

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
June 13, 1991**

- Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Mario Bognanno, W. Andrew Collins, Amos Deinard, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, Stanford Lehmborg, J. Kim Munholland, Burton Shapiro, Thomas Scott, Shirley Zimmerman
- Guests: Avner Ben-Ner (Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs), Shelley Chou (Medical School), Mary Dempsey (SCFA Subcommittee on Tenure), Senior Vice President Robert Erickson, Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), Morris Kleiner (Working Group on Academic Salary Structures), Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Discussion of the Budget with Senior Vice President Erickson

Professor Ibele began by welcoming and introducing Professor Judy Garrard to the Committee. He then welcomed Senior Vice President Erickson to the meeting to provide a report on the budget and thanked him for coming on short notice, in the midst of Regents' meetings.

Professor Ibele reported to the Committee that he had attended the Regents' meeting earlier in the day, where the budget principles had been adopted and the 1991-92 budget discussed. John Gunyou, Commissioner of Finance, had appeared at the Regents' meeting at the request of the Governor. Mr. Gunyou, Professor Ibele said, made little in the way of concessions; the Governor's action was taken to bring the higher education appropriation down to the level he--the Governor--had originally recommended. Mr. Gunyou also told the Board that the Governor would be proposing to the 1992 legislature that the IT and Women's Athletics State Special appropriations be restored.

Professor Ibele told the Committee that Mr. Gunyou also brought the Governor's best wishes for the University for having taken the lead, in light of difficult financial times, in making a substantial and precedent-setting internal reallocation. Professor Ibele noted that words, however, will only go so far. He then turned to Mr. Erickson.

Mr. Erickson said that an additional point which had come up was related to financial aid. The administration had proposed, at the request of the students, an additional \$2 million in financial aid because of the tuition increases. A number of Regents noted that if the additional funds were not provided, the tuition increase could be lower--which is correct. The 12% tuition increases raises about \$13 million in additional revenue; if the new \$2 million in aid were not to be provided, the tuition increase could be lowered to about 10+%. He solicited the views of the Committee on this question.

One Committee member observed that retaining the higher tuition increase, and the additional aid, would permit differential distribution of the aid to the most needy students; Mr. Erickson said that this is the crux of the proposal. The students observed that there are some students, on the financial brink,

* 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.

who would be unable to attend the University if not for more aid; it is these students for whom the aid would be targeted.

There are four main points which need to be borne in mind as the budget is set, Mr. Erickson said. First, Restructuring and Reallocation must continue. Second, tuition must be consistent with the priorities and quality of the University and also competitive in the market sense (the University, with the proposed increase, would remain at 5th place in the Big Ten in terms of tuition rates). Third, the reductions are permanent, not temporary. Fourth, some level of faculty/staff compensation adjustment is essential in the second year of the biennium.

Mr. Erickson then reviewed for the Committee the sources of funds that would be needed and where they would be spent. The causes of the reductions (for 1991-92) are the cut in the appropriation (down by \$16 million), unfunded inflationary increases in such items as fuel and utilities (\$5 million), student financial aid (the increase of \$2 million), debt service on new buildings (\$1 million), and zero compensation increases--which will continue to be noted in every budget presentation in order to point out the contribution being made by the faculty and staff.

The needed funds will come from programmatic cuts (\$32 million), which will be made in the first year of the biennium. Mr. Erickson said the administration believes it important to make the cuts early, in order to emphasize the magnitude of the reductions, and to avoid the understandable internal reaction (if cuts of about \$15 million were to be made each year of the biennium) of "when will this stop?" The worst thing to cope with is uncertainty, he observed; to do a reduction in installments would be worse than doing it all at once.

Talking about this also demonstrates why the \$23.2 million in line-item vetoes has been so devastating--what it requires is that the University must wait until next January to know where it will end up for 1992-93. The great frustration of "when will this end?" is what has led the administration to decide to act in the next few months.

This assumes, one Committee member observed, that it will end next year. Mr. Erickson responded that the University has to begin to make it crystal clear what it does for the State of Minnesota. That is not well understood. One result of the veto of the Specials was an "interesting" lunch the Governor had with the High Technology Council. What may galvanize support for the University is the harm to the research function: Jobs are something that everybody understands. The University has been a job machine, if one looks at the economy; this point was apparently made vigorously at the High Technology Council luncheon. The same thing can be said of the other funds that were cut.

How is the administration planning to deal with the programs which will be cut (if the State Specials vetoes are not reversed) vis-a-vis the \$32 million in programmatic cuts? The University has taken the position, Mr. Erickson said, that the Governor made line-item veto cuts, and those are the programs that will be cut. To the extent that the University deviates from the cuts required by the vetoes, it will damage its ability to deal with the legislature. It is a difficult issue, and the administration is mindful that there are a lot of people on one-year contracts.

Professor Ibele commented that Mr. Gunyou seemed to imply that because of the size of the University budget, it has almost unlimited discretion: that if it believes the programs (cut by the vetoes)

are important enough, it can pick them up with all its extra money. Mr. Gunyou may not understand that the University does not have that kind of latitude. Mr. Erickson agreed; he said that the University cannot permit the issue to be re-framed in that fashion and let the programs be funded from other sources. If that happens, the University loses much of its ability to marshal resources; as painful as it is for the people involved in the programs, it is essential that the University deal with the cuts in this way.

Mr. Erickson agreed with the observation that those Specials, however, cannot be targeted for reductions in 1991-92.

It was also observed, by another Committee member, that the Specials are as personnel-intensive as other programs. Unless some stability and continuity exists for them, the best people in those programs will take flight just as surely as they would from a regular academic program. Mr. Erickson agreed that this is the delicate balancing act in which the University must engage--and some of those programs are among the "crown jewels" of the University. Each of the Specials, it was said, has a clearly-identifiable constituency--and the Governor and legislature should hear from each one.

The University has long tried not to co-mingle Special and O+M funds, it was said by one Committee member, and the Specials are reviewed every two years. Another noted, however, that for at least 10 years there has been a discussion about the extent to which the funds and programs should be kept separate and the extent to which the University should exercise greater control over the Specials.

The administration realizes, on the \$32 million in program cuts, that the funds will not be immediately realized; Mr. Erickson said they expect to actually have about \$10 million in 1991-92. Money will be provided for phasing the cuts.

Discussion returned to the tuition question. One Committee member noted that the rate increases will cost students about \$300 more, on average, for the year; this is not unreasonable, considering the investment, especially if additional funds are made available for the most needy students.

Is there any campaign on behalf of higher education being contemplated, Mr. Erickson was asked. This is an important issue, he said; in the last session the legislature proposed a radical change in State support for higher education when it considered altering the proportion of instructional costs paid by tuition (from 33 to 38 to 43 percent in the biennium and a question about future years). The administration has been so busy reacting to things that it has not had time to initiate a public policy debate; Mr. Erickson reported that he has contacted the Citizen's League to raise this very question.

The fact of increases in human services funding was discussed. One Committee member noted that the State has a predicament as a result of a "double whammy": Not only has there been a recession, affecting revenues, but there have also been skyrocketing human services costs; the amounts are staggering and the State has mostly been reacting--and the costs have overtaken any policy discussion about programs to which funds should be directed.

Education is like a capital investment, Mr. Erickson reflected; if the investment is not continually made, at some point economic vitality and growth may decline. The decline may not be apparent in one or two or even five years, but at some point it will become very real and for an extended period of time

irreversible. The University has to re-establish in people's minds that there is that direct benefit--and the issue of jobs is the easiest way to demonstrate it.

Mr. Erickson was asked about reliance on the savings to be achieved, perhaps over the next decade, when senior faculty retire and are replaced by new junior faculty. In the social sciences, half of the faculty will retire by the year 2000. Could not this be factored into the decisions? The magnitude of the budget cuts being contemplated make one worry: "I am fearful that some of the programs that might be cut are things that we will later discover are very valuable and wish we had back--and we will find them almost impossible to reconstruct once they are gone." If bridge funding could be identified--to the extent of using all of the reserves or even borrowing money, if there is a clear prospect of its being recovered--this might be wiser than savage programmatic cuts.

Mr. Erickson said that the long-term demographic questions have been discussed. Given the faculty shortages that are projected, the market may drive up salaries for new faculty--so there may not be savings of great magnitude realized. That will vary by field, it was rejoined, and is less likely in the liberal arts, where there will always be more people than positions. Mr. Erickson said that options which have not previously been available will soon be provided to people to aid the process, but figures have not been developed on the likely savings to be had from the retirement/ replacement process. This is primarily because it is difficult to predict when individuals will retire. He agreed, however, that the point is worth considering further.

Another issue of great concern, said one Committee member--even though it is a Catch-22--is the question of consultation with SCEP or SCC about programs targeted for elimination or reduction. It is understandable that the administration is reluctant to produce even a tentative list of units under discussion, because of the impact and possible backlash, but the University is committed to consultation. Committees will be gravely distressed if they are not consulted about the programs. Mr. Erickson said he would certainly carry that message back to the President and Dr. Kuhi. At some point, he said, the administration will have to rely on some level of trust at least with committee chairs if even minimum consultation is to occur. His responsibilities extend only to Finance and Operations, Mr. Erickson reminded the Committee, but he agreed that open discussions are essential.

Mr. Erickson affirmed that the programs to be reduced or eliminated will not be identified at the July Regents' meetings; the 1991-92 budget will be approved, however, which includes a requirement for the \$32 million in cuts. The recommendations for program cuts will be presented in September or October. It seems, it was commented, that this process is similar to the one used by the Governor: The target figure is identified without knowing the damage that will result, and items will have to be found which add up to that amount. One result of not doing this, however, it was observed by another, is that there would be no salary increases in 1992-93.

Another Committee member urged that the possibility of savings from replacing higher-salaried faculty with lower, at least over the next five years, be explored; the reserves could provide the bridge funding. It is also critical, in terms of the University's reputation, to put programs and the governance committees on the alert so that the process of review and consultation can begin in order that changes can be made by September or October. It is better to do so early than late, even though there may be strong reactions, so the cuts can be introduced in a timely and reasonable fashion. Other Committee members concurred in the importance of consultation.

It was agreed that Professor Ibele should write to Senior Vice President Kuhi emphasizing in the strongest possible terms the importance of consultation and asking him to plan on how it would take place over the summer months. Mr. Erickson agreed that he would also carry that message.

Professor Ibele thanked Mr. Erickson for joining the Committee.

2. Progress Report on the Working Group on Academic Salary Structures

Professor Ibele next welcomed Professor Kleiner to the meeting to provide his report.

Professor Kleiner began his comments by reviewing the background, appointment, and procedures of the working group. The working group has consulted with other institutions as well as a number of individuals and groups within the University. It has focussed its discussions on a salary step system and the normal length of intervals between reviews, the relationship of cost-of-living and merit increases, and whether it should be introduced at the University; on the criteria for salary review and adjustments, where those decisions should be made and at what time intervals; and on post-tenure reviews. There have been lengthy discussions and straw votes on a number of issues.

The working group has developed a questionnaire to be sent to faculty and administrators to obtain their views on issues; it will also have open meetings during Fall Quarter on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses and a teleconference with people at Morris to obtain reactions to possible recommendations. It intends to issue a final report in October to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

One issue not mentioned but which has been raised in a number of quarters, it was pointed out, is salary equity; in some disciplines a particular faculty member is often not paid, by whatever measures are used, at a level commensurate with standing--even when allowances are made for market considerations. A case in point is the Morris campus, where the schedule of faculty salaries do not seem to reflect the recognized quality associated with the Morris programs. The same holds true for some units on the Twin Cities campus. There should be some sense of justice or equity which ought to prevail even when one considers market factors.

Professor Kleiner said the working group has given considerable attention to the issue and recalled that the Scallen committee report on the elimination of mandatory retirement had also provided guidance on this issue. The preliminary recommendation is that the University set aside funds for post-tenure salary reviews in order to correct such inequities. Professor Kleiner also reported on a post-tenure review system that has been used at the University of Colorado since 1980. Policy recommendations about that system call for \$250,000 to be set aside to address these questions--at an institution half the size of Minnesota.

The matter of equity, another Committee member observed, applies also in the instance of two faculty members in two different disciplines who are otherwise alike in every respect, including their performance reviews. In that instance, when a faculty member is under-rewarded, the chair, dean, and provost ought to bring about the justified equity adjustment. The present system does permit these

adjustments; it was agreed that the Provost needs to be involved because the units themselves may not have the resources to make the change.

A related equity issue, Professor Kleiner was reminded, has to do with lower salary levels associated with departments traditionally dominated by women.

It was also suggested to Professor Kleiner that the work of the working group should also cover the Crookston campus, the other campus which does not have a bargaining agent for the faculty. Information for the Duluth campus, even though not a part of the study, should also be included. Professor Kleiner agreed to include it.

Professor Kleiner was asked if it would be possible to calculate how many millions of dollars it would require to pay current faculty according to the California step system. There is a deep disillusionment prevalent among the faculty; a perception that there will never be enough money to treat the Minnesota faculty equitably and so it's hardly worthwhile talking about. Most faculty are paid tens of thousands of dollars less than peers elsewhere. Simulations are being conducted, Professor Kleiner reported, for paying faculty according to Michigan and California rates.

There are two questions presented, said one Committee member. One is whether or not there should be a step system and the other is how much a given step is worth. AAUP data document that Minnesota faculty are about \$10,000 below what might be the Weal situation. One problem is that faculty do not understand how raises are given; they receive a letter saying they will receive a certain amount. What is needed, especially since mandatory retirement will be eliminated, is a system which includes systematic review and a public statement of what it will consist of. The criteria may differ among units.

Asked about the California system, Professor Kleiner reported that in many instances faculty members are "off scale," especially those in high demand; what the steps do is provide a minimum wage. There are cost-of-living increases every year except when a faculty member is being evaluated for promotion to the next step. He confirmed that merit and cost-of-living funds are separate.

What the Scallen committee discussions came down to, recalled one Committee member, is what is to be done with tenured faculty who sort of "retire" into a tenured faculty position, especially when they will now be able to stay with the University literally to the point of incapacity or death. Some mechanism has to be developed to review faculty on a periodic basis, in part for salary, to determine if he or she is doing the job and to either recognize performance or to provide the basis for an inquiry about how the University might be able to improve performance. And in the case of the individual whose performance does not improve after repeated reviews, a mechanism to provide a process for justly and fairly removing someone for cause under the provisions of the tenure code.

The second issue that the Scallen committee considered critical was that if compensation is to be linked to performance, then if a faculty member does well and gets a large increase, every faculty member in the unit should know why, i.e., what it is that the faculty member did in order to be so rewarded. This would permit faculty to model their behavior after those who are successful. That information is not now available. There is at present no release of information on performance which would cause the University to establish a compensation review system that would provide incentives to

faculty to excel. Is the working group looking at the relationship of compensation to performance? Is it looking at review of tenured professors? Professor Kleiner answered in the affirmative to both inquiries. (There is nothing in the present system which would preclude these practices, it was pointed out, and there are at least a few departments which do exactly these things. Some expressed surprise at learning this.)

The Scallen report was also concerned that older faculty would appear to be the target of post-tenure reviews for the purpose of forcing them out; it is that concern which led to the recommendation for comprehensive periodic post-tenure reviews.

The working group is focussing on salary, Professor Kleiner said in response to a question. If so, said the Committee member who inquired, when total cost is being considered the entire compensation package must be considered.

The most important aspect of these periodic reviews, it was said by one Committee member, is that faculty in different phases of their professional life need help. If they want to begin a new research direction, the periodic review provides the opportunity to consult with the department chair to make necessary arrangements for the changes. Emphasis should not be placed on the punitive aspects of the review, nor should they dominate; the emphasis should be placed on getting the most out of the faculty who are here by providing them with the conditions that enable them to do their best possible work. The Scallen committee, it was pointed out, emphasized this precisely.

One pitfall of the Colorado system, Professor Kleiner reported, is that high-performing faculty who need travel or sabbaticals to continue to work are not provided the funds to do so. This may clearly be a problem here as well. But that system does emphasize the positive aspects of career development.

Professor Ibele cautioned that even if the work of the group appears unlikely to bear immediate fruit, its recommendations will be useful in the near future. It should not take its work lightly. He also urged that the working group make sure the entire faculty know of its activities and recommendations.

One Committee member suggested that the need to establish cost-of-living increases is very important; unless that is accomplished, the so-called merit system is actually a demerit system: People who are performing well, but not exceptionally, are penalized because the merit money goes to those doing exceptionally well. This creates enormous discrepancies. The merit funds must be kept separate from the COL funds, another agreed. It was suggested that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs should perhaps revisit the issue of using all salary funds for merit.

Professor Kleiner commented that on a number of issues, the working group may present majority and minority reports. There is near-unanimity, however, on the questions of post-tenure reviews and criteria for salary increases. That is not the case for a step system or separate funds for COL and merit.

Professor Ibele thanked Professor Kleiner for his report.

3. Proposed Clinical Track for the Medical School

The discussion next turned to the proposal for a Medical School clinical track. Professor Ibele welcomed Professors Ben-Ner, Chou, and Dempsey to the Committee for this item.

Professor Ben-Ner began by briefly reviewing the recommendations and rationale of SCFA and its tenure subcommittee. [See the May 30 FCC minutes for the substance of these comments.] SCFA unanimously recommended that the Medical School proposal not be accepted, primarily because the tenure code (section 7.11) allows the Medical School to recognize the various contributions of faculty who could be placed in the tenure track and because, if the Medical School finds it undesirable to opt for tenure for the individuals, the P&A track provides an alternative. A new title could be developed for individuals in these positions. The need for the track, he said, appears to be motivated to a large extent by the symbolic aspect of the title.

Professor Ibele recalled that there had been a proposal from the Medical School to extend the probationary period; it had been considered by an ad hoc committee and rejected, although the ad hoc committee was sympathetic to the Medical School problems. This proposal for a clinical track has now been developed. He also drew to Committee members' attention the article about the changing composition of Medical School faculty. The University is a very complex institution; it may be that the price of complexity is one of being willing to accommodate special needs, albeit with proper protections, of certain units.

It was reported that the Dental School has about half a dozen people who are clinical specialists who teach and do research; they are on three-year contracts. They are on the P&A track, Professor Dempsey informed the Committee; there are similar appointments in the Medical School. They, however, Professor Chou pointed out, do very specific jobs and do little teaching.

The Committee was informed about the status and appointment of those currently designated as "clinical faculty." These faculty are not paid by the University.

Professor Chou then explained that within the Medical School different departments have different functions. Some are purely service, such as anesthesiology, laboratory medicine; they provide service to the Hospital but do not have direct patient care responsibilities. Since their time is dictated by patient load at the Hospital, the faculty in them have very little time to do basic research.

By the same token, there are demands on certain of the medical disciplines, such as pediatrics and medicine; surgeons cannot take three or six months off to do "bench" research. Moreover, shifting patients from doctor to doctor raises the question of continuity of care, a major issue in the health care community.

About 80% of the medical schools in the country, for these reasons, have a clinical track, in order to permit them to carry out their service missions.

The Medical School believes that the criteria and standards of the tenure code, with research and teaching as the primary measures, has led it to struggle with the application of the tenure code and uniform criteria for tenure. They have tried to bend the criteria but have

encountered a number of problems. The provisions of section 7.11 of the code have not helped, because it speaks to primary responsibilities of teaching and research; the third element, service, can be considered but it is not primary.

It was suggested that patients are in the hospital so that medical students and interns can learn; the clinicians are certainly doing the teaching, even if it is not credit-based. Cannot this activity be considered for the purposes of section 7.11 of the tenure code? The question about research would remain. Professor Chou agreed, but noted that in terms of the information assembled for promotion, one can look at the quality and quantity of publications and the amount of research funding brought in, but documenting the "softer" element of teaching is more difficult. The Medical School, it was rejoined, could develop a second track under 7.11, which would not consider research, and this understanding could be known at the time of appointment. Generally, the University needs to be more flexible in what it considers a "professor," it was argued.

One difficulty with this proposal, it was pointed out, is that the Medical School wishes to appoint these clinicians on renewable appointments, not on the tenure-track. They want the individuals subject to review and do not want to make a tenure commitment. This led to a discussion, among Committee members, about the legality of continued use of "T" appointments (which these renewable term contracts would be).

It was suggested that one could be appointed on the P&A track and then given a professorial appointment, at no salary, in the appropriate department. The P&A classification, it was also noted, would give the individual more protection at the upper levels than would these renewable term contracts. A "T" appointee need not be renewed; the individual can be told at the end of the term that their appointment is not being renewed. There are also no opportunities for single-quarter leaves or sabbaticals. There would be, however, in the P&A track, and there are also notice provisions for P&A appointees. Individuals should not be on the staff for 15 or 20 years and without protection. An opinion from the General Counsel might be sought about the possibility that individuals on a clinical track for a long time would de facto acquire tenure.

At present, Professor Chou reported, there are faculty on "T" appointments under a provision of the tenure code which permits such when funding is dependent on an outside agency. It is true, he observed, that the "T" appointment can fail to be renewed on short notice, but these are experts needed by the Medical School. If the individual were not a strong performer, he or she would not qualify for the clinical track appointment in the first place.

The real issue here, it was argued, is the title and the associated prestige. Is not being a professor or associate professor and simultaneously being in the P&A track inherently contradictory? And if not, would that not cause all kinds of trouble for the units? The personnel documents, it was pointed out, would note the professorial title even though a P&A appointment. Another suggested that it would be somewhat ironic to put these individuals on the P&A track, in order that they are not "professors," and then turn around and give them the professorial titles.

The problem of units which operate largely on soft funds is also a consideration; if the faculty are tenured but the funds disappear, the rest of the University has to assume the financial responsibilities for their continued employment.

Professor Chou said he believed the Medical School could deal with the problem of de facto tenure. Professor Dempsey noted that the people who favor this proposal will develop criteria for appointment, review, and promotion if the proposal is accepted. It also needs to be made clear that these individuals are generating resources and bringing in patients for the hospital; this is one reason why the Hospital wants them. Professor Chou concurred; the hospital is a laboratory and must have the patients in order to carry out its University mission.

Professor Ben-Ner commented that it was the feeling of SCFA that this problem is not unique to the Medical School; other departments have addressed it under the provisions of the tenure code. Different criteria are used for different groups of faculty. If these individuals provide a unique service, as part of the academic mission of the unit--rather than the financial mission--and the role they play can be agreed upon, then the Medical School should rely on the tenure track. If that cannot work, the need to grant the professorial title could be solved by granting a courtesy appointments. SCFA recognizes the need but believes it would be unfair to other units in the University who have similar problems. He noted, however, that SCFA would not be offended if FCC voted to overturn its recommendation.

Attention returned to the possibility of having two different (tenure) tracks in the Medical School. Both groups would be professorial but there would be two different sets of criteria for promotion and tenure, clearly understood at the outset. This would avoid the problems of the "T" appointments and the lack of benefits.

Professor Ibele reminded the Committee that it should come to some conclusion about the issue, something that will permit the Medical School to do its work.

Even if the Committee were to bring the proposal to the Senate, it was suggested, it would most likely not be supported. If, however, the Medical School could implement its proposal under the tenure code provisions, it could begin doing so immediately.

One Committee member expressed reservations about using different criteria and tracks under the tenure code. There are physicians at hospitals all over who are instructing residents--doing the very things being discussed here--but who do not have tenure or academic rank. Are not tenure and academic rank designed to differentiate faculty members from others on the street? By hanging our hat on the teaching in the Hospital, is not the fundamental meaning of tenure and academic rank being changed? The central issue is granting title while not granting tenure. If so, a device to do so needs to be developed--rather than fiddling around with the provisions of the tenure code.

These clinical faculty, it was rejoined, will be doing more than just teaching. They will also be doing research, although it will be more clinically-oriented than normal "bench" research. There will also be a service component. But under section 7.11 of the tenure code, these individuals cannot compete with the Ph.D.s who have NIH grants and doing fundamental research. Professor Chou concurred; the individuals must be nationally known for patient care excellence, someone invited to give lectures and to contribute to national publications. Other units, however, it was said, have similarly-situated individuals who would very much like professorial appointments.

Another Committee member argued that the diversity of the University must be recognized and that individual units should not be obstructed in their desires to handle their problems. Sometimes the University tries too hard to achieve symmetry between things that will never be symmetrical.

If the proposal is approved, noted another Committee member, it will set a precedent; there are five other units in the health sciences and each of them will also want to make use of separate tracks.

One irony of this situation, it was pointed out, is that if an individual has a position outside the University--such as the Veteran's Hospital--there is no concern about granting professorial rank. But now there is controversy about a similar individual inside the University. The source of funding appears to be the only difference.

The Committee deliberated about what to do next; it was moved and seconded to forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate. After additional discussion, however, the motion was withdrawn and the Committee finally concluded, with the assent of Professor Chou, that the Medical School would be better advised to reconsider the use of section 7.11 of the tenure code to accomplish its objective. If it can do so, there would be no need to go to the Senate. It was agreed that the Medical School would do so in the next few weeks, and if it concludes it is unable to use section 7.11, Professor Chou will contact Professor Scott and FCC will convene during the summer to act on the proposal for a separate clinical track.

It was also suggested that a question should be returned to SCFA: Can the University use the existing language of the tenure code in such a way that it can recognize the different behaviors of clinicians and "regular Ph.D. professors." If SCFA says the tenure code language can accommodate these different individuals, that may be what is needed when other units come forward with proposals--and those units may not even have to make separate proposals. Others pointed out that the Music School and others have already wrestled with such problems and have solved them, for the most part.

4. Concluding Miscellany

The Committee confirmed the final meeting schedule for 1991-92.

Professor Ibele noted that the main concern now is how the budget of the University will develop. It will perhaps become clearer as the fall approaches, but in the meantime people should make their voices heard about what is at risk. In the longer term even these bleak circumstances cause institutions to discover resources they did not know they had. There are a lot of good people who are willing to extend themselves to see that the situation is improved. While the faculty is willing to sit still for no compensation increases during the first year of the biennium, it will be critical that something substantial occur during the second year. Should that not happen, then there will be a serious flight of many of our best faculty from the University. The best efforts of the Committee will be required to prevent this, for it would work great harm to the institution when it can least afford it, and recovery would be long in coming.

Professor Ibele expressed his thanks to the Committee for its support during the last two years and extended his best wishes for its continued success.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

Faculty Consultative Committee
June 13, 1991

12

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota