esteem question, Professor Bales said. Does “faculty” mean only someone who does research as well as other things? The way faculty is defined in the tenure code, there is no way to include others as faculty (e.g., those who teach 100% of their time or who do research 100% of their time). There is no title for such people, but they should be included in the category of faculty so they can be counted. In one way, this would improve the data on faculty-student ratios, but it would also falsify it if those who only do research are included.

The biggest issue raised the Educational Policy and Finance and Planning committees was not who is called “professor” but whether these other staff should be called faculty. The term and concept is sacrosanct, and to apply it to others will meet resistance.

Professor Martin commented that she had given thought to this issue since the Educational Policy committee meeting, trying to reconcile appointment of those who teach on year-to-year contracts but are not faculty. In some institutions they are called teaching fellows and given long-term contracts; would this be a way to recognize their contributions to the teaching mission but not call them faculty? Professor Bales said the Subcommittee had talked about titles; everyone wants one for those who only teach, a title that differentiates them from other faculty (and from those who only do research). Professor Dempsey recalled that this issue came to SCFA in the past; research staff wanted to be called research faculty, and SCFA adamantly opposed it.

Some believe this is a problem that should be solved without reclassification. The Subcommittee does not believe that is possible. If one only counts heads, there is no way to control the numbers and the ratio of faculty to those who do faculty-like work.

Professor Bales said there is considerable irony in the fact that one group of non-TTT faculty are talked about in the tenure code, if they have appointments of 67% time or more; all others, including the P&A staff, are invisible. That is the nub of the problem; until they can be counted, and a policy for non-TTT faculty developed, providing that no more than 25% of the faculty in a unit could be non-TTT, there will be a problem.

Professor Morrison said that the proposal makes sense. What has been permitted since the 1985 tenure code revisions, and the 1980 P&A system, is that a lot of faculty-like tasks have been moved to a differently-protected group of staff. The worst example is at Crookston, where over half the teaching is provided by individuals who are not faculty. The University began with a few P&A appointees, but now there many of them. There may need to be a system parallel with that of the tenure code, a faculty category, for people doing research or teaching who are not covered by the tenure code.

One reason to be concerned arises from the unit determination issues that were faced during the collective bargaining hearings, Professor Morrison commented: P&A staff are in unit different from the faculty. Temporary faculty are in no unit. This is not a healthy way to carry on a single enterprise. P&A staff are supposed to be professionals or administrators – accountants, attorneys, computer programmers – not teachers. This is a problem that must be dealt with.

Also an issue is the AHC, Professor Morrison observed, with clinical teachers. If the University is not careful, the majority of the instruction for advanced students in the AHC will not be delivered by faculty.

This problem also has an impact on undergraduate students, Professor Martin pointed out.

Professor Evans agreed that the faculty must gain control over this problem. All draw a distinction between faculty who teach 100% of the time or do research 100% of the time. There is reason to be concerned when faculty responsibilities are shifted to non-faculty who do not have the protections of the tenure code. It is easier to think about a category of faculty who teach 100% of the time, and for whom academic freedom can be eroded. There is a middle group, consisting of P&A staff, who both teach and do research; the question is, why are they not faculty? In part because they are on soft money, Professor Morrison said, and in part because of qualifications. Does the faculty wish to give tenure to a surgeon to do surgery?

Those who do research 100% of the time do not strike most as faculty members – but if such individuals instruct graduate students, then the ARE teaching, Professor Evans commented.

A related issue is PI qualifications, Professor Morrison said. Some P&A staff are eligible to be PIs; when they are, they should have the same protections as faculty. They are making judgments like faculty make.

Professor Murthy maintained that P&A staff are being misused; if they are performing faculty-like tasks, they should not be P&A. They must be recognized as faculty and a policy of limits adopted.

Professor Bales said he has concluded, from discussions with the committees, that there is both a conceptual and a naming problem. There needs to be a term other than faculty if the concept is to receive any support. In addition, there must be a change in hiring categories. There are five that are academic, and one for all tenure-code faculty. The categories, however, are not clean.

Professor Evans said the Committee would be at the service of the Subcommittee, and invited Professor Bales to think about how FCC could be more helpful. He said he would take the report to the deans; Professor Morrison noted that the report is on the docket of the Faculty Senate for November 5, where more comments may be made. Professor Evans thanked Professor Bales for the report.

## **6. Policy Review Group**

Professor Evans informed her colleagues that there is need to work together with the Board of Regents' staff on reformatting policies. There is a constant process of policy review, and the faculty must be a part of it. There needs to be a mechanism in place, and FCC needs to develop its own expertise.

The issue is prompted by the need to review a number of policies with respect to the change to semesters. Some of the changes are major, some are trivial, Professor Morrison said; there needs to be a group that can identify the difference. It was agreed that Professors Morrison (chair), Dempsey, and a representative from the Committee on Faculty Affairs would serve as the policy review group.

## **7. Access to Information**

Professor Evans distributed copies of a proposed revision in the University's policy on access to information for employees, prepared by Dr. Zetterberg. She asked Committee members to let her know if they wished FCC to discuss it, or if the changes were straightforward enough that no discussion was needed.

## **8. Dockets**

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve the dockets submitted by the Business and Rules Committee.

Professor Evans adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand