

FOOTNOTE

 January 19, 1988

 Volume 1, Number 1

 Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Dedicatory Lines for a New Newsletter

with condign apologies to W. Schwenk Gilbert

By Rutherford Aris

Regents' Professor of Chemical Engineering

Before Consultative became

A power in the land,

And eager students did not itch

To interfere in matters which

They did not understand,

Then brightly shone our North Star rays

In Lewis Morrill's glorious days.

When Auerbach laid down the law,

As those that mind can tell,

Consultative throughout that war

Did nothing in particular,

And did it very well.

Committees set the U ablaze

In O. M. Wilson's glorious days.

When faculty still ruled the roost

(Before C. Peter's time)

Consultative made no pretense

To intellectual eminence

Or intellect sublime.

Yet Samuel had his greatest power

In Malcolm Moos' latter hour.

When Keller took the C.C. chair,

Whilst still a simple Prof.,

The history books do not record

What pearls of wisdom from his hoard

Were trundled thru the trough.

And yet he had some influence

On budgeting the Petrine pence.

The Chair in these more focused times

Is Phillips Shively.

Not only does he consultate,

But wishes to communicate

With all the faculty.

And hence this letter, full o'news,

Requests your comments and your views.

From the President

It has often seemed to me that the most difficult problem facing a university of our size and complexity is communication. The problem has many facets, certainly including the exchange of information and opinions between the administration and the various parts of the University community, but just as importantly involving exchange within each of those parts. We function with a representative form of governance, but it can only work if representatives and represented are in effective communication with each other. This seems particularly important in a time of change.

This newsletter, *Footnote*, has been initiated at the request of the Faculty Consultative Committee to help us in addressing this issue. While it is still an experiment whose results we will have to evaluate, I welcome its introduction with enthusiasm. It offers us a vehicle for communicating important policies and points of view across the University. I am optimistic that it will improve debate on issues and increase the level of participation in governance matters.

Kenneth H. Keller

THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By W. Phillips Shively

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

It may seem that the last thing we need in the Land of Newsletters is . . . another newsletter.

Still, I am pleased to see *Footnote* get going. The Faculty Consultative

continued, p. 2

Turning a Corner

As six months of intensive deliberations on Plan for Focus came to a close along with the year, the campus mood was less than celebratory.

"Since June, our discussions have emphasized local interests, with little espousal of the overall good of the University," W. Phillips Shively, Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) chair, told students, faculty, the provost, and the president at a Senate committee meeting in December.

"It seems like every unit has been proceeding on an assumption of its own weakness. For example, some faculty in IT believed that if CLA split, CLA would dominate the undergraduate academy proposed in Plan for Focus; while some faculty in CLA believed that if IT didn't split, IT would dominate the academy. No one was in a position to take an affirmative lead."

"After this long period of planning, I sense a desire for closure, for the president to shape a final plan out of all this discussion. I think there is receptivity for strong leadership right now."

A look back over the past two years may account for some of the weary faces around committee tables. Since Commitment to Focus was proposed in February 1985, grass-roots involvement in the planning process has been substantial. An FCC poll of Twin Cities senators, which asked for an assessment of the quality and quantity of collegiate consultation during the past months of planning, confirmed a generally positive experience. Of 54 respondents, 34 were positive, 8 (over five colleges) were negative, and the remainder offered mixed reviews.

President Kenneth Keller decided in late December to change the original planning schedule, in which his own recommendations were to be issued following discussion of Provost Roger Benjamin's recommendations. Instead, Keller is working with Benjamin to draft a single set of administrative recommendations for release in early February. These proposals will be reviewed in Regent-sponsored public hearings during February and March, then will be voted on by the Regents in April.

Administrators are candid about the hard choices facing the University. Becoming one of the top five public universities means some things have to go. Significant cuts, some unpopular, will have to be made to achieve the \$17 million reallocation necessary for improvement in priority areas.

Closures Still in Question

Commitment to Focus may come with a price tag, but Keller says, the status quo costs the University, too. The difference is that "the arts and sciences and undergraduate education are presently paying the price."

Keller acknowledges his proposals will not meet with everyone's approval. "Although discussion is an invaluable part of the planning process," he notes, "this University is too large and too complicated to reach consensus on every decision. Ultimately, there has to be an element of trust."

Although Keller announced in September the decision not to close the School of Dentistry, the College of

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 1
January 19, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in *Footnote*, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

Shively, from p. 1

Committee (FCC) requested last spring that such a publication be set up to give faculty a source of University news (especially about Senate committees) that would be more detailed than *Brief* and would "cover the beat" more regularly than *The Daily*.

In each issue, I will be reporting here what has been happening in the FCC and the Senate Consultative Committee. To start things off, let me summarize our fall quarter activities.

As one might expect, most of our time was spent organizing discussion of the planning initiatives presently before this campus. Our efforts included the sponsorship of five Twin Cities campus forums. The FCC capped these forums with a special meeting of the Twin Cities Faculty Assembly. In part, this was occasioned by our continuing desire to allow

faculty to speak more on important substantive questions.

The FCC also spent time (probably more than the issue merited) on proposals for a new tuition-refund policy. This proposal had—in some of its forms—troubling implications for faculty in the classroom.

Other matters of FCC concern included: 1) recruitment of a new faculty lobbyist; 2) implementation of a number of proposals on faculty development, including an enhanced sabbatical policy; 3) a new, much simplified grievance code; 4) anticipation of the lifting of mandatory retirement at age 70 in a few years; and more.

I welcome you to our new newsletter (or perhaps welcome the newsletter to us) and invite you to contribute your thoughts in the form of either letters or longer opinion pieces. ■

Veterinary Medicine, and the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, other units suggested for closing in Plan for Focus still await action. Last month, KUOM and MacPhail Center for the Arts learned they had five years to establish financial independence. But the future is still uncertain for the mortuary science department, the public health nursing program, the recreation, park, and leisure studies division, the Mineral Resources Research Center, St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Laboratory, the linguistics and south/southwest Asian studies departments, the University Art Museum, and the Office of Educational Development Programs.

"The real question may be whether this institution has enough courage to cancel anything," says Keller.

There has been some activity over the past few weeks concerning the development of a mechanism to handle research policy and the final design of the proposed undergraduate academy.

After the Faculty Assembly's recent and resounding "no" vote to the idea of appointing a VP for research (which reflected strong opposition to the proliferation of VP positions rather than lack of concern about the University's research needs), Vice President Richard Sauer drafted an alternative plan proposing a committee mechanism. In late December, the plan was being reviewed and revised by Benjamin and the deans.

Although to date there has been no official word as to whether all or part of IT would belong to the proposed undergraduate academy, Professor Charles Campbell said at a recent FCC meeting that it was probable an agreement would be reached to include all of IT in the academy. In early December, the CLA Assembly declared its willingness to divide as recommended in the Plan for Focus, if the academy is implemented.

Academy Report Issued

In mid-December, the Academy Planning Committee, chaired by John Wallace, assistant vice president for academic affairs, made its recommendations for the reorganization of undergraduate education on the Twin Cities campus.

The report addressed admission, curriculum, advising, and administrative organization.

The committee proposed a single entry point and policy for freshman admission to the Twin Cities campus (to replace the current seven collegiate entry points). From this single entry point, first-year students would select their own "curricular paths." Students wishing to explore a variety of disciplines would do so through a proposed "Regents' College" path.

After calling for "campuswide reexamination of baccalaureate programs and requirements," the committee endorsed the establishment of a single liberal education standard and the creation of a curriculum policy group called the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. A two-year committee from this broadly defined faculty group would make recommendations to the provost and to Senate committees on how best to reshape liberal education and on the role of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

In addition, a three-year curricular experimentation period (1988-1991) was proposed, "in which faculty prepare, develop, and teach courses that constitute major changes in course content or delivery." Special encouragement is given to the development of "mini-core" curricula (packages of courses that offer active, integrated learning opportunities) and the expansion of honors curricula.

To support this kind of experimentation, the committee recommended three strategies: 1) that all funds in the current Educational Development Grants and Small Grants programs be redirected to this purpose; 2) that consideration be given to dedicating the Bush Sabbatical Program to this purpose for several years; and 3) that outside support be sought as part of the Minnesota Campaign.

As part of the reorganization of undergraduate advising, the committee proposed a new University advising office and a new director of advising for the Twin Cities campus. Other recommendations included cross-collegiate "advising clusters" and immediate development of a computerized system for degree

clearance, academic advising, and tracking.

Representing perhaps the greatest departure from previous planning documents, the committee's proposed administrative reorganization centered on the establishment of a new vice provost for undergraduate education. Although deans would not report to the person in this position, the vice provost would supervise student support functions such as admissions, records, orientation, financial aid, student publications, honors programs, and the Offices of Minority and Special Student Affairs, Students With Disabilities, and Special Learning Opportunities. Two other new positions requested by this report, a director of precollegiate programs and a director of recruitment, would also report to the vice provost.

In a postscript to colleges, committee members emphasized the urgency of the University's need for undergraduate reform and noted with concern the divisions that seem to be appearing on campus as a result of competition for resources, adding that they hoped "for a return to an atmosphere that nurtures attitudes essential to improving undergraduate education—openness to new ways of teaching, patient cooperation, willingness to share energy, and idealism about teaching and learning." ■

Faculty Experts Needed

The University News Service and the Speakers Bureau are updating their lists of faculty experts and potential speakers.

The News Service uses its experts list to identify University specialists in fields of interest to the news media.

The Speakers Bureau finds speakers for state and local groups, filling several hundred requests each year.

Forms were sent to all faculty and academic staff in November, inviting their participation. If you wish to be included in these listings, please return the form(s) as soon as possible. If you need a form or have further questions, please call University Relations at (612) 624-6868. ■

□ FOR THE RECORD

Chairs and members of Senate and Assembly committees are listed in the front of the student and staff directory.

Committee on Faculty Affairs

(Senate)

During fall quarter, the committee discussed the Academic Staff Assistance Office, which assists faculty and academic staff engaged in University grievance procedures and which was established on an experimental basis in 1986 as part of the Rajender settlement. The current agreement expires at the end of winter quarter and SCFA needs to make a recommendation about its continued status. Members also discussed and endorsed the Faculty Development Committee's June 1987 recommendations about faculty salary policies and faculty leaves and study projects.

Following up these recommendations, SCFA has been talking with staff in Provost Benjamin's office about a timeline for implementation and for discussion about development of drug and alcohol abuse treatment policies.

SCFA also dealt with issues of benefits, child care, committee roles of professional/administrative staff, tenure policies, and A versus B appointments. The committee has been following developments in both the retirement plan and health benefit options. The former reflect changes in the tax laws, and at this point it is too early to say what will happen. The latter reflect the controversy with Blue Cross/Blue Shield about the cost of Aware Gold and Aware Gold

Limited, plus state concerns about the University Hospital and Clinic's offer (since rescinded) to cover patient deductibles for University of Minnesota staff. These health coverage issues may well be the beginning of more major problems related to health care costs.

Committees on Educational Policy

(Senate and Assembly)

Fall quarter discussion centered on:

- 1) The proposed change to a 50-minute (instead of a 45-minute) class period on the Twin Cities campus and the establishment of a 1:1 ratio between the number of class periods per week and credits granted. After consultation with colleges, a recommendation on these two questions is expected by spring quarter.

- 2) (At the request of the FCC) A review of the 1974 Senate policy on the evaluation of teaching. The committee also heard testimony from the Minnesota Student Association regarding a proposed revival of the Student Course Information Project.

- 3) The initiative by state government for more extensive use of student-outcome measures as criteria for educational effectiveness. Additional monitoring of this initiative is planned.

- 4) The appropriate uses of graduation rates as criteria of institutional effectiveness. This discussion will continue between SCEP and academic affairs throughout the year.

Committee on Research

(Senate)

Fall quarter meetings were devoted to an analysis of the Plan for Focus document, particularly items related to research. The committee completed a number of recommendations about the plan and forwarded them to the Senate Consultative Committee and Provost Benjamin at the end of December.

Student Academic Support Services Committee

(Senate)

SASSC presented an 11-point plus/minus grading system to the Campus Assembly. The motion was tabled until further information is gathered by this committee. The committee also approved a policy of I grade reversion to F for future Campus Assembly consideration.

Placement Services Committee

(Assembly)

A winter/spring work plan was formulated to:

- 1) explore what the University is doing to improve coordination among the various college and school placement services,
- 2) review campus services with respect to compliance with state and federal laws regarding placement services, and
- 3) examine the issues raised by the passage of the recruitment policy last May in the Campus Assembly and the passage of the resolutions about CIA recruitment guidelines last April in the University Senate.

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

DGF 466223 65
MRS PENELOPE S KROSCHE
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U GF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

February 2, 1988

Volume 1, Number 2

Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Libraries in Crisis: What's Ahead?

The Plan for Focus committee used words like "serious" and "sobering" to describe the notable decline of the Twin Cities University Libraries over the past four decades. Professor John Howe, interim head librarian, settles for nothing less than "absolutely appalling." A variety of statistical measures prove his point.

Collection size Forty years ago we ranked second among public research universities; today we rank ninth.

Collection growth Over the past 40 years, the average rate of collection growth among the top public university libraries has been 4.2 percent per year; Minnesota's average has been 2.8 percent per year.

Staff Current staffing is 100 full-time positions below the lowest of the "top five" public universities, and nearly 300 behind Berkeley and UCLA.

Operating budget In 1940, we were third; today we are eighth.

Library budget compared with total university budget We rank 84th among 92 major U.S. and Canadian universities (seventh in the Big 10).

No dramatic turning point marked the beginning of the libraries' troubles. As Howe observes, their decline represents the same kind of slow, cumulative process that weakened the quality of the entire university—trying to do too much with too few resources. The libraries have been asked to do more and more for a widening constituency while coping with diminished staff, inadequate funding, and ineffective management.

The heavy demands on the University of Minnesota Libraries (consisting of the Wilson, Walter, Biomedical, and St. Paul libraries) are illustrated by the fact that no other

institution in the country, including the Library of Congress, loans out more materials.

Added to that level of activity have been the Herculean task of converting the libraries' 1.5 million-title card catalog to machine-readable form (the largest such conversion ever undertaken) and the development and implementation of LUMINA (Libraries of the University of Minnesota Integrated Network Access).

According to Howe, part of the problem is that "the library system has not done an effective job of representing its importance and needs to the University community. It has become politically isolated and hasn't been viewed as a high enough internal priority."

As evidence, Howe points to the exclusion of the libraries from the Minnesota Campaign. In an effort to correct that situation, he has been meeting with development staff and administrators and is now confident that a library campaign will become a continuing part of University fund-raising efforts.

Howe sees one of his most important tasks as that of repositioning the library by building positive, productive relationships with faculty and administrators. "The libraries may have made some mistakes over the years, but they didn't devise the budget ratio that left us 84th out of 92 universities," Howe says. "I have to conclude that over the years neither the student-faculty governance structure nor University administration was sufficiently responsible in nurturing library development."

Especially encouraging to Howe since his appointment last September has been the campus community's

receptivity to the idea of building a library system equal to the goals of Commitment to Focus. Responses from the offices of the Twin Cities campus Provost Roger Benjamin and President Kenneth Keller have been particularly supportive.

Running Out of Time and Space

Although their eventual aim is an integrated systemwide plan for meeting collection growth needs over the next 50 years, right now library administrators are trying to address two urgent short-term problems: space and facilities needs and an insufficient operating budget.

When Wilson Library ran out of collection space fall quarter, central administration funded the conversion of a basement study area to stacks—a stop-gap measure to be completed this summer. The next step depends on approval of \$1.25 million in the current legislative request for further expansion of Wilson's stacks. That would give the library six to eight years to develop long-range storage solutions.

At the St. Paul Library, also short of space, additional collection areas could be created by moving the administrative offices to the basement and adding stacks.

According to Howe, past suggestions to divide Wilson's collection into separate humanities and social sciences libraries are no longer under consideration. A study of the proposal concluded that it would be too expensive to duplicate books, journals, and reference materials necessary for both libraries.

Two other top space and facilities priorities are a modern, functional Institute of Technology Science and Engineering Library (currently housed

continued p. 2

Libraries, from p. 1

in Walter) and a central home for the University's remarkable array of archives, manuscripts, and special collections (currently scattered throughout the Twin Cities campus, some in what Howe calls "embarrassing and destructive facilities").

The consolidation of the science and engineering libraries in Walter has generated severe space management and staffing pressures in a structure already in desperate need of major rehabilitation. Phase I of the libraries' merger, the relocation of collections and staff, took place in mid-1985, but the \$256,000 required for completion of Phase II came through only last month. Cynthia Steinke, director of the Institute of Technology Libraries, says the institute is "overjoyed" by the funding, which was approved by the Management Committee (President Keller, Provost Benjamin, and Vice President David Lilly) to cover the cost of minor remodeling in Walter. The money will go toward installation of a much-needed smoke detection system, upgrading of the library's protection against theft, and general construction work.

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 2
February 2, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in *Footnote*, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University's 1988 legislative request contains \$3 million to fund planning of Walter's total renovation. The estimated \$24 million required to complete the project will be included in future legislative capital improvement requests.

Even if the Walter building is totally renovated, the Science and Engineering Library may eventually move. In late December, Howe submitted to Robert Kvavik, assistant vice president for academic affairs, four preliminary plans dealing with the library system's long-term space and facilities needs.

Plan one recommends that the University: 1) build a new Science and Engineering Library; 2) renovate Walter Library to house archives, manuscripts, and special collections; 3) build a collection overflow addition to Wilson Library; 4) build an addition to the St. Paul Library; and 5) renovate Diehl Hall (home of the Biomedical Library).

Among the other three plans are alternative recommendations for keeping the Science and Engineering Library in a remodeled Walter building, housing special collections in a Wilson addition, and building a central facility that handles overflow from all the libraries and that houses special collections. Central administration is scheduled to decide among these plans by spring.

Operating Budget Needs Boost

Other major challenges facing the libraries are their lagging acquisitions and staffing budgets. According to Howe, "The best news about the library over the past several years is that its acquisitions budget has almost tripled. Twenty-five years ago our collection development rate was sixth in the country, eight years ago we had dropped to 40th, now we're back up at 16th. But that's not good enough. Our acquisitions budget is still 15 percent below those of the top five public universities."

Contributing to this problem is a high inflation rate for library materials, a worry that plagues not only Minnesota but every other university library as well. "Domestic price increases for library materials, especially serials, are running at about 17 percent annually; foreign prices at 30 percent annually," Howe says.

"Across the land, major research

libraries are devising strategies for sharing journals or simply canceling them. We are going to come to that ourselves next year. There will be an estimated shortfall of \$600,000 in our \$4.5 million acquisitions budget next year due solely to this kind of inflation. That's a big chunk of money."

The libraries' acquisitions budget may never keep up with market-driven inflation, but library administrators are determined to build it to a level at least equal with Minnesota's peer institutions. "You can't talk about becoming one of the top five public universities without having a library system of that caliber," says Howe.

The other side of collection development is preservation, a problem Howe refers to as a "time bomb ticking in the stacks." It is estimated that 30 percent of the libraries' materials will become too brittle to use because of paper acidification. Cooperative efforts are under way among Big 10 libraries to explore preservation methods, but microfilming prices are still too high to consider (about \$30-\$40 per volume). A new deacidification process, which could be performed at a regional plant, looks more promising at about \$4 per volume.

The libraries' dramatic understaffing is due largely to the years of retrenchment, when it was decided to limit the damage to collection budgets by making staff cuts. From 1976 to 1984, the libraries lost 47 full-time positions.

"The litany of frustrations one hears about sloppy stacks, inadequate reference services, etc., is no surprise. This is a competent, hardworking staff, but they have been stretched so thin across all the demands placed on this system there is no way to provide the level of service expected of a major research library," says Howe.

Personnel needs will be eased somewhat by the \$350,000 in new staffing money approved in the last legislative request, but an additional \$650,000 is required simply to restore staffing to its previous level.

Internal governance problems, which affected both the library's position in the University community and internal morale, are in the process of being sorted out. A new constitution should be in place by the

end of the year, and Howe believes staff morale is greatly improved.

Looking toward 2000

Despite its current problems, Howe sees an exciting future for the library system. "In ten years," he predicts, "the University of Minnesota Libraries ought to be quite a different kind of operation than they have been historically. The electronic revolution is already broadening the definitions of information and library science. Some futurists even say the book is dead, but we intend to continue building our print collection while we exploit the move to electronic formats."

There are big plans for the new LUMINA system, which is already operational as a card catalog accessible through terminals in the libraries. By spring quarter, properly equipped remote terminals in faculty offices, students' homes, and libraries across the state will also be able to access LUMINA.

By fall quarter, circulation information will be automated so users can find out whether a book is on the shelves, checked out, or lost, then type in recall or other special requests. Books will be checked out using bar codes and electronic scanners like those used in supermarkets, helping staff to better manage the libraries' enormous collection.

LUMINA will eventually extend the libraries' ability to deliver documents, allowing users to order copies of articles to be sent to their campus offices. Functioning as an electronic gateway, the automated system will also offer users direct access to a wide variety of bibliographic, quantitative, and census databases housed elsewhere in the United States.

Although the necessary software has yet to be written, LUMINA will someday be able to perform searches for specific periodical articles. The system will also reach beyond the library to become a campuswide information network through which students can gain access to course catalogs.

In summary, Howe believes "Good things are happening in the libraries. The curve is up. Much has yet to be done, but it's no longer a question of whether it will be done, only of when. We are very optimistic." ■

Other Libraries Report Needs

Falling outside the organization of the Twin Cities University Libraries are the Law Library, the Sevareid Library in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, and the libraries on other campuses.

Although many of their problems echo those of the larger library structure, Professor John Fraser Hart, chair of the Senate Library Committee, believes it is difficult for a single group to address the varying needs of all libraries across the University. "We have been trying to establish user advisory groups, which include at least one member of this Senate committee, for each library," says Hart. Because libraries can differ so much (e.g., Wilson is mainly a book library, the Biomedical Library is mainly a journal library), Hart feels "this is one case where we need more bureaucracy to carry out effective planning."

Derived from recent reports submitted to the Senate Library Committee, the current needs for each library are summarized below.

Law Library

The Law Library is trying to regain its number three rank among publicly supported law schools. Professor Kathleen Price, library director, identifies its most critical needs as: 1) 10-15 additional staff to handle community outreach, special collections, media, reference, and basic maintenance functions; 2) \$100,000 to cover a shortfall in the acquisitions budget (the last legislature approved only half of the library's \$200,000 "catch-up" acquisitions request); 3) purchase of equipment for a new publishing project; 4) renovation of existing facilities and equipment; and 5) creation of additional storage space within the Law School over the next 10 years.

Sevareid Library

The Sevareid Library is funded totally from alumni contributions. "It's not the most dependable way of funding and it can hinder planning," says Kathleen Hansen, associate professor of journalism and librarian, "but the alumni deserve a great deal of credit for their continued support."

Beyond the need for a more stable funding base, the library has space and staffing needs. Since overflow books are stored in University Libraries, when that system runs out of space, so will the journalism library. Although the Sevareid Library has operated fairly successfully with a single staff member, Hansen wants a half-time assistant to fill in during absences.

Duluth

The Duluth campus library will run out of collection space within two years. Since remodeling would not meet anticipated needs, library administrators recommend the construction of a new building.

Duluth ranks last among its 10 peer institutions in staffing, and ninth in its acquisitions budget (\$300,000 in acquisitions funding approved by the last legislature will help). The library, which is responsible for the majority of audiovisual support on campus, also needs equipment, including an up-to-date television studio.

Morris

The Rodney A. Briggs Library on the Morris campus ranks consistently below average among its peer institutions in staff size and journal subscriptions, and requires an estimated \$140,000 to significantly improve its standing in those areas. Other needs include expansion of shelving, replacement of equipment, and enhancement of existing automation.

Crookston

Most important among Crookston's requests for Kiehle Library are: 1) funds to supplement work-study help, which has diminished over the past years; 2) \$25,000 to bring its acquisitions budget up to a minimum standard; 3) support for operation of the online catalog and reference functions; and 4) funds to maintain equipment and to cover the cost of database searches.

Waseca

High priority library needs at Waseca include: 1) 1.5 additional staff; 2) a \$25,000 increase in the acquisitions budget; 3) support for the online catalog system and other automated equipment; and 4) additional space for storage, computer terminals, study, and offices. ■

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By W. Phillips Shively

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

While not exactly in a holding pattern, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) have paused after the consuming tasks associated with this fall's planning initiatives, and are now pursuing a number of general business activities. We will still be involved in extensive discussions with the president and provost about the shape of their final recommendations, but we have added a few new efforts to our agenda.

Kathy Price is chairing a subcommittee to review personnel policies (hiring, job classification, etc.) with an eye to removing impediments to the smooth performance of our teaching and research missions.

The FCC is discussing with the Senate Committee on Tenure and the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee the establishment of a task force to study the implications of lifting the University's mandatory faculty retirement at age 70.

The SCC is assisting the Senate Planning Committee in setting up a review of service operations such as buildings and grounds, student services, etc., (somewhat similar to the review of academic programs by the advisory task force last spring).

At our last meeting, the FCC had an extensive discussion with Provost Benjamin about ways in which the working environment for female faculty at the University could be improved. More on that issue in an upcoming *Footnote*. ■

□ FOR THE RECORD

Chairs and members of Senate and Assembly committees are listed in the front of the student and staff directory.

Finance Committee

(Senate)

Committee members discussed with Provost Roger Benjamin the implementation of fringe benefit decentralization (fringe benefit monies are being aggregated during this academic year at the department level rather than at the central administrative level). The committee expressed agreement with the principle behind the decentralization, but pointed to possible implementation problems. Provost Benjamin was asked to return in late spring with a report evaluating the

new system's first year of operation.

The committee also examined a proposal from the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) for funding health insurance benefits for graduate students who are on at least 50 percent appointments. Although committee members sympathized with COGS, they raised the larger issue of granting such benefits to all classes of University employees. The committee will ask for a cost study on granting health insurance benefits to all University employees on 50 percent or greater appointments, and will share the study results with the Graduate School committee being set up to explore the COGS health benefit proposal.

After brief discussion with Professor Geoffrey Maruyama, chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, about his committee's approval of the Faculty Development Committee's seven recommendations on sabbaticals and leaves, the Finance Committee endorsed those recommendations (numbers 5-11). Included were requests for \$150,000 in new money to be budgeted annually for replacement funding in departments where tight staffing makes sabbatical options difficult, and \$150,000-\$175,000 to provide new funding for a sabbatical program similar to the Bush program, but not tied to undergraduate education. ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELOPE S KROSCH
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

February 16, 1988

Volume 1, Number 3

Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Faculty Women Concerned with Qualitative Issues

Although only about 20 percent of its total faculty hires for 1985-86 were females, the University of Minnesota ranks high nationally in recruiting women faculty. Among Big Ten schools, only Ohio State is doing a better job.

According to Patricia Mullen, director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, intensifying female recruitment efforts in any large university is an enormously slow process and the University is moving faster than most.

In the past 10 years the percentage of women professors at the University has risen from 6.1 to 7.3 percent, women associate professors from 10 to 21 percent, and women assistant professors from 22 to 33 percent. Vice President Roger Benjamin says the University's goal is to achieve 50 percent female representation in all areas of the University.

Bringing qualified women into the system will remain a priority, but Mullen believes that access is no longer the main obstacle for women. "Right now, the biggest challenge we face is how to create a working environment that maximizes the talents of all the people we bring on board, whether they're women, men, or minorities. We have to learn to participate in a professional environment as equal partners. I don't think anyone anticipated how hard that was going to be."

Many academic women view Benjamin's recently announced initiatives to improve the working environment for women faculty as an important step in the right direction. "When I read about it," says Professor Ellen Berscheid, "I felt like the cavalry had finally arrived."

Benjamin intends to establish a University advisory committee on women's affairs, hire new staff for the

equal opportunity office, organize seminars to educate faculty about sexual harassment, and appoint more women to top administrative positions.

Although Regents' Professor Margaret Davis is very impressed with Benjamin's efforts, she believes this institution is 15 years behind other public universities in developing and implementing policies toward women. "Discussions going on

right now among administrators here are similar to discussions held at the University of Michigan in 1970," Davis says.

This spring the University will take another big step to enhance the situation of women academics. Benjamin's office and the equal opportunity office will undertake a two-year study of issues concerning women faculty, administrators, and

continued, p. 2

Salary Increase Figures Explained

Some Twin Cities faculty have questioned the difference in 1988-89 salary increase figures between unionized and nonunionized University faculty. Recently negotiated contracts bring the Duluth salary increase to 8 percent and Waseca's to 6.5 percent, while the increase level announced for the Twin Cities campus is 4.75 percent.

Salary increases for all University campuses have two main sources: legislative appropriation and centrally allocated University funds. For 1988-89, each of these sources will contribute 2.5 percent for a total available salary increase base of 5 percent on all five campuses (4.75 percent on the Twin Cities campus because .25 percent is automatically held back for retention).

In addition, any campus or unit can allocate funds from its own budget to supplement this salary increase base. For 1988-89, Duluth projects that it will be able to bring the 5 percent base up to 8 percent by using internal funds. As they do every year, many colleges on the Twin Cities campus will also supplement the projected salary increase with money from their budgets.

For 1987-88 (in which the Twin Cities salary increase percentage base was also 4.75), faculty salary increases

among larger campus units ranged from 5.07 percent in the School of Nursing to 7.45 percent in the Carlson School of Management. The span of these salary increase percentages for various Twin Cities units, as well as the Morris and Crookston campuses, is listed below.

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| CLA | 5.98 % |
| IT | 5.98 |
| Agriculture | 5.46 |
| Forestry | 6.21 |
| Home Economics | 5.58 |
| Medicine | 6.91 |
| Public Health | 5.93 |
| Pharmacy | 5.44 |
| Veterinary Medicine | 5.31 |
| CBS | 5.96 |
| Law | 7.17 |
| Education | 5.49 |
| General College | 5.90 |
| Morris campus | 6.95 |
| Crookston campus | 5.41 |

It is also noteworthy that over the past few years, faculty salary increases on the Twin Cities campus have been greater than those on the Duluth and Waseca campuses. ■

Women, from p. 1

professional staff. The study, which grows out of the Rajender Consent Decree, will involve data gathering and problem identification, the design of a comprehensive affirmative action plan for solving those problems, and the development of support for that plan within the University community.

"The supportiveness of this administration is getting stronger all the time," says associate vice president Betty Robinett. "Ken Keller has always been adamantly in favor of improving the lot of women, and Roger Benjamin is making real efforts in that direction."

Monitoring quantitative indicators such as hire rates is much easier than identifying the qualitative problems some faculty women experience daily. "Most instances of sexual harassment aren't the stuff of formal complaints," says Berscheid. "It's not as clear-cut as salary inequity. The statistics in a unit can look fine, but harassment can still be going on in a thousand little ways."

Some women faculty think the administration needs a more accurate picture of how widespread sexual discrimination is at this university. "Men often believe they understand

the nature and extent of the problem," says Professor Shirley Clark, "but they can never have an empathetic understanding of what it is like to be hassled from the very day you arrive."

At a recent Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) meeting, both Clark and Berscheid strongly urged Benjamin and other top administrators to sit down and talk in depth with groups of women faculty before making specific intervention plans.

Women on campus are eagerly seeking a forum for discussion, as illustrated by the standing-room-only crowd that attended a January meeting on women's issues sponsored by the University's three female regents.

Beyond the 30-40 sexual harassment cases handled by Mullen's office each year, there are many subtler forms of discrimination that can inhibit personal and professional productivity. It can be as blatant as exclusion from collegial social gatherings or as subtle as a search committee chair referring to the person who will occupy an unfilled position as "he."

It can even take the form of heavy committee responsibilities. "Because women faculty are few, they may be expected to represent the female viewpoint in a range of forums while continuing to compete for promotion," says Robinett. She warns tenure-track women not to fall into the trap of overcommitting themselves.

Departmental culture can contribute to the development and perpetuation of sexual bias. Department heads, as elected leaders, tend to embody the dominant values of their departments. If those values are sexist, in some cases the department head may fail to recognize or take action to discourage discrimination.

Sensitivity Training Recommended

Some faculty women suggest that the University follow the model of certain corporations where administrators undergo sensitivity training about the many subtle forms of sexual harassment. Mullen doubts that kind of approach, where discussions are carried out in a "hothouse" environment, would be very effective.

Instead, she believes that colleagues

need to establish between themselves an ongoing participatory agreement promoting on-the-spot sensitivity training. "You have to establish ground rules, a mutual understanding that when one of you says or does something that creates a problem for the other, you can talk about it right when it happens," Mullen says. "This kind of agreement allows someone to say, 'What you just said really bothered me,' without feeling that they are overreacting or being unreasonable."

Mullen acknowledges it can be difficult for both parties to reach the initial agreement, and sees part of her role as helping people learn those skills. "There are lots of people on campus who could teach this kind of thing to unit administrators, who could then teach other faculty."

There is no shortage of suggestions from women academics about other improvements that could be made. At a recent FCC meeting, Professor Patrice Morrow presented a list of possible disincentives and incentives for curtailing sexual discrimination. One disincentive would allow a faculty woman who finds herself in a hostile environment to take her line to a more supportive department, depriving the original unit of that line for the remainder of her tenure.

For incentives, Morrow recommended that the University:

- 1) present an annual monetary award to departments that are particularly successful in recruiting and retaining women;
- 2) advertise continuously in areas where there are few women faculty until appropriate people are hired;
- 3) establish a fund to aggressively recruit outstanding women faculty.

Davis suggests two other reforms: 1) the administration should make more policy statements that clearly express for the record its interest in improving the professional climate for faculty women; and 2) an advocate for women should be designated on every search committee (she thinks it is a role either men or women can be trained to carry out effectively).

Female academics also point to the immediate need for a counseling referral service or hotline for women who are not interested in filing a formal grievance, but who want to talk to someone about ways of

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 3
February 16, 1988

Managing Editor: Cayle Gales
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathen

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Duluth and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Contributions, articles, and comments from all readers are specifically invited for possible publication. Contributions by faculty or administrators on topics of campus interest, write to: Footnote, Morrill Hall, 100 Central Street, S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote should arrange the manuscript with the editor, address of call (612) 625-2020.

handling gender-related professional problems.

Although Mullen's office handles as many of these referrals as staff time allows, some women feel more should be done to develop a stronger support network, especially for junior faculty.

In response to this need, women scientists at the University have begun to meet informally for dinner to share experiences, advice, and humor. Such gatherings are one attempt at building what Morrow calls a "critical mass" in disciplines where female faculty can be especially isolated.

Search committees will continue to play a vital role in eliminating the token status of women in some departments, but female academics doubt that alone will affect the working climate and life issues that concern them. "It is extremely difficult to influence behavior or control attitudes. How do you force department members to be pleasant to one another?" says Berscheid.

Despite such difficulties, Benjamin is convinced that as the University moves beyond the Rajender phase and its focus on litigation, progress can be made on a much wider range of qualitative problems, "but only if we work very hard." ■

If you would like to share your suggestions and opinions about issues concerning faculty women at the University, we invite you to write a letter to Footnote (mailing address is on page 2).

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By W. Phillips Shively
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Faculty Salary Grievances

The question of how faculty can file grievances about salary increases was at the center of an interesting, if inconclusive, discussion at the last Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) meeting.

Occasioned by a letter from Associate Professor Charlotte Striebel about a case she had advised, we invited Striebel, Amos Deinard (chair of the Senate Judicial Committee), and C. Robert Morris (chair of the judicial panel in question) to join us for what turned out to be a long and

sometimes heated discussion. Because this is a difficult question of general interest, I'll try to summarize the exchange.

Professor Striebel believes that because criteria for salary increases are highly subjective and, in effect, untestable, faculty cannot pursue grievances about them. She recommends that the University either adopt a more objective system for allocating salary increases, or recognize and publish the fact that salary increases are inherently subjective and thus, indisputable.

Professor Morris noted that the judicial panel rejected the case in question for three reasons: 1) it did not claim a large enough difference in outcomes that a "reasonable observer" would assume an invidious distinction to have been made; 2) the claimant was not of a protected class, i.e., he was a white male; and 3) the claimant did not charge personal animus or discrimination because of his exercise of academic freedom.

Morris emphasized that under other conditions faculty can bring salary grievances to adjudication, and he worried that Striebel's letter would discourage faculty from pursuing justifiable cases. If the salary increase differential had been much greater or if the claimant could have showed that the merit decision was tainted by personal, racial, or sexual prejudice or that it was in violation of academic freedom, a case could have brought forward.

It is clear that our procedures for handling salary disputes are a mess. Six full years elapsed between the time this particular case was filed with a college grievance committee and the time it was received by the Judicial Committee. This is terrible treatment, which seems to result less from ineptitude than from the difficulty of deciding how to handle salary grievances.

A committee of Deinard, Striebel, and Fred Morrison from the Law School is currently working to produce new, streamlined grievance procedures that may better define this gray area.

However, a basic policy question underlies the problem. Is it appropriate to use merit criteria that are subjective and multidimensional and that lead to decisions that are difficult to justify? Should we instead use more testable criteria such as

across-the-board raises or formulaic assessments of merit?

No vote was taken, but it was clear that FCC members were strongly disinclined to the latter.

Unfortunately, that still leaves the gray area gray. ■

New Lobbyists Face Tough Session

The University will be represented in the 1988 state legislative session by a full complement of institutional lobbyists.

Richard Heydinger, appointed vice president for external relations in January, has already assumed his role as chief University lobbyist. Although Stanley Kegler, former vice president for institutional relations, will be a visible partner over the next few months, Heydinger will present all of the testimony himself. "It's a good chance for me to learn first-hand about the lobbying process and to become personally acquainted with the legislators," he says.

Eventually, he hopes to hire a full-time state lobbyist with whom he and President Kenneth Keller will work closely. Heydinger plans to involve the University community in lobbying efforts by organizing administrators, faculty, and students to help make the University's case to the Minnesota legislature.

Joining Heydinger in the statehouse will be two new faculty lobbyists, Professor Irwin Rubenstein, legislative liaison for the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and Professor Geoffrey Maruyama, recently elected president of the University of Minnesota Faculty Association (UMFA).

Rubenstein considers the next two years at the state legislature to be critical to the future of the University. "If we don't receive the funds necessary to carry out plans made under Commitment to Focus," he says, "we will have lost a major opportunity to improve quality. I want to do anything I can to help in achieving our goals."

The FCC is in the process of identifying potential members for a legislative advisory committee to assist Rubenstein and to develop a pool for the selection of future legislative liaisons.

continued, p. 4

Lobbyists, from p. 3

The FCC legislative liaison position, a half-time commitment, was held in previous years by Professor Richard Purple, Professor W. Phillips Shively, Associate Professor Peter Robinson, and President Kenneth Keller (a professor at the time).

The University Faculty Association, founded seven years ago, consists of two organizations — the UMFA, which lobbies the state legislature, and the Candidate Support Committee, which raises funds from faculty to disperse as campaign contributions. Both organizations are headed by the UMFA president, but served by separate committee membership.

Maruyama believes his new post will give him the opportunity to use the knowledge he has acquired serving on University Senate committees over the past few years. "Hopefully, as UMFA lobbyist," he says, "I'll be able to help legislators gain a better understanding of faculty concerns and needs."

Maruyama's UMFA predecessors include Professors Patricia Swan, W. Phillips Shively, and Richard Purple.

Money Tight in 1988 Session

According to Heydinger and Keller, this legislative session is going to be a challenging one. The state's recent economic forecast for a smaller than expected 1987-89 budget surplus means that most state funds are already earmarked.

With money so tight, the University will have to make a strong

case for its \$168 million, three-part request. The Operations and Maintenance Budget requests (\$34 million total) include an important \$11 million rank funding adjustment to be used for the continued implementation of Commitment to Focus. The top two priorities in the Special Appropriations requests (\$4 million total) are \$3 million for the University Supercomputer Institute and \$375,000 to fund Minnesota Extension Service projects. Although funding for an engineering study on boiler replacement for the Minneapolis campus is priority one among Capital Improvements requests (\$130 million total), the three largest ticket items are construction of a Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, renovation of and addition to the Architecture Building, and waste cleanup for the Rosemount Research Center.

Keller hopes for a show of legislative support that acknowledges the progress the University has already made toward Commitment to Focus goals. "We are going into this session with a record we can be proud of," he says. "We've already changed preparation standards, restructured General College, and reduced enrollments."

"Negotiation is a two-way process: one party presents something, and the other party responds. So far, the University has done a great deal, but the legislature's response has been 'What else are you going to do?' The question right now is, 'What are they going to do?'" ■

□ YOUR BENEFITS: Q & A

Q. Why can't faculty who have their faculty retirement funds in the Vanguard Family get more timely and complete reporting? At present, reports come out every six months at best and dividends and capital gains are not directly reported.

A. The University of Minnesota went to a new Vanguard Vista 2 computer system in October 1987. Statements for the fourth quarter of 1987 have been delayed because of programming problems, but were mailed starting February 1, 1988. In the future, all statements will be mailed by the third week after the end of the quarter.

Under the new Vista 2 system, quarterly statements are broken down by each fund, showing the contributions and earnings for the quarter. Under the Vista 1 system, they were broken down by dividends, appreciation, etc. — but a large number of people were confused by this detail. Vanguard may try to work out a compromise in the future.

If you have a question about faculty benefits that you would like the Employee Benefits Department to answer in this column, please send it to: Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Concerns of Faculty Women
Faculty Lobbyists Named
Salary Grievance Questions

DGJ 300983 69
PROF ROBERT F ESTELLE
U ARCHIVES
10 WA LIB U CF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ March 1, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 4

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Faculty Respond to Academic Priorities

The Academic Priorities document, containing the final administrative recommendations from Commitment to Focus planning, was sent to all faculty and administrators in mid-February.

Prof. Charles Campbell
(Physics)
Chair, Plan for Focus Advisory Task Force

I wholeheartedly support the report's emphasis on resurrecting the arts, sciences, and engineering at the University. There was a very strong consensus on the advisory task force on this subject, and it shines through this document like a beacon. I am also happy to see the issues of instructional equipment addressed so clearly, and to see the preeminence of the library recognized.

The semester recommendation surprised me. Faculty and students spoke decisively on that issue several years ago, and I'm a bit disappointed to see it before us again so soon. However, I am glad that the question will be settled through the faculty governance structure.

If the semester change is approved, that alone will be an enormously time-consuming task. The report asks that it be implemented by 1990, which would give us two years if the Senate passes the recommendation this spring. But schools that have made such a change testify that successful transition requires a minimum of three years.

Implementation of many of these recommendations will take a tremendous amount of detailed planning. We are talking about making some remarkable changes, particularly in restructuring the lower division and reorganizing advising and other student services. And, as some deans have pointed out, in the faculty for arts, sciences and engineering (FASE), we are in a sense creating a larger entity than we already have. It's easy to go wrong in that situation, so

we'll have to be very careful.

Overall, I was very pleased with the document. In one way or another, it endorses all of the positive recommendations of the advisory task force. And in solving problems, it manages to avoid the kind of "draconian" cuts we were forced to make because we could assume no additional outside money.

By virtue of the way the report has been brought to the public, the administration is indicating reasonable confidence that its recommendations will be followed up with legislative funding, that this won't end up an empty exercise.

Assoc. Dean Julieann Carson

(College of Liberal Arts)
Member, Academy Planning Committee

One of my chief concerns is the inclusion of engineering in the FASE. Our academy report recommended that a faculty of arts and sciences determine the bachelor of arts degree requirement. It's not clear in Academic Priorities whether the FASE would take on that responsibility, but it would be unfortunate if it did. It's appropriate that professional school faculty participate as individuals in

continued, p. 2

Gifts Show Commitment

Last year at this time, Professor Emeritus William Shepherd, chairman of the Minnesota Campaign's faculty/staff leadership committee, was very pleased. Solicitation of the University's 18,000 faculty and staff members had already yielded contributions of \$4 million, exceeding the committee's original goal by a million dollars.

This February, Shepherd is "overwhelmed." With a few months still left in the campaign, contributions from over 6,000 faculty, staff, and retirees total more than \$11 million.

While the committee hoped that those who knew the University best would be among its strongest supporters, no one guessed how strong that support would really be.

"The fact that we are now at almost four times our initial goal of \$3 million is a powerful statement about the positive feelings that University faculty and staff have toward the institution they serve," says Shepherd.

While Shepherd's leadership committee set basic campaign policy, various campuses, colleges, and

administrative units conducted their own solicitations. The campaign's tremendous success is a testament to the dedication of key staff, faculty, and administrators whose endorsement and participation were an inspiration to others.

One incentive for giving was a special challenge grant, a commitment made by President Kenneth Keller to match all faculty/staff Minnesota Campaign donations made by December 31, 1987, with funds from unrestricted gifts.

So far, Twin Cities faculty and staff have contributed nearly \$4 million. At the request of donors, much of that money will support special projects identified by individual units at the beginning of the campaign.

Many faculty and staff contributors on the Duluth campus (nearly \$700,000 raised) have designated use of their money to a scholarship fund for children of UMD employees. While the majority of the Morris campus' \$89,000 total goes toward student scholarships, the \$181,000 raised on the Crookston campus is

continued, p. 4

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By **W. Phillips Shively**

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

The Semester Proposal

The administration's proposal for a semester system involves a tricky question of consultation. Although a number of proposals in Academic Priorities, such as those on tenure and faculty development, are clearly subject to further consultation with the Senate and its committees, the semester proposal is meant to be administration's final recommendation.

The argument behind this is that there was very full faculty and student discussion of the question a few years ago. A poll taken at that time showed a majority of faculty and a heavy majority of students were opposed to the semester system, and the matter was dropped. The administration believes they can

make a decision today based on that past advisory consultation.

They also point out that some conditions have changed. There will presumably be 8,000 fewer students in a few years, which should ease many scheduling problems. Since the shift to a faculty of arts, sciences, and engineering will require major curricular revision, it will be easier to make the required course changes for the semester system at the same time. Finally, the change to one class credit per one hour of contact time per week (if approved) could be accomplished with less strain on the faculty under the semester system.

The FCC sympathizes with the administration's desire not to endure another long discussion on a matter that has already been thoroughly aired. At some point, the University should be able to make a decision. On the other hand, this matter was regarded by all as settled a couple of years ago. Students and faculty have strong interests in this decision; and, because it is a curricular question, faculty play a special legislative role in its outcome.

We are now setting up consultation in a way that will not delay a decision, but will allow the senate to vote on a detailed semester proposal. This vote will, of course, be advisory, but we are sure the administration will weigh it heavily when deciding this issue. ■

funding to stimulate undergraduate curricular reform.

The report is silent on a few issues it might have addressed, such as the Regents' College proposal our academy committee made. Students who are undecided about a major still need a collegiate home. They want to belong just like their friends in IT or music. Failing to provide them with a collegiate identity could force them to prematurely declare a major, which is the reverse of the plan's intention.

Although we're grateful for the money CLA gets in this report, it isn't adequate for our needs. And, if it's dependent on legislative appropriation, we're not certain we're ever going to get it.

We are trying to be optimistic, but it takes more than promises. We need dollars. A calendar of funding distribution for this plan would go a long way in allaying some of the anxieties our faculty is suffering right now.

Assoc. Prof. John Taborn

(Afro-American Studies)

Chair, Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus

In terms of my concerns as chair of the minority programs committee, I feel the statements in this document about affirmative action and the position of minority students are very convincing. I am impressed the administration would speak out that strongly.

I also support the idea of faculty from professional schools and graduate school working more closely with undergraduates. The proposal for a tracking system is a good thing; an institution this size should have more data about what's actually going on.

Implementation is going to be a very complex process, almost revolutionary. It's been 70 years since changes like this have been proposed, so it won't be easy to get people turned around. Whenever you alter lines of reporting or reshuffle units it's inevitable that certain internal power bases will be eroded, and some people will resist that.

It's a very bold document, and it leaves no question that the University is determined to carry out Commitment to Focus. Most important from my standpoint is the fact that it intends to do so without negatively affecting the minority

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 4
March 1, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Response, from p. 1

such discussions, but I object strongly to professional schools having an equal voice with the arts and sciences faculty.

Since conversations about creating a College of Fine Arts have always included architecture, I was surprised they are proposing independence for the School of Architecture. I now wonder about the future of the arts college — will it have to become a College of Performing Arts? It would be very difficult to make a unit independent, then later make it one division of a college.

There are several things in Academic Priorities that please me a great deal: the single entry point, the \$1 million designated for advising improvement, the move toward uniform admission standards, and the

population.

Prof. Shirley Clark

*(Education and Sociology)
Chair, Senate Finance Committee
Member, Plan for Focus Advisory
Task Force*

I like the positive tone of Academic Priorities, but it is not as balanced as I had hoped, especially since it represents a more advanced stage of deliberation and negotiation than our task force report.

In the general statements at the beginning of the report, I think it should be made clear that the other items listed under General Health of the Institution aren't of equal importance with the needs of the library. More importantly, I would like to see the needs of core programs addressed before the needs of support service units.

To rationalize the importance of core programs because of their importance to the state seems to me a very narrow view. The interests of the state should be more broadly defined, and the heavy emphasis on physical and life sciences should be balanced with an equal emphasis on the humanities and social sciences.

In view of the great need for money, the internal reallocations proposed in this report are from a very small number of units, compared to the much larger number of units recommended for cuts in the task force report. That probably could have been anticipated, since there is an obvious political element to the reallocation schedule that has evolved.

Because of its relative freedom from political considerations, I think the advisory task force was able to look with a clearer eye on many areas that needed review, reorganization, even termination. We came closer to the mark than this document in identifying where changes should really be made.

Although I agree with the exhortations for units to do more in the area of affirmative action, such statements don't necessarily cause behavior to change. There have to be strategies laid for the hiring of greater proportions of women and minorities and for the assurance that they will be advanced and paid at a rate commensurate with men and majorities.

Implementation will be eased

because there is much in this plan that is gradual. At the same time there will be critics, perhaps including those who fund us, who expected more radical adjustments to be made more quickly. I guess any plan for change is going to be problematic with respect to whether it goes far enough or goes too far.

We have received quite mixed signals from the state of Minnesota as to which direction the University should take — continue to do all the things it did before or become considerably more focused. It remains to be seen what the commitment of legislators is to our Commitment to Focus.

Prof. Mark Brenner

*(Horticultural Science/Landscape
Architecture)
Chair, Senate Planning Committee*

One concern I have about the implementation of these recommendations is timing. We want to start planning the changes in lower division curriculum right away, but we also face the uncertainty of whether the University will be moving to the semester system. It's unfortunate, because we'll almost have to develop two plans for curricular reform, one for semesters and one for quarters.

The corollary of this is that once we begin to plan curricular changes, we will probably be able to make more intelligent decisions about whether the semester or the quarter system better suits the University's evolving academic needs.

I like the idea of establishing a FASE, although I have doubts about it replacing the Twin Cities Assembly. Being a potential member of the FASE and also a member of a professional school, I don't want to see the professional schools disenfranchised. The FASE can be a helpful body in developing academic policies for students, but I have serious reservations about whether that group should take on other responsibilities in setting University policy.

I'm very supportive of the common entry point for undergraduates and the improvement of advising services. We do, however, have to be careful not to project the image that all undergraduates at the University are now going into one advising melting pot. In fact, this plan should ensure

that they will be treated more personally than ever before.

Within my own unit, agriculture, we look at Academic Priorities as a very positive challenge to find new ways of increasing enrollment and of providing teaching effort to other parts of the institution. We're already redoing our curriculum top to bottom as part of Project Sunrise, so this is good timing in that sense.

Prof. David Hamilton

*(Cell Biology/Neuroanatomy)
Chair, Senate Research Committee*

These recommendations arose out of long, sometimes acrimonious, debate, and I think they represent a reasonable compromise. Things are going to be done, and that's important. For us to have gone through all the turmoil we've gone through in the past year and have nothing happen would be unacceptable.

The reorganization of the biological sciences won't be difficult because most of the things suggested have been operative for some time now. The deans' council knew it was going to be appointed. Members have been working together and have a pretty clear idea of what they are going to do. I think faculty also have a good sense of how they are going to interact more fully.

The research council is an excellent idea. It's not as definitive as the suggestions in the task force report, but there was enormous resistance to the establishment of another high-level administrator. With this plan, those people who should be organizing University research will be brought together in such a way that they will have to do it and do it properly. ■

**□ FOR THE
RECORD**

Members of Senate and Assembly committees are listed on pages 6 and 7 of the 1987-88 Student & Staff Directory.

**Senate Committee on
Faculty Affairs**

Chair, Geoffrey Maruyama

Both the Faculty Consultative (FCC) and Finance Committees recently

continued, p. 4

Record, from p. 3

joined the faculty affairs committee in support of seven recommendations on sabbaticals and leaves from the June 1987 report of the Faculty Development Committee. Guest Robert Kvavik, assistant vice president, reported the results of his discussions with Vice President Roger Benjamin about implementing those recommendations.

With regard to a recommendation for a flexible sabbatical plan adding new options for faculty leaves of two quarters at 3/4 salary or one quarter at full salary, Benjamin agreed to the first option, but questioned whether the second option would undermine the single-quarter leave program.

Kvavik suggested that the faculty affairs committee pursue with Benjamin two financial recommendations (\$150,000 in new sabbatical money for units with tight staffing and \$150,000 to support 8-10 new merit sabbaticals), since such items have to be placed within current University funding priorities.

Benjamin accepted the recommendations that the single quarter leave option should be left intact and that the Bush sabbatical program should be re-evaluated and restructured.

While Kvavik praised a recommendation to endorse faculty study projects (in which faculty make arrangements with their units for short-term projects) he asked for more information about implementation procedures.

In response to a recommendation

providing fringe benefits and supplementary salary to winners of prestigious awards, Kvavik commented that some external agencies were unfairly passing these costs on to the University. He suggested that a threshold be set as an implementation guideline.

Senate Committee on Educational Policy

Chair, John Clark

Discussion of how and if the change to 50-minute classes should be tied to the change to a semester system led to comments about the effects of these changes on extension courses and graduate seminars. It was concluded that flexibility should be exercised in special situations, as determined by collegiate curriculum committees. The committee then unanimously approved, in principle, the 50-minute class and the 1:1 ratio between classroom hours and credits granted.

A student survey about to be undertaken by academic affairs was presented for committee input and reaction. The survey is part of a multi-faceted assessment effort that will help the University monitor the effectiveness of undergraduate education.

The purpose of the student survey (which began in mid-February) is to learn how graduating seniors evaluate various aspects of their University experience. Survey results will be sent to all departments on the Twin Cities campus so each will be aware of how their graduates evaluated their

undergraduate years.

Two other components of this assessment effort will also be undertaken this year: 1) a survey of departmental practices and policies that affect undergraduate education; and 2) a test of tests — two tests (the College Outcomes Measures Project/ACT and the Academic Profile/ETS) will be administered in order to compare University students with their peers, to relate students' scores with curricula taken, and to evaluate the tests themselves. ■

Gifts, from p. 1

being divided among three programs: an "Endowment for Excellence" initiative to enhance education, a series of seminars, and a fund to support faculty/staff family scholarships. Scholarships and equipment are high on the list of proposed uses for the \$96,000 raised at Waseca.

In a separate solicitation effort, the Minnesota Medical Foundation has raised more than \$6.3 million from faculty, staff, and retirees of the Medical School and University Hospital and Clinic. This represents about 50 percent of the entire faculty/staff campaign.

"On behalf of all the co-chairs of the faculty/staff campaign," says Shepherd, "I want to express both my appreciation for the tremendous response and my joy over the faculty and staff's obvious commitment to the University. These gifts are a real demonstration of faith in the future." ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Faculty Response to Academic Priorities

Faculty/Staff Gifts Reach \$11 Million

The Semester Proposal

DGJ300983
PROF ROBERT F ESTELLE
U ARCHIVES
10 WA LIB
MPLS, MN 55455
69
U OF M

FOOTNOTE

☐ March 15, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 5

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Chemical Abuse: Faculty Not Exempt

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) is proposing to the senate this spring a Faculty Assistance Program parallel to the Employee Assistance Program currently available to University civil service staff. The new office, for which funding has been approved by the central administration, would provide faculty with referral service on a variety of personal problems, including alcohol and drug abuse.

Although the senate voted against a similar proposal eight years ago, SCFA members feel that it is time to try again. "People's general awareness is higher," says Professor Toni McNaron, who chaired the subcommittee that drafted the proposal, "and now we can point to precedent; other universities are operating successful programs of this nature."

If you look at the general literature about chemical abuse prevention and treatment in higher education, "the faculty, historically, have been a particularly tough nut to crack," says James Meland, assistant director of the University's Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Prevention Office (AODAP). "They are very independent people who don't want too much intrusion and who don't see themselves as really needing much help. In many ways this self-portrait may be accurate, but in the area of alcohol and drug abuse, we are all susceptible."

"National figures show that one out of every four Americans has a drinking problem," says McNaron. "Any profession that is stressful is bound to be affected, and being in the university is no longer some sort of ivory tower activity. I think any faculty member here would tell you that it's pressure-packed. There is no way faculty can be exempt from what is generally true about chemical abuse in comparable populations."

Although technically the Employee Assistance Program is for civil service

staff, director David Johnson estimates that he receives about two dozen calls a year from faculty. He offers as much help as he can, but emphasizes his office's civil service focus.

In addition to the well-documented personal tragedy of alcohol and drug abuse, McNaron worries about the loss of faculty talent to the University. "If you are in a chemical-induced fog, you may be here, but it's like driving a car with two spark plugs. It's not that a person is doing bad things, it's what a person isn't able to do—diminished office hours, papers that aren't graded in time, committee meetings that are missed, letters of recommendation that are poorly written and not on time, carelessly done research and writing. That's all a terrible loss."

Associate Professor James Holte, who has gone through successful treatment for alcohol abuse, believes that departmental priorities determine which part of faculty performance is sacrificed to chemical abuse. "If your paycheck depends on research grants coming in, your teaching will probably suffer. You cut corners, pay TA's to do your work, or, if you're powerful enough, tell your department you are too important to teach—whereas the real statement may be 'I can't make it in on Monday mornings.'"

Johnson is often asked about the symptoms of chemical dependency. "Obvious clues like liquor on the breath are often unreliable," he says. "More important symptoms are subtler—changes in behavior, relationships, and productivity." One difficulty in recognizing chemical abuse in others is that personal and professional decline takes place over a long period of time. "If you compare someone's behavior or productivity with what it was five years ago," Johnson says, "the change may be obvious. But if you compare month to

month, or even year to year, the change may be harder to perceive."

Johnson and Holte both believe that one of the major obstacles to abusers seeking help is that they believe no one knows about their problem. Holte recalls an incident in one of his classes during his period of chemical dependency. "I was passing out exams, and perspiring very heavily, as many alcoholics do. One of my students asked me loudly why I was sweating. It was like a knife in my heart. 'Do they know?' I thought."

Research shows that there is an average of seven years from the time the abuse problem is first confronted

continued, p. 2

Campus Club Move Considered

Discussion about a possible move for the campus club is still exploratory, says associate vice president Clinton Hewitt. The idea of relocating the club in more appropriate facilities came up during the development of the administration's proposal for a multi-purpose art museum.

The site for the proposed museum building is north of Comstock Hall, where a parking lot currently exists.

Construction of the new building is contingent upon the art museum's ability to raise \$4 million to \$6 million of the \$8 million total cost. The remainder of the cost will be covered by private donations to the University. Museum director Lyndel King believes the museum's fundraising success is "highly probable."

The price of moving the campus club hasn't been figured yet. "It's too early to get into detailed planning and costs. That will be determined after we've talked about the needs and desires of the faculty," Hewitt says. He will be meeting soon with campus club representatives and vice president David Lilly to discuss the proposal further. ■

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By **W. Phillips Shively**
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Streamlining the Committee System

NOTE: I would have liked to address here the crisis in public confidence the University has been suffering, but the two-week lead time for *Footnote* means whatever I wrote would be overtaken by events before it appeared in print. So, we will have to leave the crisis to the other presses. However, there is an important proposal in the works on another subject that I can discuss.

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and the Committee on Committees are considering a proposal to cut down radically the number of senate and assembly committees. The current committee system is large, with much overlap in responsibilities, and it continues to grow. This proposal would reduce the

current 41 committees to 18 by: 1) folding the functions of "operational" committees such as calendar, ROTC, etc., into broader policy committees; and 2) combining assembly (Twin Cities) and senate (all-University) business in a single committee.

Advantages of the streamlining include: 1) fewer faculty and students have to put in time on committees; 2) only 18 wise people willing to serve as committee chairs have to be found each year, compared to 41 at present; 3) committee business could be better coordinated, since 18 chairs could reasonably meet together once a month to divide the work; and 4) the cynicism born of committees with no clear charges and no work to do could be eliminated.

Disadvantages include: 1) each of the remaining committees would have more work to do and chairing some of them would be particularly demanding; 2) committee service, which brings diverse people together and integrates the University, would

continued, p. 4

stop keeping the situation secret. He also advises that they focus on the consequences of abuse rather than on the abuse itself. "If you are a friend of the ill person, you might say 'Look, I'm worried about you. I don't know what's going on, but I don't like it. Let's see what we might do about this.' Tell them about the behavioral changes you've noticed. Be very frank."

Once a chemically dependent person accepts there is a problem, the next step is referral to the University or community resource most appropriate for that person's situation. "Some people abuse alcohol, but aren't chemically dependent. Some people will deny they have a drug abuse problem, but will accept the idea of another kind of help, like marriage counseling," Johnson says. "There are a lot of choices, some are educational, some involve treatment. We try to match persons with the most effective program for their unique needs."

Meland thinks that even though community-based referral services are available, the campus employee assistance model is valuable because "initial access represents a big step for someone with a problem like this. The more easily identified and accessible a diagnosis and referral service is, the higher the probability that someone will actually use it," he says. "Another advantage of on-campus referral is its availability to colleagues and supervisors who want advice on how to help these people."

Meland and Johnson agree that the size of the Twin Cities faculty warrants a separate assistance program, and that faculty would probably be more comfortable with a referral service geared to their problems. "An extremely high level of trust is absolutely necessary for an office like this to function," says Johnson. "I'm not saying that only the faculty could provide that for itself, but I'm sure that's a prime consideration."

"This SCFA proposal isn't implying that we all need help," says McNaron. "Just that a service like this should be available to whatever percentage of the faculty population wish to make use of it. Not every faculty member makes use of University child care services or many other fringe benefits provided, but those who want to take advantage of them should not be prevented from doing so." ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 5
March 15, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in *Footnote*, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Abuse, from p. 1

until the person seeks help. "So it's very important that people around the ill person express their concern openly," says Johnson. "That person has to understand that others have noticed a problem."

Helping Can Be Difficult

Trying to help a colleague face a chemical dependency problem can be frustrating. Even when informally confronted, abusers may become angry. Often, they gradually isolate themselves from colleagues. It usually takes someone—a friend, coworker, or supervisor—to finally decide that a concerted, well-planned effort is needed to help the person.

"That's when someone like myself enters the process," says Johnson. "Upon request, I sit down with the concerned person or group and discuss the possible modes of intervention for the particular situation with which they're involved. These modes range from informal to structured, from a coworker approaching the abuser to calling in a professional interventionist to organize a confrontation involving family and friends."

Among Johnson's recommendations to people trying to help is that they

Getting into Focus, Retrenching Bullshit, and Other Matters and Manners of Moment

By Thomas Clayton
Professor, English and Classical Studies

In the words of American poet Stephen Crane,

*I saw a man pursuing the horizon;
Round and round they sped.
I was disturbed at this;
I accosted the man.
"It is futile," I said,
"You can never—"
"You lie," he cried,
And ran on.*

There is a lot of that kind of "conversation" and action around, but the issues are seldom so keenly and vividly characterized. Typically "I" don't try to stop "the man" because he wouldn't stop if I did. In a universe-city like Minnesota, most of us for much of the time stand—or run—in the same way. The resulting campus blur is known as "Minnesota Pace," a visitor told me; we don't recognize the race for what it is because we are (often) the rats in it. Among causes are size and numbers, diversity, commuting, lack of time to meet inordinate demands and unreasonable deadlines adequately, congestion, and shorthanded faculty and support staff: too few or too many doing too much or too little. Inevitably, we are forever standing in line, getting in each other's way, or colliding, conditions that contribute not to happiness, a sense of accomplishment, or the feeling of fellowship, but to misunderstanding, frustration, and short tempers. In these and other connections, four matters of current consequence seem to me to be the following.

1. There are enough incorrigibly snotty people around to strip the gloss from the sunniest day, and they are always thicker on the ground—as well as above the shoulders—than the golden people of the sunshine, who have a smile and on occasion a kind word for all, sometimes even an amusing one, Minnesota style. Psychology Professor Ellen Berscheid is quoted in the February 16 issue of *Footnote* as saying that "it is extremely difficult to influence

behavior or control attitude. How do you force department (or college or university) members to be pleasant to one another?"—and for that matter students and civil-service personnel. All the more reason for the sociable to identify themselves and help to make the day for others, maybe even swell their own ranks. As it is, we have too many "too much of late i'the frown," like Goneril to her old father in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, and too many Dirty Harry (or Harriet) types making their day by "wasting" others' with whatever means are at hand, nose, or foot.

The U Ask M lapel-sticker campaign was a step in the right direction. Another would be a "CCC" button—three symbolic smiles?—to identify members of a Courtesy and Civility Conspiracy. (Others could identify themselves, if they wished, by SSSSS, as Specimens of Snotty, Surly, and Supercilious Swine; a ready-made cheer there, too.) I haven't the money, the assistance, or the time to promote the cause and market buttons and bumper-stickers ("Don't honk, just smile and wave"), but I would if I could. Some colleges have (noncredit) courses in Manners, which are not mere "etiquette"—don't eat peas off the back of your *left* hand—but a code of considerate behavior by which individuals reduce abrasion and discomfort for others and promote social cohesion: current applications of the much eroded Golden Rule.

Such concerns are mine not especially as an academic, but as a human being, a condition that has been contested, but it is false that I was suckled by a werewolf. My primary discipline—and wider—concerns of the moment are the need for an effective and widely shared "dialect of the educated"—an English relatively independent of vocational and social sub-group exclusiveness—and the exponential burgeoning of bullshit from here to the horizon, and for all we know beyond: its contagion quotient is sky high.

2. We need courses in the kind of English I have just mentioned, and I know that members of campus composition and speech programs are eager to expand and strengthen existing courses or invent others to meet the need. In particular, we need a course, required of *all* students in their freshman year, in practical logic, ways of language and (ab)users, the

elements of scientific method, and the like. At a time when the complexities of things can confuse even the most alert, eligible complexities are systematically exploited by charlatans who thrive on others' confusion, and we need a more sophisticated version of the sixties' "built-in crap detector." Such a course could be a signal means to clarity of thought and accuracy of analysis—and expression—that are all too often in limited supply at present.

3. In his "Reflections on Bullshit" in the February 1987 *Harper's*, Yale chair of philosophy Harry Frankfurt begins, "one of the most salient features of our society is that there is so much bullshit. . . . It is impossible for someone to lie unless (s)he thinks (s)he knows the truth. Producing bullshit requires no such conviction. A person who lies is thereby responding to the truth, and to that extent respectful of it. For the bullshitter, however, all these bets are off: (s)he is neither on the side of the true nor on the side of the false. His (or her) eye is not on the facts at all, except insofar as they may be pertinent to his (or her) getting away with what (s)he says. . . . (S)he does not reject the authority of the truth, as the liar does. (S)he pays no attention to it at all. By virtue of this, bullshit is a greater enemy of the truth than lies are." Now return to #2, and then go on to

4. At a time when "literature" is increasingly being denied identity and profession, it is salutary and timely to be told by poet Joseph Brodsky, winner of the 1987 Nobel Prize for Literature, that "there is no doubt in my mind that, had we been choosing our leaders on the basis of their reading experience and not their political programs, there would be much less grief on earth. . . . If only because the lock and stock of literature is indeed human diversity and perversity, it turns out to be a reliable antidote for any attempt—whether familiar or yet to be invented—toward a total mass solution to the problems of human existence. As a form of moral insurance, at least, literature is much more dependable than a system of beliefs or a philosophical doctrine." He may be partly wrong, he is *certainly* partly right.

Finally—I use the Muzakal phrase not because I like it but because it is there—"have a nice day." A *really* nice one. And pass it on. ■

Shively, from p. 2

benefit fewer people; and 3) care has to be taken to ensure that certain operational questions such as the setting of the calendar receive adequate attention.

This proposal is still in a fluid state, and it's not yet clear how it will turn out. Your comments, either to me (for SCC) or to Bert Ahern, acting chair of the Committee on Committees, would be welcome. ■

□ YOUR BENEFITS: Q & A

Q. Is there a consultant to discuss with faculty the pros and cons of retirement options (e.g., rollovers, annuities, etc.) well before retirement, so that faculty can do advance financial planning?

A. The Employee Benefits Department has for many years provided counseling to faculty when they enter the faculty retirement plan and when they retire.

The department is looking into expanding this service to include more counseling help during the intermediate years. A program of group presentations that cover financial planning as it relates to the faculty retirement plan is now being developed. This program will address three levels of expertise: 1) faculty with little or no knowledge of the retirement plan, investments, or

financial planning; 2) faculty with a basic understanding of the retirement plan, investments, and financial planning; and 3) faculty who are very familiar with the retirement plan and who are currently involved in making investments and financial planning decisions. This program should be partially implemented within the next few months.

In addition, this department is adding an individual with financial planning experience to its staff. It is hoped that this position will be filled shortly.

If you have a question about faculty benefits that you would like answered in this column, please send it to: Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

□ LETTERS

The cover article in *Footnote* about faculty women's concerns was a welcome sight. The article includes some very positive and helpful suggestions for action and I'm personally glad the issues facing women faculty are being given attention by central administration.

Still, it's not helpful to state that the University is doing "better than most other universities." Is discrimination okay as long as everybody does it? It excuses the discriminatory practices of the majority and allows the unacceptable to be compared against the same.

Perhaps the University is making

progress in affirmative action. It just doesn't look that way when you see that the highest level of university administrators are all male; that the vast majority of deans are male; and that 92.7 percent of full, 79 percent of associate, and 67 percent of assistant professors are male. How about acknowledging the problem for what it is? If we don't accept that there is a problem, it will never be solved.

*Judith Brown
Associate Professor
School of Public Health*

The sight of distinguished faculty circling the wagons around the Eastcliff fiasco reminds me of the feces some misogynists left on the desk of a female faculty member last summer. The only ones to respond publicly to that despicable act were the *Daily*, other women faculty, and a few good men, notably Larry Miller. The regents' professors and other leaders who speak for our community in times of difficulty were silent.

Several years ago, for only the second time in its history, the University fired a full professor because he failed to meet his teaching and service responsibilities. The College of Liberal Arts thought his failures important enough to warrant his firing. Who among us thinks acts of violence against women are also important? Who will voice the community's contempt for the boys of chemistry?

*Andrea Hinding
Professor and archivist
University Libraries*

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Chemical Abuse: Faculty Not Exempt
Streamlining Committee Structure
Clayton on Manners, Bullshit, and Literature

DGJ3C0983 69
PROF ROBERT F ESTELLE
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ March 29, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 6

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Instructional Equipment: Problems and Proposals

A recent survey of 50 top U.S. engineering schools underscores one of the biggest worries of the Institute of Technology (IT). The survey shows that these schools spend an average of \$1,800 per graduating senior on instructional equipment each year. Last year IT spent \$250, while the University of Michigan spent \$2,500.

In the University's College of Education, science teachers are being trained in facilities that haven't been upgraded since the 1950s and are using materials and equipment much less sophisticated than those in average secondary schools.

A year ago, the University's ratio of microcomputers to students was 1 to 100. At Carnegie Mellon and other leading research universities, the ratio is around 1 to 3.

Even if the University's instructional equipment budget were nearly tripled, it would still be the lowest in the Big Ten.

Central administration acknowledged the severity of the problem in its recent Academic Priorities document by earmarking \$5 million for instructional equipment over the next few years—\$3 million for IT and \$1 million each for the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) and the College of Liberal Arts (CLA). An additional \$2 million is slated to go toward computer networking.

Ten years ago, University students who enrolled in laboratory courses paid lab fees to help cover the cost of instructional equipment. That policy was discontinued when an instructional equipment line item, which came from tuition income, was added to departmental budgets.

"In physics, the original line item was \$20,000," says Professor Charles

Campbell. "Unfortunately, it hasn't gone up during those ten years. Inflation has eroded it to the point where \$20,000 is only enough to cover the cost of expendable supplies. There is simply no money to maintain or replace any equipment."

IT dean Ettore Infante calls the situation disastrous. "A great deal of research equipment is provided by funds from agencies, but instructional equipment has to be purchased with University money, and that's a big problem," he says.

Junior and senior IT laboratories are using 15- to 20-year-old equipment that is nothing like what students will encounter in the workplace. "It's not only that this situation puts our graduates at a competitive disadvantage," says IT associate dean Russell Hobbie, "but we run the real danger of accreditors rating our programs as substandard."

The College of Biological Sciences also suffers from obsolete equipment prone to expensive breakdowns. "Right now we need computer equipment, microscopes, and equipment to teach molecular biology," says Dean Paul Magee. "Relatively soon we are also going to need a large number of PCs for students, and some capital equipment to significantly improve our laboratories."

CLA associate dean Craig Swan doesn't think that most people recognize the equipment-intensive nature of many liberal arts areas, such as journalism, psychology and other social sciences, theater, studio arts, music, and art history. "Writing and language instruction here would be much different if CLA students had more computer access," he says. "Technology has fundamentally

changed the way professors teach and communicate: today's English professors require a lot more than quill pens and ink wells."

While associate dean Wesley Wharton says the College of Agriculture is in "pretty good shape" in the area of instructional equipment for undergraduates, he points out an urgent need for microscopes and increasing demands for VCR equipment and adds, "If you name something related to instructional computers, we need it."

Equipment needs for graduate-level teaching represent a gray area, according to horticulture professor Mark Brenner. "Traditionally, when we go to the dean and ask for graduate instructional equipment, we are told to go to the Graduate School," says Brenner. "Although the Graduate School offers grants for purchasing research equipment, it doesn't fund instructional equipment for what could be described as a lower division graduate course. We need a source for funding instructional equipment in graduate-level introductory methodology courses, which are difficult to teach in a research lab setting."

Science Education Underfunded

"This university has the responsibility of providing leadership in science education in this state through its graduate and doctoral programs," says education professor Fred Finley. "Our graduates must have experience with state-of-the-art equipment and ideal facilities in order to pursue research and to spread that information throughout the state's secondary and higher education systems. Our current science teaching facilities

continued, p. 2

Equipment, from p. 1

don't meet safety standards of the 1960s, and we aren't even close to having adequate equipment and materials to cover the majors and minors in this field."

Finley and his colleagues have proposed renovation of a few rooms and purchase of additional equipment to create a model science teaching unit at the University. He thinks such a facility, unique in the Midwest, would help attract top graduate students. But funding, estimated at \$750,000, looks unlikely, especially in light of recently proposed cuts to the college.

Campuses like Morris are also caught in the equipment crunch. "We've never had up-to-date equipment on this campus, so we're constantly fighting just to catch up," says science and math associate professor James Van Alstine. "A second problem is that our campus is funded like a college. We get one

lump sum, which has to cover student services and other activities not typically funded through collegiate units. So that restricts our equipment acquisition."

Van Alstine cites particular needs at Morris as high-quality microscopes and analytical scientific, computing, and telecommunications equipment. Right now, the campus gets much of its equipment used from National Science Foundation and Minnesota State surplus lists and from other University campuses.

Industry-donated equipment plays an enormous role in IT, accounting for an estimated 60 percent of current instructional equipment. One major problem with such donations, according to Infante, is the cost of maintenance. "We cannot accept some equipment gifts to IT because they are offered with the understanding that the equipment will be maintained — and we have no money for that."

Campbell believes that, while industry contributions help, IT should be educating its students on state-of-the-art equipment. "By its nature, anything discarded by industry is last-generation equipment. Students can certainly learn things by using it, but what we really need to do is keep up with the current generation of technology."

Keeping up is especially demanding in the computing area, where microcomputer systems can be out of date in as little as three years. And because the University was concentrating on providing supercomputer access during the early 1980s — when the shift from time-sharing to workstations was taking place — its supply of microcomputers lags behind other institutions.

Two possible ways of paying for instructional equipment are a state bonding bill and a tuition surcharge.

Although Infante suggested the bonding bill, a funding strategy typically used for buildings, he has reservations about the proposal. "There is something inherently distasteful about taking 20 years to pay off bonds, when the equipment's life span is only 3 to 10 years. And even if the bonds brought us \$30 million to buy new equipment, we have to think about maintenance and replacement costs for that equipment.

A good rule of thumb is that you need 25¢ to cover maintenance and replacement for every dollar you spend on equipment. That means when the \$30 million was expended, probably over three or four years, the University would be under an obligation to have a line item of nearly \$8 million for maintenance and replacement. We can't say, 'Let's bond, then the problem will be solved.' These are continuing costs."

Some other universities have used tuition increases to help cover instructional equipment costs. The University of Michigan established a \$100 information technology access fee per semester for all students. The idea of a tuition surcharge meets with mixed response from University students and faculty. Bruce Vandal, chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, believes that if students were presented with a surcharge plan cast in terms of the alternative (i.e., no improvement in instructional equipment) and were assured the money would go only toward equipment for student use, approval would be likely.

Although he finds a surcharge reasonable, Infante prefers that it be levied on specific courses rather than on tuition overall. Magee objects to a surcharge because it would magnify an existing differential in CBS tuition costs. Swan and Campbell prefer a combination of tuition surcharges made across the board and in equipment-intensive disciplinary clusters.

"Our students pay awfully high tuition, so I think any surcharge would have to be spread out," says Campbell. "One related idea we had in the Advisory Task Force was to levy a surcharge on the sale of computing equipment through the bookstore to support the efforts of the microcomputer labs. I think the administration has accepted our recommendation in principle, but it hasn't been implemented yet."

One thing everyone agrees on is the magnitude of the problem. "We are getting an important message from leaders in industry," says Campbell. "Our equipment is so antiquated that our graduates have to be retrained. Other states have gained a hiring advantage." ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1, Number 6
March 29, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Legislative Update: The Question of Sales Tax

By Irwin Rubenstein
Faculty Legislative Liaison
Faculty Consultative Committee

Many University faculty, students, and staff do not realize that the Minnesota legislature enacted a bill last spring that produced a major change in the University's tax status. All University purchases are now subject to a sales tax of 6 percent. This tax costs the University about \$6 million per year, which is paid by faculty, students, and University Hospital patients.

Perhaps more importantly, the application of this sales tax is inequitable; not all institutions of higher learning in this state are taxed. Vocational-technical institutes and private colleges are exempt.

Faculty who have research grants are affected since they now have 6 percent less to spend on supplies to support their research and that of their graduate students. In many instances, no budget increase can be built into the grant to cover this new expense because the budgets of multiyear grants are set and cannot be changed for the next three or four years. In addition, 6 percent has been added to the cost of major equipment on grants.

Thousands of dollars are involved here, since many supply budgets are over \$20,000, and equipment budgets can easily exceed \$10,000. The total sales tax on faculty grants at this university is estimated at \$800,000 per year. Even faculty without grants are affected since this tax represents a 6 percent decrease in departmental supply budgets.

The sales tax directly affects students because of its impact on the price of teaching supplies and student dormitories. This tax is estimated at several hundred dollars per student. The tax will cost the University Hospital more than \$2 million next year, and it is the only hospital in the state that will pay this tax.

There are also a number of indirect costs associated with the University's collection of this tax. Brian Obermeier, director of University accounting records and services,

estimates that it has already cost \$65,000 to develop a system for calculating and reporting this tax and that the yearly administrative costs will be about \$70,000. This does not reflect costs to the departments.

In effect, the state is taxing itself and charging itself to do so. Even if the legislature "gives" the University money to cover these costs, the money will not cover the consequences of these taxes on faculty research grants.

What can be done? Faculty, students, and staff should contact their legislators to share their concerns about this unfair application of the sales tax. First, I suggest that you ask them what their positions are. If they favor the tax, it would be useful to know why. Or, if they oppose it, you might ask what they are doing to get it eliminated.

The decision on this matter will be made mainly by the tax committees. If your legislators are on tax committees, ask them what their positions are and have them defend what was done. If your representatives are not on tax committees, ask them to talk to Representative Gordon Voss, chair of the House Tax Committee, or Representative Dee Long, chair of the Tax Law Division, about this matter.

Also ask your senator to talk to Senator Douglas J. Johnson, chair of the Senate Taxes and Tax Laws Committee, or Senator LeRoy Stumpf, chair of the Sales Tax Division. Have your legislators call or write you to tell you what these individuals say, and please send any replies to me at 250 Biological Sciences Building, Minneapolis campus.

It will not be easy to change the minds of legislators on this issue, but it can be done. The senate seems to be more willing than the house to change this tax law. Time is short.

To find out who your legislators are, call 296-2146 and give them your address. Letters to your representative can be sent to: State Office Building, St. Paul, MN 55155. Letters to your senator can be sent to: State Capitol Building, St. Paul, MN 55155.

I urge all faculty, students, and staff to contact their legislators and ask that this sales tax on the University be dropped.

As we went to press, for the first time there were indications that the house and senate may be moving toward removal of the sales tax for higher education. Therefore, the need to contact your legislators is less urgent than previously believed. ■

□ YOUR BENEFITS: Q & A

Q. Does the new University of Minnesota Federal Credit Union offer a way for faculty on nine-month appointments to spread their income over twelve months?

A. Yes. In fact, you can choose from among three plans. The first alternative is to deduct enough money during the nine-month accumulation period to allow the credit union to send you regular checks during summer months. For example: 18 deductions of \$290 would allow the credit union to send you \$1,740 per month during the summer. One advantage to this plan is the interest paid on your share savings balance. Currently, this interest is 6 percent for the first \$2,000 in an account and 6.5 percent for balances over \$2,000.

If you are not able to deduct the full amount necessary for the first option, a second option combines payroll deduction and a line-of-credit (LOC) loan. The credit union matches the total amount that is deducted with an LOC. You can then draw upon both this LOC and the balance in your share savings account. The interest rate charged on the LOC may be as low as 8.5 percent, depending on the amount of credit used.

The third possibility is a pure line-of-credit loan from the credit union. The current rate for unsecured loans is 14 percent. Secured loans are offered at lower rates.

continued, p. 4

Benefits, from p. 3

Line-of-credit loans are paid back over the following nine-month period by payroll deduction.

The new credit union is located in 149 Coffman Memorial Union, telephone 612-624-8626.

If you have a question about faculty benefits that you would like answered, please send it to: Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty Convocation with Interim President

A faculty convocation with Interim President Richard Sauer, Regent's Chair David Lebedoff, and W. Phillips Shively, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee will be held at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, April 6 in Northrop Memorial Auditorium. Written questions for Sauer can be submitted to Phil Shively, Political Science Dept., 1414 Social Sciences Bldg., 267 19th Ave. S., Mpls., MN no later than Friday, April 1.

The Chair's Report, by Phil Shively, will return in the April 12 edition of Footnote. Unfortunately, the copy deadline for this edition fell on the day after the president's resignation.

□ FOR THE RECORD

Members of senate and assembly committees are listed on pages 6 and 7 of the 1987-88 Student & Staff Directory.

Senate Planning Committee

Chair, Mark Brenner

The planning committee met with members of the Faculty Consultative Committee to develop a slate of potential members for a new task force charged with review of support services as they relate to the University's academic mission. Membership will be drawn primarily from faculty but will include civil service, professional and academic, and student representation.

Beginning its work spring quarter, the task force will operate under the joint aegis of the provost's office and the senate. The group will look over the planning documents submitted by support service units as part of last year's Strategy for Focus, asking units involved for updates if necessary. Four graduate fellows will be assigned to work with the task force, especially in gathering data over the summer. A final report is expected by November.

Following up a recommendation from the Report of the Faculty Development Committee (June 1987), the planning committee is also exploring the question of a proper University faculty/staff ratio.

Assistant vice president David Berg's office is now completing a pilot study that compares the faculty/staff ratios of several University departments.

During the coming weeks, the committee will be examining the detailed, item-by-item administration response to the recommendations of the Advisory Task Force on Planning (June 1987) that was recently released. Members will be considering possible follow-up to that document, especially in cases where the administration's final decisions seem to warrant further discussion. ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Instructional Equipment Needs
Lobby to End Sales Tax
New Credit Union Options for Faculty

DGJ300983 69
PROF ROBERT F ESTELLE
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

□ April 12, 1988

□ Volume 1, Number 7

□ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Uncapping Mandatory Retirement

To retire or not to retire will be the question as of January 1, 1994. On that date, higher education's exemption expires from the 1986 Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) amendment prohibiting mandatory retirement on the basis of age.

The expectation was that during the seven-year exemption period, national research on the effects of uncapping retirement age for tenured faculty would provide colleges and universities sufficient guidance in planning for the future. Over a year ago Congress called for a National Academy of Sciences study of the ban on mandatory retirement, but the necessary \$1.2 million still hasn't been appropriated. Unless the situation changes soon, the planning initiatives of individual institutions trying to prepare for the impact of the ADEA amendment will be handicapped.

"With the age limit removed, we really don't know how faculty will time their retirements," says education professor Shirley Clark, chair of a senate subcommittee currently drafting the charge for a University task force being set up to study the implications of uncapping. "What little data we do have suggests that retirement patterns may not be appreciably altered. But we really don't know enough to predict anything very accurately."

Those seeking answers from schools that have already uncapped mandatory retirement (Wisconsin, Utah, Maine, Florida, Hawaii) may come away disappointed at the lack of conclusive data. One report from the University of Wisconsin does note that during the first year of uncapping, five out of nine faculty members who reached age 70 chose not to retire.

Reports from Yale University, with a firm mandatory retirement age of 70, indicate that 80 percent of those

who retired over the past three years waited until they were 70. Recent University of Minnesota statistics show faculty generally retire at 66 or 67, even though they could work until age 70.

Reactions to the ban on mandatory retirement range from mild concern to sobering predictions about a graying professoriate. "The prospect of truly unlimited tenure stimulates phantasms of doddering nonagenarians clinging to their

podiums, irremovable because they have tenure, and thwarting the appointments of younger scholars. The subcommittee believes that such a prospect is indeed phantasmagorical," states a recent report by the Association of American University Professors (AAUP).

That group's conclusion that there is little cause for alarm is based partly on the lack of evidence that raising the mandatory faculty retirement age

continued, p. 2

From the Interim President

By Richard J. Sauer

By the time you read this, I will have been interim president for over three weeks. And I will have both sent a letter to University faculty and staff and held a faculty convocation in Northrop auditorium. As I responded to the Board of Regents following my appointment, I am addressing two immediate challenges: a) restoring trust and credibility with regents, legislators, faculty, staff, students, and the public; and b) moving ahead with the implementation of Commitment to Focus by seeking regential approval of our Academic Priorities plan. Most of my time and energy, off campus and on, has been devoted to addressing these challenges.

The greatest concern has focused on the disclosure and use of University reserve funds. It is unfortunate that the press portrayed a reserve fund of \$221 million, when two-thirds of that figure represents dedicated or committed year-end balances. The actual central discretionary reserves are approximately \$70 million. And given the size of our annual budget, our dependence on state appropriations, and the volatility of state revenues, economists and financial advisors recommend that we should maintain

an annual central reserve of \$40 million to \$50 million.

Faculty have questioned why we should not use some of the central reserves to improve faculty salaries and thereby restore your lost purchasing power. Civil service staff have asked that we use reserves to finance an accelerated implementation of the pay equity plan. And some faculty and staff, as well as some of our publics, have suggested that the internal funding cuts proposed in Academic Priorities are now no longer necessary. The reserves are not recurring and thus not a source of funding to solve any of these problems. We need recurring funds to budget salary increases for faculty and staff, as well as to increase budgets for some of our highest priority programs, and the only sources of such funds are new or reallocated state appropriations.

By the time you receive this, the regents should have approved both a spending plan for 1988-89 from central discretionary reserves and an appropriate level for future reserves. They will have also discussed both the 1988-89 budget plan and the Academic Priorities document, with action yet to come.

continued, p. 2

President, from p. 1

On March 28, I held my first outstate meeting, in St. James, Minnesota. During the spring and summer months, I will be holding many town hall meetings, both outstate and within the metropolitan area. These meetings will be hosted by alumni and other friends of the University. Legislators and other public officials as well as legislative candidates will be invited to attend. I will be listening to people's concerns, receiving their constructive criticisms, and enlisting support for both Commitment to Focus and our 1989-91 biennial request.

I am dedicated to restoring the integrity and improving the quality of this university and its management in the months ahead. I appreciate greatly the support and help that many of you have already offered to me. While we have enormous challenges ahead, I am convinced that they represent major opportunities. The future of this institution grows brighter by the day. ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 7
April 12, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Uncapping, from p. 1

from 65 to 70 several years ago put any real strain on institutions. In fact, faculty appear to be retiring earlier now than they did 10 years ago, despite the opportunity to work longer.

"Everyone's worst-case scenario is that there will be a large fraction of faculty who stay past 70, that there will be higher salaries to pay and no slots for new faculty," says William Weiler, associate director of University Management, Planning, and Information Services. "But the best evidence suggests that faculty will continue to retire at the same point they do now."

David Swanson, assistant director of personnel for the Employee Benefits Department, says there is a core of tenured faculty who will continue to work if given the opportunity. "When you remove mandatory retirement, there is a general tendency for people to stay somewhat longer than they would have," he says. "But since we've never had a situation without a cap, it's difficult to predict how many will stay or how long they will continue to work."

A variety of factors could persuade faculty to continue working past 70. Because the University's retirement program is designed to grow substantially in value each year retirement is delayed, it operates as a clear financial incentive for faculty to remain. "If you are simply looking at dollars," says Swanson, "the longer you stay the larger the amount becomes." The prospect of inflation can also be influential. If faculty see returning levels of high inflation that would erode pension dollars, they may believe they can't afford to retire. The AAUP report also suggests that uncapping may have the most effect on research universities, where relatively light teaching loads and plentiful research opportunities may be attractive to older faculty.

Possible Effects

If enough tenured faculty do decide to defer retirement, a variety of negative effects could ripple through institutions, from increased salary and benefit costs to lack of promotional prospects for junior faculty. Since senior faculty are usually on

the high end of the salary spectrum, and since their pay either goes up or remains stable each succeeding year, if they delay retirement institutions will have to pay a higher percentage of large salaries for a longer period of time. Added to that financial commitment is the cost of continuing contributions to the faculty member's pension. As of 1988, it is illegal to discontinue pension contributions on the basis of age, which means that institutions cannot automatically stop contributions at age 65 or 70 as has been done in the past.

There is also anxiety over the effect uncapping may have on already-tight promotional prospects for younger faculty. If tenured faculty retire later, institutions, especially those with high tenure ratios, may be hesitant to grant tenure to qualified junior faculty. (Currently, at the University 78 percent of the faculty is tenured.) "We have a fairly elderly group at the University right now," says Betty Robinett, associate vice president for academic personnel. "If retirement is uncapped and they stay on longer than they normally have, it would mean there wouldn't be very many new positions for younger people."

A dearth of tenure opportunities might also deter talented individuals who are considering an academic career. "I'm sure one of the reasons a lot of people go into academe is the possibility of tenure and consistent employment once they get it," says Robinett. "We are having enough trouble attracting qualified people into the professoriate as it is, especially in the professional areas where they can earn big incomes from industry. I think uncapping will exacerbate that problem."

Uncapping could have special significance for institutional affirmative action aimed at establishing more balanced faculty representation for women and minorities. The majority of senior faculty are white males; their later retirement could diminish the institution's ability to bring women and minorities into the system.

Although Pat Mullen, director of the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, agrees that uncapping could affect hiring levels, she believes a more probable result of the new law may be

an increase in age discrimination cases—already the largest class of suits filed with the state Department of Human Rights.

"If faculty do choose to retire later, it's likely that less productive members may be encouraged to leave, and if that encouragement is not carefully structured around an age-neutral evaluation system, it could lead to legal disputes."

A Range of Remedies

Proposed strategies for addressing the concerns raised by uncapping retirement generally fall into two categories: tenure code modifications and early retirement incentives. Although the AAUP's recent report emphasizes the dangers of changing the tenure code in response to uncapping, it does discuss the option of limited-term tenure. That proposal calls for the adoption of five- or ten-year contracts, renewal of which would be dependent upon evaluation. Longer term contracts (20 years) have also been proposed, but might involve legal questions.

"If a faculty member was last evaluated when (s)he became a full professor at 45," says Mullen, "and we begin evaluating that faculty member 20 years later, it's going to be hard to defend ourselves on age discrimination charges. Any post-tenure review needs to be highly systematic and age-neutral—something like regular five-year evaluations, or maybe the merit increase process could be regarded as a review."

One drawback to the limited-term tenure plan is the amount of faculty and administrative time a review process would require. The plan could also lead to an increase in faculty grievance proceedings.

Clark hopes that the attention being focused on how universities might use post-tenure performance reviews to encourage less productive faculty to retire will not distract from other possible strategies. "I would hope this institution could develop a system that would provide faculty with a variety of positive options—things like early retirement incentives, phased retirement, and special assistance for departments with age profile problems to help them achieve a healthy faculty mix.

We have to start thinking about a lot of innovations in this area."

If uncapping does turn out to be problematic and universities are forced to make changes, Weiler thinks one option might be revision of the policy that prevents reduction in a tenured faculty member's salary.

According to the AAUP report, reductions could be effected in two ways. A limited salary flexibility plan could allow an institution to reduce salary payments, within well-defined limits, as an incentive for early retirement. Alternately, a two-track salary plan could allow an institution to withhold future salary increments from a faculty member. Again, both plans would require development of a post-tenure review process in order to decide which faculty members should be encouraged to retire early.

Another possible incentive mentioned by the AAUP is the shift to a modified defined contribution plan, in which an agreed-upon ceiling is set for institutional contributions to all individual faculty pensions and long-term health benefits.

Early Retirement Options

Much less controversial than tenure modifications or salary reduction policies are early retirement options (EROs), which include:

- *Lump-sum severance pay*
(Disadvantages: 1) the new tax laws make the whole of such payments taxable in the year they are received, and 2) the targeting involved could lead to legal conflicts with the ADEA)
- *Liberalized actuarial reduction*
Early retirees receive full value of pension as if retirement had been delayed
- *Annuity enhancements*
Early retirees receive for a specified period of time additional annuity or cash payments to supplement their retirement annuity
- *Phased or partial retirement*
Faculty retire in exchange for part-time employment and other financial incentives
- *Other perquisites*
Expanded rights and privileges for early retirees, including continued use of office and parking space, photocopying, and support staff, and continued participation in group life and health insurance programs

continued, p. 4

THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By W. Phillips Shively

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Faculty Salary Increases

I am writing this on March 25, in a black mood. By the time you read it, my mood may be better. But given the history of the past six weeks, it might be even worse! Fitting this mood, I want to share with you some background on faculty salary increases for 1988-89.

What I write now may be out of date by the time you read it, since the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs will have met with the provost on April 4 to discuss faculty salaries. However, these issues are continuing ones, even if the specific numbers change. It is also possible that legislation to more fully fund all of the state's health plan may have offered us relief from the problem described below.

Our initial expectation, based on the legislative allocation last year, was that next year's faculty salary increases would be 4.5 percent. A major problem has since arisen—the University's fringe benefit costs are due to rise by 13 percent, and this increase must come out of the same pot as salary increases. The biggest culprits are the health plan, a \$3.4 million (22 percent) increase; tuition benefits (primarily graduate assistant tuition scholarships and Regents' Scholarships), a \$1.6 million (58 percent) increase; the faculty retirement plan, a \$1.4 million (7 percent) increase; and FICA, a \$1.2 million (7 percent) increase.

Unless these fringe benefit increases can somehow be finessed, an austerity budget suggested by the administration would use the dollars remaining after fringe benefit increases to provide the following: a faculty salary increase of 3.1 percent, a civil service salary increase of 2.3 percent, and a supply budget increase of .8 percent. This would be devastating, and the faculty affairs, finance, and consultative committees are seeking ways to improve these

continued, p. 4

Shively, from p. 3

figures. The provost has promised to bring a new proposal back to us for discussion. Among questions we will be asking are:

- Should tuition benefits come out of the salary increase pool?
- Would it be advisable to levy user fees for the more expensive forms of health insurance?
- What is the status of the legislature's allocation of money to increase faculty salaries by an extra 2 percent above other increases in the operational budget?

We will also propose using money from the University's famous reserves to provide a one-year cushion allowing us to seek legislative help in the following year. At the worst, this strategy would delay the unwelcome news for a year, which would not be a bad idea given what faculty have been through in the last several months. It is important to note, however, that because a salary increase is a recurring obligation and money from the reserves can only be spent once, permanent salary relief can't realistically come from that source.

There appears to be no easy answer, but after all the other shocks of this year, an austerity budget would have awful effects on the whole campus community. We are wrestling with this problem, and would welcome your suggestions. You could contact Shirley Clark, chair of the Finance Committee (624-8527); Geoff Maruyama, chair of the Committee

on Faculty Affairs (624-3315); or me (624-4395). ■

Uncapping, from p. 3

About one third of all colleges and universities currently offer EROs to faculty. Studies show that institutional EROs, which typically combine a few of the above incentives, are most successful when faculty play a substantial role in program design.

The University of Minnesota's early retirement plan is "essentially creative," says Swanson. "Within certain limits, you can do flexible things." Swanson is a particular fan of partial or phased retirement. "I think everyone should consider it," he says. "It eases the transition from active full-time employment to retirement. People who try this scheme tend to look forward with greater anticipation to full retirement. It's a beautiful way of easing fears." Support for phased retirement is heartily seconded by Robinett, who has been a participant in the program.

EROs, while less threatening, still cost money. And because higher education can't afford the kind of lucrative early retirement buy-outs common in business and industry, there is always the risk that maximum benefits won't be powerful enough to induce retirement.

Clark believes the effects of EROs at other schools need to be carefully examined to identify the

characteristics of faculty who take advantage of such plans. Evidence from national studies indicates that EROs can be especially attractive to highly productive faculty. In order to prevent its ERO from attracting the very faculty it wants to keep, Stanford University has implemented a provision whereby larger early-retirement benefits are offered to professors with below-average salaries (a low salary is seen as an indicator of low productivity).

Uncapping the mandatory retirement age for tenured faculty obviously raises many institutional questions, some of which are still fairly vague. But as Clark says, "This is a fascinating set of issues." And as more schools begin investigating them, it may become clearer whether the potential problems under discussion are borne out by experience, or whether the alarm with which some faculty and administrators look toward 1994 is premature. A University task force will offer its opinion next year. ■

Faculty Forum on State of University

A faculty senate forum on the state of the University and where we go from here will be held at 2:15 p.m. on Thursday, April 14 in 175 Willey Hall. If discussion warrants it, the forum will be continued the following week.

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Uncapping Mandatory Retirement
Faculty Salary Increases
Message from Interim President

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELOPE S KROSCH
U ARCHIVES
10 WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ April 26, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 8

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

The State of the University Faculty Perspectives

Three weeks ago just about anywhere you went on campus was thick with gloom. Snatches of faculty conversation were almost funereal. The frenzy and uproar over recent events had ebbed into feelings of disbelief and disappointment. Classes were taught, research proceeded, committees met, decisions were made. . . but for many, the heart had gone out of it all.

Still, despite bleak salary increase news, financial projections that push academic reform into the distance, and rumors of retrenchment, there have been a few signs of hope. The appointment of Interim President Richard Sauer, with his emphases on openness, financial integrity, and continuing Commitment to Focus, has earned widespread approval. Administrators appear to have intensified the faculty consultation process, and seem concerned about the profound morale problems on campus. Regents have unanimously passed a resolution reaffirming their support for the basic principles of Commitment to Focus.

These times may not encourage optimism, but faculty interviewed for this article, while realistic about the state of the University, showed great determination to carry on. Despite the damage and the uncertainties, faculty are trying hard to believe (along with Sauer and Churchill) that this is only the end of the beginning.

Associate Professor Constance Sullivan *Spanish and Portuguese*

The faculty generally feel that there is serious disarray and confusion, and at least a momentary lack of direction, at the top administrative level—including regents, which makes it very dangerous. I hear faculty saying that there are a lot of people who

have control over the University at this moment who don't understand the nature of an academic endeavor.

I haven't seen much mention so far of questions about our autonomy. I read in the newspapers that legislators say they want to know everything that is spent here, how it is spent, and who decided it would be spent that way. In the 23 years that I've been here, that has never been considered a matter of course. One of the most serious results of this whole affair is that the University has lost an immense amount of its autonomy.

I see the most crucial problem facing the University as the retention of its best faculty. If we don't get ourselves back in order pretty quickly, other universities will simply take them away. To keep the quality we have right now we have to proceed with Commitment to Focus and convince the legislature we need funding. And if central administration can't give faculty raises that meet inflation, while still drawing off retention money, they will have to watch this place disintegrate around them. Without these essential things, we won't be able to keep good faculty. When the University of Washington was forced to retrench several years ago, barracuda approached the place. Whenever a major university gets into systemwide difficulties like retrenchment or budget problems at the state level, eyes are immediately fixed on top faculty.

Another critical need is for the reinsertion of authenticity into the University governance system. You can't continue to ask faculty to give freely of their time, then ignore their advice. This is one of the problems caused by imposing a business-management model on a governance system with a long history of constructive faculty participation. I'm

not suggesting the proliferation of committees, but just putting more meaning into what faculty already do by acting on their recommendations.

Professor Norman Simler *Economics*

This has been a disaster. We've lost our president, our vice president for finance, and for the time being our state and private funding. Right now we need as much damage control as possible. Then we have to recruit, not just search for, a first-rate president. That will be very difficult because: 1) there are a lot of problems here, 2) state law requires that the search be an open proceeding, and 3) there aren't that many qualified people who are looking for a new position.

I regard the reaction of the regents, the legislators, and the public to the reserves issue as outrageous. All organizations have reserves, and Vice President Lilly did a superb job in centralizing these various pots of money and in managing them so they grew. All that seems to have been destroyed.

I am not defending the administration's apparent penchant for secrecy. But I can't believe it was as secret as other people seem to think. I knew they were doing this, and I'm not privy to what goes on in central administration. Every so often you would pick up, in casual conversation or in reading the *Daily*, evidence that the University had reserves. I can't understand why the regents and the legislature didn't know about it.

We've been smeared in the media because the facts came out in the wrong order with the wrong emphasis. When the reserves were first

continued, p. 2

University, from p. 1

publicized, all that appeared was the fact that the University had \$221 million. Only later did it come out in the back pages of the newspapers that the real reserve figure is about \$70 million. Yet, if you go down to the Roadside Cafe in Tracy, Minnesota, everyone is talking about the \$221 million. This whole series of events was bad enough, but the University let events overtake it and we came out with our worst foot forward.

Professor John Howe

University Librarian

Our dramatic fall from grace has been profoundly disturbing. It puzzles me that public reaction to these events has been so excessive. It seems to have something to do with the charges of elitism that surrounded Commitment to Focus, as if somehow high academic standards are inconsistent with the democratic values of the state. Nothing could be

further from the truth, but if Minnesotans feel that way, I guess we and other state leaders haven't been effective in communicating the compatibility of those two values.

This is not an aloof university. This is not a university that has separated itself from the state's well-being or is moving in that direction. The public misperception that we are becoming distant and elitist is very troubling.

It seems to me that the task of reestablishing goodwill is not the University's alone and should be borne in part by state political and opinion leaders. It's time for us to put our house in order, but it is also incumbent upon state leaders to recognize what an incredible educational bargain this university has been for the people of Minnesota. It's time for them to get beyond university-bashing and help restore confidence before fundamental damage is done. This institution is vulnerable, and considerable harm has already been done.

It's also important that we find a president who instinctively buys into the larger goals and philosophies of Commitment to Focus and who can provide crucial leadership in helping us regroup and proceed. Presidential searches are frequently difficult and problematic, but in our troubled situation it will be worse. What we don't need is tugging between faculty advisory groups and regents. I don't expect that will happen, but right now it's unusually important that we all be pulling in the same direction.

Professor Ronald Phillips

Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Keeping the general public perception of this institution's high educational quality is important right now. We can't let our goal of improving the University be turned back on us so that Minnesotans think we are not a good institution unless we make big changes.

Faculty are proud of this University and dedicated to making it the best place possible with the resources available. While that is the general attitude, it's a fragile one. Overall, people don't feel that they were as well-informed throughout this whole series of events as they should have been. Not that there was deliberate

intent, but it seems the communication process didn't work as well as it should have.

One important result of all the recent faculty committee meetings is a strong affirmation by those of us involved in governance of our willingness to come together on a 24-hour basis to act as a sounding board for the administration. They don't have to wait until our next monthly meeting to get reaction to proposals. We really want to be helpful.

Regents' Professor Margaret Davis

Ecology and Behavioral Biology

The faculty are stunned—shell-shocked, waiting for the next disaster to strike. It's almost as if the president had been assassinated and we still can't believe it happened.

It will be difficult for us to find a new leader as willing as Keller was to take a strong stand on controversial issues. I think, in light of what's happened, candidates for the job of president will be very timid about taking a position on anything.

Professor Victor Bloomfield

Biochemistry

A lot of positive things have been set in motion with Commitment to Focus that the majority of the faculty feel strongly and positively about. We've all committed ourselves to the success of this enterprise and are willing to try to make it work regardless of whether we get all the money that's been promised us. But if this goal is obscured, or if we are told by central administration or the regents that this is no longer our goal, there will be a great deal of disappointment.

We can't make the changes we are proposing in a vacuum. We have to operate as part of a larger system of higher education within the state. The University has always been rather grudging about that. We want to do everything ourselves and we forget there are state colleges and universities out there that can serve some of the purposes we are being asked to serve. Originally, that was part of Commitment to Focus, but I think it has been forgotten, much to

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 8
April 26, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

our political disadvantage. One of the tasks that our president and regents have to accomplish is to build long-range structural ties with the rest of the state's higher education system. We tried to move quickly with our planning and sort of forgot about all the allies and supporting units that we needed to consider.

Another problem we're going to have to solve is the low salary level for full professors at this institution. For example, the average nine-month salary for a full professor in biochemistry is about \$50,000. We recently made serious offers to two candidates for a senior position who had both been guaranteed \$80,000 to \$85,000 11-month salaries by other universities. That's about \$65,000 for nine months—\$15,000 is a big gap. Judging from AAUP salary figures, we are doing all right with junior faculty, but our low senior faculty salaries have brought us to the point where we're almost noncompetitive.

Regents' Professor Edward Ney

Physics and Astronomy

A lot of people think we've lost our last chance to be a great university. But I don't believe it. This institution has the basic strength of a number of outstanding faculty who are equal to the best anywhere.

The University does have to gain control of the physical plant situation, which has been out of control for the 40 years I've been here. And the administration has to avoid the secrecy that has been part of the budgeting process in the past. We have to be clearer and more open about it. I've never been able to look at a financial statement of the University and tell what's what. And I imagine legislators have the same problem.

One thing I think is crucial to the future of this University is increased internal support for research. Government funding patterns for research have changed. Agencies like NASA and the Department of Energy may use proposal pressure from universities to get money from Congress, but then they disperse it to their own internal labs or other larger groups. It's almost impossible for an individual researcher to break into that closed circuit anymore.

The University has to find a way of identifying faculty with good ideas who can't get external funding, and sponsoring their research. Right now, a faculty member can apply to the Graduate School for a research grant (from a few hundred dollars to \$20,000), but that total funding pool equals only \$1.8 million. That's about 1 percent of what the University takes in every year in sponsored research programs.

There ought to be some kind of regents' fund of, say, \$5 million that could be tapped for internal research contracts up to \$150,000. That could bring about a real change in the outlook around here. ■

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By **W. Phillips Shively**

Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

In the hope that no new surprises will have appeared between this writing (April 11) and publication, I'd like to bring you up to date on the two issues that took most of the Faculty Consultative Committee's (FCC) attention over the last couple of weeks.

The Famous Reserves

We have been working closely with the administration to clarify the situation and figure out where to go from here. The administration has about \$76 million in central reserves available next year. Of this, nearly \$20 million is already spoken for in recurring commitments, which will have to be reexamined after this year. A number of these commitments are to basic academic programs (\$1.3 million for libraries, \$1.5 million for IT, \$5 million for CLA, etc.), but \$6 million is for administration and plant maintenance. In addition to the \$20 million for prior commitments, the University is politically committed to spend down some of its reserves on building projects and health and safety improvements. The administration is talking about a total of \$8 million here, but prominent legislators have within the last day or two quoted a figure of \$15 million.

Finally, other existing commitments for insurance and matching of gifts will total about \$6 million.

Far from being rich with reserves, we appear to have little left for new academic initiatives, and we are faced next year with a reexamination of the \$20 million in recurring commitments. We must either eliminate them, get legislative backing for them, or retrench elsewhere to harden them up.

Faculty Salaries

The Senate's Committee on Faculty Affairs, Finance Committee, and FCC have held prolonged discussions with the administration over faculty salary increases for 1988-89. Given the problem of rising fringe-benefit costs, we have reached an understanding that at least keeps faculty salary increases from falling too far behind inflation. The administration will allocate 4.25 percent for increases, centrally holding .25 percent for retention and giving the colleges 4 percent. Deans will be instructed that, as a minimum, departments should on the average receive 4 percent, so the percentage raise for faculty on the scene will not be reduced as it moves from the college to department level.

This agreement has taken hard work on both sides. It does not allow us this year to keep to our stated goal of restoring the faculty's lost purchasing power, but it appears to be the best we can accomplish given the problem with fringe benefits. ■

Wrap-up from Lobbyists

March 28, 1988

As your faculty lobbyists, we would like to share with you what have been some frustrating times. As those of you who follow the legislative process know, this year, the second year of the biennium, is not a "funding" year. In off years like this one, there is a short session to consider a somewhat smaller array of issues. By rights, this should have been a fairly quiet session, which of course it was not.

With respect to our overall agendas,

continued, p. 4

Lobbyists, from p. 3

FCC represents faculty on the full range of University issues, whereas UMFA tries to restrict itself to concerns directly related to faculty, such as salaries. It initially seemed our representative roles might be quite different: while UMFA focused on sales-tax exemption, indirect cost recovery (ICR) offset, and faculty benefits (e.g., dependent tuition), FCC would consider those issues plus general academic planning priorities. Once the two groups had set their priorities, we met to see where we could best work together. Not surprisingly, restoring the sales-tax exemption and retaining the remainder of ICR offset money were issues we agreed to push jointly.

Then the Eastcliff story broke, and it became clear that our respective agendas would be subsumed under a need to focus on priorities about which faculty, students, and administrators agreed: library acquisitions, instructional equipment, undergraduate advising, and ICR. At the same time, we continued to lobby for sales-tax relief.

We tried to remind legislators that University faculty and students would suffer most from the sales tax and lack of new funding, and pointed out that the search for a new president would benefit greatly from a message of legislative support in the face of adversity. Initially, our efforts seemed to be paying off—the house and senate both proposed allocations toward our four priorities—but then

the reserve issue emerged.

The effect of the publicity about a \$221 million reserve was catastrophic; legislators felt the same sense of deception and betrayal many of us felt. Constituents were so offended that legislators decided reflecting that outrage superceded faculty and student concerns.

As you know, at that point central administration withdrew its request for any new legislative monies. Efforts to attain sales-tax relief continued. Although it now looks like the sales-tax exemption will remain, there was talk in the house about extending this University tax so Canterbury Downs could have a tax break.

This proposal was appalling—we've heard of states using gambling money to support education, but this is the first time we've heard of the converse. If nothing else, this plan should give us a clear idea of where the University stands in the minds of some legislators. It also means that we need to make sure our friends and supporters in the legislature know they are appreciated.

In closing, we would like to share one experience that illustrates the nature of the lobbying process. Our efforts reflected the contributions of administrators, faculty, and students, but relied heavily on the assistance of UMFA's long-time consultant Thomas Berg, former legislator and U.S. Attorney of Minnesota. We were extremely fortunate to have access to Tom's expertise. After the University had developed its revised list of four

funding priorities, we had to sell it to legislators. Tom scheduled a meeting with Rep. Glen Anderson, head of the House Appropriations Committee, so that we, Vice President Heydinger, and student lobbyist Robert Trewartha could brief him. As we were talking with him in a hallway, Senate majority leader Roger Moe walked by. Tom gave him a 15-second briefing and set up a later follow-up. House speaker Robert Vanasek then walked by; he got a briefing plus a copy of the new priority list. Lastly, head of the House Higher Education Appropriations Committee Lyndon Carlson passed, giving us the opportunity to update him on our new plan.

At that time all of them appeared receptive to our ideas. Although this particular effort was derailed by the reserve issue, we are continuing our efforts to represent the faculty and to restore the University's image in the eyes of the public and legislature. Given current public opinion about the University, there is an opportunity for an expanded and more effective role for faculty in assisting with legislative lobbying. If you are at all interested in getting involved, please call us at 624-3315 (Maruyama) or 624-2716 (Rubenstein). Thanks.

Geoffrey Maruyama

*Lobbyist, University of Minnesota
Faculty Association*

Irwin Rubenstein

Lobbyist, Faculty Consultative Committee

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

The State of the University
The Reserves and Faculty Salaries
Lobbyist's Update

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELOPE S KROSCH
U ARCHIVES
10 WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ May 10, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 9

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Health Care Benefits: New Realities

Even with the sometimes shocking University news of the last two months, a recent announcement that health benefit costs are expected to jump 22 percent next year managed to raise eyebrows and drop jaws among members of faculty governance committees.

Dismay was due partly to the fact that because benefits and salary raises are funded from the same part of the University budget, the jump meant a lower-than-expected faculty salary increase for the coming year (now tentatively set at 4.25 percent). But faculty also shared the surprise of the rest of the University community at the sheer size of the increase. Employee benefit administrators say the long-term prognosis isn't hopeful—higher health plan costs are here to stay.

"There's no doubt about it," says David Swanson, assistant director of personnel. "From now on we can all expect health care to take a bigger piece of the financial pie. The University and its employees have been paying less than their health benefits have really been worth. Now it's catching up with us. Our health plan will never be what it was in terms of cost, but it's still very attractive—we're still getting a good deal."

Swanson emphasizes that this is not just a local or state problem. "When you look at the cost of living in this country, medical expenses have been going up faster than other expenses," he says. "The Blue Cross Blue Shield problem may be unique to us, but every college and university in the nation is facing problems in coping with escalating health care costs."

The story behind the surprisingly large increase in health plan costs and the University's \$3.2 million payment to Blue Cross Blue Shield (BCBS) last month for claim overruns can both be

traced back to 1985. That was the year BCBS introduced the Aware Gold option.

Aware Gold Plan Causes Problems

Aware Gold was an experiment in a way, a nontraditional plan designed to offer the same comprehensive coverage offered by Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs), while allowing subscribers more choice in facilities and physicians.

"Whenever you have first-dollar coverage, without any deductibles," says Swanson, "which is what Aware Gold offered, people have a tendency to use their benefits a little more than they otherwise would." This tendency, along with a national trend of intensified health consciousness, probably contributed to the high level of claims made by Aware Gold subscribers.

The plan's tremendous popularity, combined with the fact that it was underpriced because it was a new product, soon forced the state into debt. Expenses incurred by subscribers far exceeded premiums paid, and the state had to cover both. To cut its losses, the next year the state limited its financial responsibility to 100 percent of the cost of employee premiums, which meant BCBS paid the difference on claims that went above those premiums.

According to Swanson, BCBS agreed to the plan expecting to take losses that first year, then make up for them by raising premium rates the next. The enormity of BCBS's losses soon became clear, however, and in negotiation with the state, it was decided to discontinue Aware Gold, the plan with the biggest overruns.

"Their assumption," says Swanson, "was that most of the former subscribers to Aware Gold would move to HMO coverage and the rest would subscribe to Aware Gold Limited, which offered less

comprehensive coverage." Again, predictions proved unreliable and practically all subscribers switched to Aware Gold Limited (now covering about half of the University's faculty and staff members).

Because that plan was also underpriced, BCBS's financial troubles became so severe that the company hinted it might have to use a contract escape clause and cancel all coverage within 30 days.

"That's when the state began to realize a compromise was necessary," Swanson says. "Although state employees had enjoyed a terrific health care bargain, BCBS simply couldn't continue to absorb such losses. So the state agreed to pay BCBS 125 percent, rather than 100 percent, of employee premiums."

Within the past few weeks, the state passed a bill promising to pay that additional 25 percent for the present year for all state agencies except the University of Minnesota. The University will have to pay the estimated \$3.9 million to BCBS from its own coffers.

Geoffrey Maruyama, University of Minnesota Faculty Association lobbyist, says, "Faculty committees that have been informed about this

continued, p. 2

Readership Survey

After you have read this issue of *Footnote*, please take a few moments to complete the readership survey on page three. Your reply will help us make this newsletter more responsive to your needs. Please detach the completed form, fold it so the *Footnote* mailing address faces outward, and drop it in campus mail. For those on the Crookston and Morris campuses, please staple the folded form, stamp, and send it through the U.S. mail. We appreciate your assistance. ■

Health Care, from p. 1

bill feel the legislature has been punitive in singling out the University to pay its share of these costs, when no one else had to." Richard Heydinger, vice president for external relations, believes the legislature's decision was related to the recent reserves controversy and to the state's attempt to balance its own books.

High Costs Continue

Next year, Swanson estimates that, with medical inflation figured in, University faculty and staff will face a 30 percent to 40 percent increase in BCBS premiums.

HMOs will also be pushing prices up to meet the demands of medical inflation, past financial losses, and a new state mandate that HMOs build reserve funds.

These projected health plan premium hikes lead to the question of how additional costs will be shared between employer and employee. Currently, the University pays 100 percent of employee premiums and 90

percent of dependent premiums for faculty and staff who choose the low-cost carrier for their county (presently, BCBS is low-cost carrier for all Minnesota counties).

This year that means the University pays the full \$932 individual BCBS premium and \$1,076 of the total \$1,195 dependent BCBS premium. The University's share of the combined annual premiums is \$2,008, and \$119 is paid by the subscriber (10 percent of the dependent premium). But it's possible that, sometime in the future, University employees could be asked to pay a higher percentage of health care premiums.

Next year's budget plan, according to the University finance office, proposes a \$2,000 per person cap for combined individual and dependent premiums. In light of the projected rise in premiums, the effect of such a cap could be higher costs to faculty and staff. For example, if BCBS premiums increase 30 percent next year (a lower figure than many experts predict), then individual premiums would go up to \$1,212 and dependent premiums to \$1,552 for a combined premium of \$2,764. With a \$2,000 cap on the University's contribution, the individual subscriber would be asked to pay the \$764 difference.

Since current health plan contracts run through the end of the year, faculty and staff will not see any changes in premium costs until January 1989. "Meanwhile, the University is exploring all available options to mitigate an increase in health plan premiums," says Nick La Fontaine, director of budget development. "We are especially looking for opportunities that would preclude these additional costs eating up salary increases."

Could the University control health benefit costs by starting its own employee insurance plan? Swanson says that preliminary investigations concluded such a plan would probably be more expensive than the current arrangement.

The state is looking into a new option that may help. A preferred provider plan could keep premium costs down because subscribers use specific facilities and physicians who offer discounted rates to the state in exchange for higher volume. According to Swanson, the state is

putting together a request for proposals to invite insurance carriers to submit bids for a preferred provider plan.

Swanson notes the trade-off between cost and choice in most health care options, including a preferred provider plan. "Either you can have a wider choice and pay higher premiums," says Swanson, "or you can have lower costs and less choice. At some point, you have to decide which it's going to be."

Retirees have already been hit with increases in their health insurance premiums. Part of that increase, says Swanson, is also due to the fact that people in that age group typically make more frequent use of health care services and medications.

While Swanson is realistic about higher costs for health plan coverage, he believes that it is important to remember the positive side. "We are living longer and better and have technology and equipment and drugs we never dreamed of," he says. "And we are making new improvements all the time. Yes, they *are* expensive. But look at the amazing advances we've made—experimental treatments that were deadly not very long ago now permit people to live long, full lives. That's enormously positive. We can't just look at the dollars without looking at the improvement in the quality of our lives." ■

□ THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By W. Phillips Shively
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Moving Ahead with Committee Streamlining

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) will have considered on May 5 a proposal to radically streamline the governance system. The proposal will reduce the current 51 senate and assembly committees to just 19, listed below.

*All-University Honors Committee
Animal Care Committee
Committee on Committees
Computing & Information Systems
Committee*

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 9
May 10, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Footnote Readership Survey

Please detach the completed form, fold it with the Footnote mailing address outward, and drop it in campus mail. On the Crookston and Morris campuses, fold, staple, and stamp the form and send it through the U.S. mail.

1. Have you been receiving biweekly copies of *Footnote* newsletter? yes _____ no _____
2. How often do you read *Footnote*? regularly _____ sometimes _____ never _____
3. How much interest do you have in each of the following parts of *Footnote*?

| | <u>High interest</u> | <u>Medium interest</u> | <u>Little interest</u> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Feature articles | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Letters | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| The FCC Chair's Report | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Q & A: Your Benefits | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Committee activity summaries | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. Please rate the past *Footnote* issues you have read in terms of each of the following.

| | <u>Poor</u> | <u>Good</u> | <u>Excellent</u> |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Format and layout | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Choice of topics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | 3 |

5. In general, how would you describe the way you deal with publications (e.g., newsletters) from the University?

- _____ I rarely read them regardless of content
 _____ I sometimes read them if the content interests me
 _____ I regularly read everything that interests me
 _____ I usually read most of what I receive

6. Please indicate topics that would be of particular interest to you in subsequent issues of *Footnote*.

7. Please indicate any questions about faculty benefits you would like to see answered in *Footnote*.

8. College/unit in which you hold an appointment _____

9. Faculty rank (if applicable)

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| _____ Instructor | _____ Professor |
| _____ Assistant professor | _____ Other _____ |
| _____ Associate professor | |

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Footnote

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Committees, from p. 2

*Educational Policy Committee
Equal Employment Opportunity for
Women Committee
Faculty Affairs Committee
Finance and Planning Committee
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
Judicial Committee
Library Committee
Research Committee
Senate Consultative Committee
Services for the Handicapped Committee
Social Concerns Committee
Student Affairs Committee
Student Behavior Committee
Support Services Committee
Use of Human Subjects in Research
Committee*

Several of these 19 are specialized

operational committees, such as the Human Subjects and Animal Care Committees, so there will be a total of only about a dozen broad policy committees left if the proposal passes to the senate and is approved there.

The proposal has already been approved by the Committee on Committees, and on the basis of earlier discussions, I think the outlook is good in SCC. Personally, I hope the streamlining will be supported in the senate and implemented. A number of reasonable objections have been raised. Some committees, such as the Honors Programs Committee, are concerned

their function may not be served if turned over to a larger committee (in this case, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy). Also, some have argued that committee service is innately a good thing, building acquaintances across departmental and collegiate boundaries. However, we now pay such costs in faculty time and in occasional collective incoherence that the reform seems well worth trying. ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Health Care Benefits
Committee Streamlining
Readership Survey

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELOPE S KROSCHE
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ May 24, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 10

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Getting It Right: University Public Relations

Over the years, the public relations profession has had some difficulty defining its broad mission and rescuing its reputation from the misdemeanors of amateurs. But establishing the legitimacy of the profession in higher education has been an uphill battle. While long accepted as an important part of commercial enterprise, public relations has traditionally been viewed by academics as little more than hucksterism or press agency. Colleges and universities have also tended to classify communications activity as an unnecessary luxury, thus a good target for retrenchment. But those attitudes may be changing.

"Right now," says Richard Heydinger, vice president for external relations, "higher education is in the throes of figuring out what kinds and levels of institutional public relations are appropriate, in the same way they figured out admissions marketing strategies ten years ago."

Motivated by recent events, Heydinger last month brought Sally Howard, director of Health Sciences Public Relations, to Morrill Hall to spearhead a three-month study of University communications. He gave Howard three objectives: 1) help manage individual issues as they come up day to day; 2) formulate a communications plan for the transition period until a new president is hired; and 3) make recommendations about how University public relations activity should be organized in the future.

What do Heydinger and Howard hope to achieve? "First, we need to have a better understanding of where we stand right now with all of our publics—what they really think about the University," says Howard. "And to do that we have to become more effective listeners, not only with

external groups, but with faculty, staff, and students as well."

The expectation is that once the University has a more accurate picture of itself, it will be able to communicate more effectively with its publics. "Right now I think our messages are a little muddled," says Heydinger, "and that makes it harder for people to understand what's going on here."

Need for Set Procedures

Another goal is to establish a set of University communications procedures. "I sense a general feeling on campus that there is too much ad hoc thinking about University communications strategies—that we ought to have a bigger picture of where we are headed," Heydinger says. "We need a well-defined process for getting news out, whether it's a physical plant audit or a medical research breakthrough. We have a set procedure for how to handle school closings because of snow, but we don't have anything like that for public relations."

Developing communications policy for a public university is different from developing communications policy for a private business. As Howard points out, "Most businesses offer a tangible product and convey only one message—buy it. But an institution as large and diverse as this one has to communicate dozens of complicated messages to very different groups." Heydinger adds that communications at any public institution is a two-way process. "The University is responsible not only for carrying messages to its publics," he says, "but also for receiving and interpreting messages from those same people. The challenge of improving our *internal* communication is at least as great as

improving it externally."

Howard believes that in a large organization like the University, it's tempting just to shrug and say that faculty, staff, and students will find things out anyway—someone else will tell them or they'll see it on the 10 o'clock news. "But people here want to know what's happening before they hear it on the news," she says, "so they can become message carriers rather than passive recipients. Part of people's frustration over the past two months is that they haven't been able to explain to others what was really happening here."

Plan Emerges

During the first few weeks of her new assignment, Howard spent most of her time listening. Interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, and students yielded a wealth of ideas for improving communications. "Absolutely everyone I talked with asked me what they could do to help," says Howard. "They were willing to do whatever it took—attend meetings, make speeches, travel around the state. It was very gratifying." Howard also contacted other large public universities to explore their communications policies.

Out of these discussions emerged a brief communications plan aimed at 1) restoring the credibility of the University, 2) regaining the momentum for change, and 3) building support for public and private funding.

"This plan isn't a new widget—something that is installed and everything is suddenly different," says Heydinger. "It's an analysis of how we communicate with our publics and how we can do it better." Howard believes that while a written plan is helpful, the main value in doing this sort of assessment is the exercise of

continued, p. 4

Some Cautionary Verses

By Shirley Clark

Chair, Senate Finance Committee

The Finance Committee's year began predictably enough. Fall quarter meetings were devoted largely to review and critique of the 1988 legislative request, to discussion of how well the fringe benefit budget decentralization was working during its first year of implementation, to deciding which committees would take responsibility for recommendations in the Faculty Development Committee's proposals, and to assessment of University losses in the October stock market crash.

Winter and spring quarter meetings were another matter entirely. Overtaken by disrupting events, unexpected financial disclosures, and an eternally driven agenda, the Finance Committee's business, from

February forward, took on special urgency. With colleagues on peer committees, particularly the Faculty Consultative Committee, we attended closely with central administrative officers to sorting out the reserves situation and advising how to make the best of a disaster that kept unfolding and revealing new problems. When the news broke about the University's reserves there were many misconceptions and much misinformation about what funds were defined as reserves, what portion of reserves were to be allocated, and what reserves level was appropriate for an institution of this kind and scope.

Among other major issues, we were concerned about the secrecy of the reserves. Shortly before the news about significant reserves surfaced, several faculty committee chairs were apprised of central administration's progress in putting together the whole picture of reserves from all of the vice presidential domains. New reporting procedures and an insistence on compiling this information revealed a picture of which even key administrators seemed unaware in earlier times. As far as we could determine, Vice President Lilly was moving against the practice of secrecy and the process was well along when the situation blew up in February. As the University learned first-hand and as committee member Tom Scott observed, the issue of reserves in public institutions has always been a politically difficult matter.

If the extent of reserves seemed murky, so too did the policies for managing and making allocations from them. The Management Committee (president, vice president for finance, and academic vice president/provost) responded to requests coming in. However, guidelines and principles for consulting about, making, coordinating, recording, and communicating allocations seemed neither to be clear nor to be working well. In the past, the Finance Committee has had little role in a consulting process on spending from the reserves. We should press for a larger, policy-oriented, criteria setting

role in the future as the management process is reestablished. While it is the case that, during our April 15 and 21 meetings, we consulted with the provost about proposed allocations from the reserves for the next fiscal year, many of the commitments seemed far down the stream by the time they were brought to our attention.

As spring quarter moves rapidly to a close, the committee is consulting with the administration on the legislative session outcomes (few of which seem to be cause for celebration), on the constrained 1988-89 budget plan, and on various individual items such as the funding recommendations proposed by the AIDS task force.

Looking over the past academic year from the perspective of this senate committee, one might conclude that the consultative process works fairly well. We and the administration spent considerable time together concentrating on issues of mutual concern. However, the Finance Committee would be greatly aided in its work and the quality of its advice would be enhanced by receiving full information in a timely way, well ahead of the meeting hour. Reciprocally, committee members might benefit from an annual fall seminar on University finances, in which our administrative colleagues take over the teaching role and explain or interpret budgetary mysteries to us. We also need to improve the institutional memory of the administration (and this committee) so that promises and actions of previous years are not set aside in the present. Here I have in mind examples such as understandings about faculty salary increases and restoration of monies retrenched from units and not returned to those units when monies were restored.

The consultative process at Minnesota probably works as well as or better than it works anywhere else in the country. However, it could work better consistently if we paid more deliberate attention to making it efficient and effective. ■

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 10
May 24, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to Footnote, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in Footnote, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

□ LETTERS

A Great University

By Dwight H. Purdy

Associate Professor of English
Morris

Money alone does not bring happiness, but it helps. I am not an idealist. Nonetheless, I know money killed Kenneth Keller and blurred Commitment to Focus, and devotion to money prevents any university from achieving greatness.

What is a "great" university? One where learning of many types is valued as an end in itself. That condition has not obtained at the University of Minnesota in my 16 years as a professor. It did not inform Commitment to Focus. Money informed it.

According to one newspaper report of the desk and credenza episode, Keller had decided what presidential furniture should be by looking at presidents' suites in businesses and corporations. He was the CEO of The University of Minnesota, Incorporated. Another report in the *Star-Tribune* reviewing Keller's fall (March 20) referred again and again to his "insiders," some of them professors, but most apparently businessmen. The University Fund Keller created is led by corporate figures. The former president was committed to business. Business does not believe in learning of many types as an end in itself. Business inclines to see learning (and of a few types only) as a means to end, to production and profit. No great university can come of that.

Obviously, Keller is not alone in his businesslike image of the University. The legislature and governor share it, too. What's good for agri-business, what's good for computer technology, what's good for 3M is good for the University of Minnesota. This attitude prevails all over the country. I have seen it in Texas and Maryland. Two forces today shape universities—money from business and money from government. Once upon a time, before World War II, scientists rejected federal money because that tie binds, corrupting research. Today, most medical and scientific research is funded by federal grants. Today, professors in the sciences and applied sciences can double their incomes through consulting for businesses.

When, in the wake of the Endotronics scandal last spring, the University had to establish guidelines for reporting income obtained through consultation, some objections were raised to the \$25,000 figure established for mandatory reporting of such money to the academic vice president. It was thought too low. Professors in some fields routinely use their positions at the University to increase their wealth. Professors in some fields routinely shape their research to fit what the government will fund. This is not learning as an end in itself.

I repeat, I like money. I live in a glass house. Last year I received \$935 from a publisher of textbooks for my opinion of one. Not \$25,000, but good for a professor of English. My branch of the University has profited greatly from a federal Title III grant, and I have profited with it. But neither connection has advanced learning. To tell the truth, both connections inhibited it.

What are the signs of a great university? The first is a major library. Everyone acknowledges the decay of Wilson Library. It is embarrassingly inadequate. Why did this happen? A great library is the essence of learning as an end in itself. Complete the syllogism. Another sign (and here my bias shows) is strong faculty in fields not beholden to immediate pressures. Those fields include languages and literatures, history, and philosophy. Our university is scandalously weak in many departments of language and literature, and none is first-rate. Neither history nor philosophy ranks at the top of the Big Ten, let alone nationally. Why? A third sign is a university directed by people committed to learning as an end in itself. Our regents love the University sincerely, but they are not scholars. They are political appointees given to the short view. No wonder the library totters. No wonder the University neglects the liberal arts.

These are the three signs of a great university. Ours has none of them, nor seems likely to have them. They could be had, though. When I first came to Minnesota, I was impressed by the respect and affection ordinary folk had for the University. Some of that can be chalked up to no competition. Imagine the fight if St. Cloud bid to change its name to Minnesota State. Even so, there were

and are still, despite the recent sorrows, strong loyalties for "the U." I found nothing like this in Texas or Maryland, and I can't recall similar feelings in Wisconsin when I went to college there. Given the support of the people, their yen to feel that Minnesota is as good as universities get, we could be. But not until we are willing to think farther than the next five-year plan, not until we stop acting as if learning were a kind of cash. ■

Footnote is intended as a communication forum for its entire readership, not as an official document of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Letters on University issues are invited from faculty and administrators. Letters selected for publication, which may be edited for length, in no way reflect the opinions of Footnote's publishers. It is suggested that letter writers limit themselves to one double-spaced page.

□ YOUR BENEFITS: Q & A

Q. Choices for optional tax-deferred annuities are much more numerous than for the basic faculty retirement plan. Will the University increase choices for the basic plan, and, if not, why not?

A. Historically, basic retirement plans have been conservative in the number of investment choices offered. Plan administrators have always felt their primary responsibility is to make sure that retirement funds would be available when they are needed.

This is still true today, but because of changes in federal law and the sophistication of plan participants, plan administrators have started to be more open in offering different types of investment options. The University has followed this trend. Over the past few years new investment options (money market, index, and bond funds) and a new investment carrier—Vanguard—have been added.

The Employee Benefits Department, together with faculty committees and administration, will continue to study this issue to make sure the options available under the faculty retirement plan meet the needs of the faculty.

Public Relations, from p. 1

imagining what ideal public relations would be like.

Specific actions proposed in the plan include:

- Periodic opinion polling to assess where the University stands with its constituencies
- A telephone hotline to help people determine the validity of rumors they have heard about things happening at the University
- Regular letters from the president to faculty and staff about current issues at the University
- Development of a communications manual to help administrators and faculty deal more effectively with the media
- Creation of a communications team consisting of administrators from the offices of External Relations and University Relations
- Investigation of new technologies for more timely internal communication
- Town meetings around the state, in which Sauer, the vice presidents, and deans talk with opinion leaders, legislators, and the public
- Campus convocations led by Sauer in Crookston, Duluth, and Waseca, similar to those held in the Twin Cities and Morris
- Joint public appearances by Sauer and the heads of Minnesota's other higher education institutions to explain and seek support for Commitment to Focus

- Reexamination of communications with the regents

Communications Team Could Help

The proposed communications team, according to Howard, would work something like a hospital blue team—when a code blue is called, team members drop everything and run to the patient's room. "We envision this team as four communications specialists who are available for consultation," she says. "For example, if something newsworthy happens at the Law School, the designated communications representative from that unit quickly meets with the team to strategize and make decisions. Then that representative goes back to his or her boss ready for action. This system not only would function well in a crisis situation, but also would give good news the chance for maximum media exposure."

Howard learned that many public universities have a communications manual that addresses both emerging or crisis situations and more routine activities. "We should be able to give administrators a three-ring binder resource book that answers their questions about communications or working with the media," says Howard. "The intention is not to control who speaks with the media or what they say, but to help people better prepare." Howard believes that a manual explaining how the media work and what kinds of information they might be interested in would

help organize administrators and anyone else at the University who deal with them. "It could also help reporters," Howard says. "When the people being interviewed have all the necessary facts at their fingertips right from the beginning, reporters don't have to call back five times for more information."

Faculty, too, should benefit from the communications plan. "If we do our job right," says Howard, "faculty should be receiving answers to their questions almost before they realize they have questions." Heydinger adds that Sauer intends to meet frequently with small groups of faculty members—those who are not involved in the governance system as well as those who are—both to share information with them and to listen to their views.

"The faculty is one of the most important publics the University has, and we have to let faculty members know that the need for their loyalty right now is very real," Howard says. "We are going to try to help them become better informed and knowledgeable enough about what's happening at this institution to disagree with the nay-sayers."

Howard and Heydinger are positive about the University's public relations initiative. "In the stock market they talk about a window of opportunity," says Howard. "Well, I see us as having a window of opportunity right now—to do all the things we've always wanted to do in communicating with each other, with the legislature, with alumni, with everyone in Minnesota." ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

University Public Relations
Report from the Finance
Committee Chair

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELCPE S KROSCHE
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U CF M
MPLS, MN 55455

FOOTNOTE

☐ June 7, 1988

☐ Volume 1, Number 11

☐ Published by the Faculty Consultative Committee

Merit System Study Begins

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) has begun a study of the University's merit system that may answer some questions about how faculty salary increases are awarded. The study, approved by Interim President Richard Sauer, is being conducted by a SCFA subcommittee chaired by Professor Robert Kudrle, with assistance from members of the University's Management Planning and Information Services (MPIS).

"We've had a mandatory merit raise policy of one kind or another for a number of years now," says Kudrle, "and sympathy among committee members is high for going in that direction. But we really don't know what we've bought—we have never really looked at the results of the merit policy in any systematic way."

One thing Kudrle's group will be examining is the extent to which meritorious faculty remain meritorious in terms of their percentage increase over time. "One would assume that those who are extraordinarily meritorious one year would continue to be at least fairly meritorious in future years," Kudrle says. "But we've heard stories about departments that play games. For example, a department might give a large merit raise to one faculty member one year and a large merit raise to another faculty member the next year, etc. But in subsequent years, those same faculty members receive minimal raises."

The study will also compare the way salary monies have been distributed across departments and across colleges, although Kudrle cautions that drawing inferences from such statistics will be difficult. "We'll have to be very careful in our comparisons," he says. "For instance, take the hypothetical case of two departments—one with some strong faculty and some faculty who are not performing up to departmental

standards and another department with all really high-performance faculty. In the first department, you would expect to find considerable disparity in salary increases, while in the second department you might expect to find little variation in raises over the years. Of course, you would get retention cases and things like that. But if you ignore those, you might mistakenly think that the second department was awarding salaries without regard to merit, when in fact everyone in the department is very meritorious."

Data for the study, which is being

provided by MPIS, covers the past five years and includes: 1) a cross-year correlation of dollar and percentage increases (to discover any subtype of high- and low-trajectory faculty); 2) contrasts between departments with stronger national reputations and those with weaker reputations; and 3) data on variables such as years of service, years at the University, sex, age, etc.

This focused study will not be able to explore every salary issue of concern to SCFA. "We are also curious about the possibility that superstar faculty are paid really high salaries

continued, p. 2

Message from the Interim President

Clarifying Physical Plant Policy

Improving communications—within as well as outside the University—has been a fundamental priority of mine since I was named Interim President in March. At the same time that we work together to restore our credibility and understanding with Minnesota citizens, we must work to better understand and appreciate one another as a University community of administrators, faculty, and staff.

In an organization as large and complex as this one, clear, consistent understanding of procedures and policies is a challenge. One such example is important enough to mention in this column.

During the past few months there have been a number of letters to the *Daily, Brief*, and the Board of Regents on policy related to the Physical Plant. These concerned, well-intentioned faculty expressed the opinion that University projects might be improved if departments were allowed to obtain bids from the outside rather than from the Physical Plant.

In fact, for the past five years, that option has existed. Departments have the right to bid projects designed by the Engineering and Architecture Division of Physical Planning to outside contractors if the departments don't wish to receive a bid from Physical Plant. This policy has been communicated on a number of occasions. Most recently it was explained in the February 1988 brochure entitled "The Mission of Engineering and Architecture," which was sent to deans, directors, and department heads.

The confusion about this procedure, which associate vice president Clint Hewitt assumed was clearly communicated, surfaced in the midst of current controversy about the Physical Plant audit.

Unfortunately, many other miscommunicated issues never surface to be clarified publicly. As we move forward with more careful *external* communications, I hope you will join me in working toward the goal of creative ways to improve *internal* communications.

Richard Sauer
Interim President

Merit, from p. 1

and faculty who perform poorly are starved," Kudrle says, "yet faculty who perform at a very high level are closer in salary to those who are not performing than to the superstars. That's one hypothesis we would like to investigate in the future."

Kudrle sees the current study as part of an attempt by the faculty, and the University as a whole, to understand themselves as well as possible. "SCFA believes strongly that the University has to make a much, much more powerful case to the legislature, if not to the administration, about the necessity of substantially raising the institution's entire salary base. I think there is general agreement on this committee that whatever merit formula we use, we are really distributing such a small amount of money that it is inadequate for the job. Until we get a large amount of money for salaries, the University will continue to suffer competitively. SCFA is dealing with the merit salary issue now because it is the only one we can deal with, not

because we think it's the most important."

Other Salary Studies Planned

The committee hopes to undertake two other salary-related studies: a survey comparing departmental salary-setting philosophies and an independent analysis of the University's faculty salary level as compared with those of other institutions.

"A survey of departmental salary-setting philosophies would be complementary to the merit study," Kudrle says. "It would take a completely different, interview-based approach. We would talk to departments in the hope of determining if there is any significant difference in the way departments with excellent performance records award salaries and the way other departments award salaries. That is a tricky thing to do."

The idea for an independent study comparing the University's faculty salary levels with those of its competitors grew out of SCFA's search for more effective ways to communicate with the legislature, but similar ideas have emerged in the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

"It really shouldn't be up to the faculty to go to battle for their own salaries—that is too self-serving," says Professor Richard Goldstein, FCC member. "Lobbying for a faculty salary increase should be a sincere effort on the part of central administration. They should take the lead, not the faculty."

Both SCFA and FCC agree that looking outside the University community for help might be useful. "We decided the best way to create a strong case for our salaries being noncompetitive," says Professor Geoffrey Maruyama, SCFA chair and lobbyist for the University of Minnesota Faculty Association, "would be to have an outside firm look at the market and tell us what they think we need. We all realize we are hardly uninvolved parties in making an argument for salary increases, so it would probably be beneficial to get an objective party to assess our situation in regard to other institutions."

Professor Neil Gault will chair a SCFA subcommittee to investigate ways of carrying out an independent

study. "This University, chiefly though the competence of its faculty, attracts students and produces graduates who will shape in large part the future of the state," says Gault. "Faculty salaries and incentives are crucial to maintaining excellence in academic leadership. This study will determine what changes need to be made in these rewards and incentives in the future to achieve Minnesota's objectives for this University."

Kudrle believes that, although the Faculty Development Committee report did an excellent job of documenting the University's salary position relative to other institutions, the report had little overall impact. He, too, thinks the findings of independent consultants might make a more convincing argument. "Everyone in this country claims underpayment for everything these days," he says. "And the University has talked about this issue for so long that some of the legislators no longer take it as seriously as they should. This business about restoring faculty purchasing power is really quite irrelevant. What matters is how the University is doing relative to the institutions with which it aspires to compete. By that standard we are doing very poorly. We need to document that better—the facts speak for themselves." ■

THE CHAIR'S REPORT

By **W. Phillips Shively**
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

Next Year's FCC Business

In this, the final issue of *Footnote* for 1987-1988, it might seem natural for me to review FCC activity over the past year. Since I will do that in our annual report to the senate, however, I would rather lay out here what we did not complete work on—issues that will continue into next year.

The semester system: At our request, the administration has developed a more detailed proposal than the one in *Academic Priorities* (the Commitment to Focus planning document issued last February) and we have asked the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to examine the proposal and make recommendations

continued, p. 3

FOOTNOTE

Volume 1 Number 11
June 7, 1988

Managing Editor: Gayle Grika
Design Consultant: Dawn Mathers

Footnote is a biweekly publication of the Faculty Consultative Committee produced by University Relations. Its purpose is to inform faculty and administrators about governance issues and activities and other news of interest to those groups. It is mailed to faculty and administrators on campuses represented in the University governance system and is available to other interested readers through the Institutional Advancement office in Waseca and the University Relations office in Duluth.

Footnote welcomes ideas and comments from all readers. We specifically invite, for possible publication, brief letters by faculty or administrators on topics of current interest. Write to *Footnote*, 6 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Faculty members or administrators interested in writing an opinion piece for inclusion in *Footnote*, please contact the managing editor at the above address or call (612) 624-2020.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Chair, from p. 2

to the senate for action in the fall. No action will be taken until the senate or its committees have been able to take a position on the proposal.

Proposals regarding tenure:

Academic Priorities contained several proposals regarding tenure—a University-level promotion and tenure committee, lengthening of the probationary period, and redefinition of clinical professorships. FCC referred these proposals to the Tenure Committee for comment and recently received their report. In one form or another, some of the proposals will come before the senate for discussion in the fall.

Study of salary

discrimination by gender: In response to legal action, the University is undertaking an ambitious study to assess the magnitude of salary differentials for female faculty. FCC and the Finance Committee have recently become involved in planning for the study. Major issues include: the model by which one assesses the difference between what faculty members are paid and what they should be paid, and the method by which compensation is distributed among female faculty. FCC will try to ensure that female faculty are treated fairly, and that the process is one that—as much as possible—can be seen by the University community to be just.

The prospect of eliminating mandatory retirement:

We are establishing a task force to review various issues involved in this question. We have gathered suggestions from other committees and hope to name task force members before the end of the year. A major issue here, which is not immediately obvious, was pointed out by Professor Leo Hurwicz at a recent senate meeting—the danger to the tenure system implicit in ending the practice of automatic termination at a set time.

Consolidating the committee system:

The proposal of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), the Committee on Committees, and the Business and Rules Committee to reduce the number of governance committees by about half was approved by the senate this spring. A committee will draw up a detailed

continued, p. 4

The Presidential Search

Progress and Problems

At its May meeting, the Board of Regents approved presidential search criteria and set a September 1 deadline for applications. The criteria, which cover a broad range of skills and credentials, stress two qualifications: leadership to move the University toward its goal of nationally recognized excellence, and ability to articulate institutional missions and goals and represent them convincingly within the University and to the people of the state.

Professor John Howe, chair of the faculty-student-staff advisory committee in the University's last presidential search, feels that criteria for selecting any university president usually ask the impossible. "What you are saying is that one person must be able to work effectively with regents, faculty, press, the legislature, and the public *and* be a scholar. Such people don't really exist out there; everyone has limits and foibles. What one must ask is what kind of leadership is most needed at this particular institution at this particular time. The kind of candidate who might have at one point in our history seemed ideal may look much less compelling right now."

With the timetable and criteria established, the challenge is to design a workable process for what promises to be one of the most difficult and important searches in University history. One potential problem involves the Minnesota Open Meeting Law, which requires all official meetings for the regential search committee to be public. Some regents fear that guaranteed exposure will inhibit the application of many qualified candidates.

University Attorney Stephen Dunham's presidential search plan, which was also approved at the May meeting, would keep official search meetings open but have the regents develop a list of final candidates through private, informal discussions between the chair and vice chair and individual members.

Selected candidates would then be asked if they would be willing to participate in public interviews. The names of those applicants who agreed would be published, and open search meetings scheduled.

Throughout the entire search process, the regents will be working closely with an independent search firm and with an advisory committee of faculty, student, civil service, and professional-administrative representatives.

"The selection of a president is obviously done by the Board of Regents, but in the past they have benefited from active faculty advice in the process," says Professor Phil Shively, FCC chair. "In the last search, the advisory committee helped the regents with initial screening of files, then helped narrow that field down and assisted in further investigation of candidates by accompanying regents on campus interview visits. We haven't laid out precisely what the role of the advisory committee will be in this search process, but most people seem to agree it should operate the way it did last time. It's very important that faculty be closely involved at many stages of the search."

The search firm hired by the regents, Heidrick and Struggles, is expected to expand the list of candidates and speed up the selection process. Richard Thompson, a consultant with the firm, emphasizes that each search is handled differently. "We don't just go to a file cabinet, pick out names, and start from there. We work closely with our clients on every aspect of the search process until an offer has been extended and accepted."

The practice of academic institutions working through outside search firms goes back many years, according to Thompson. "This firm's first non-profit search," he says, "which took place 12 years ago, occurred because a board of directors felt services offered by executive recruiting firms were highly applicable to certain college and university situations. More and more boards have found over the years that using an outside firm enables the institution to have a broader reach."

Howe is ambivalent about bringing in an outside search firm. "I have some difficulty with the possibility of the University substantially turning over its search to an outside firm," he

continued, p. 4

Search, from p. 3

says. "One powerful impression I got last time is that there is a set of names that turn up in every presidential search, a kind of closed world of perennial candidates, and there is a higher education establishment that facilitates the revolving motion of those perpetual candidates. Try as they might to grasp the particular needs of particular institutions, search firms are not likely to adequately understand the unique character of an institution or to serve exclusively enough that institution's agenda."

Concerns about open meetings and outside firms aren't the only difficulties in the search process. "Searches at this level are never easy or smooth," says Howe. "But I think it's going to be worse this time. The conditions under which Ken Keller resigned, the public controversy about financial issues that still seem to be unresolved, what the regents' idea will be about their proper relationship with the incoming president—all these uncertainties will have to be weighed by candidates. They will also have to consider the University's heavy investment of time and thought in Commitment to Focus planning. Under the best of circumstances, inheriting someone else's agenda can be a constraint. But the problem here is more complicated—the future of that plan appears far from certain and there are many pieces to be picked up and put back together."

Howe also points to the relationship between the legislature

and the University as a possible deterrent to candidates. "This state has a very possessive attitude toward the University. In many ways that is wonderful and commendable, but there can be a dark side to it as well. I should think any serious candidate would ask herself or himself, "Who would I really be working for?" The openness of this institution and of Minnesota's political culture make consistent, purposeful leadership very difficult. There is so much pulling and tugging, and so many conflicting agendas." ■

Chair, from p. 3

proposal, with new language for the bylaws, for senate action in the fall. The proposal will take effect in fall 1989.

Recommendations of the AIDS task force:

SCC has asked several committees to review the numerous proposals from this year's University task force on AIDS. Most, but not all, have now reported back and we anticipate that a set of recommendations for action will go to the senate in the fall. Many of the committees have asked that we try to accomplish the goals of the task force by adapting existing structures and services as much as possible rather than setting up new ones.

A Personal Note

I have generally avoided using this column to air my own thoughts, since

it seemed arrogant to take up scarce space for my own use. In this last issue, however, I wish to make an exception.

This has been a terrible year for the University, and morale is drooping. Certainly there is plenty of reason for us to drag our tails, but we must not overdo it. We should remember that it is very difficult to change a major university, for better or worse. Last fall, when many hopes were riding high, we frequently heard the metaphor of the University as a river barge used by those who bemoaned the fact that it took great effort to shift our course even slightly. Well, if that metaphor held last fall, it holds this spring as well. The trials the University has been through this year have not really changed things much in the classroom or laboratory. Faculty are still doing the same good things we had been doing, although we certainly feel more uneasy about our situation.

It's possible that the University could go into a serious reversal as a result of this year, but it is more likely that it will not. Those who are concerned about their future would do well to give it a year or two. A new president, the legislature's response to our next biennial request, and some time to let the dust settle will allow us to see more clearly how things stand. My personal hope—and I think this is the most probable outcome, although by no means certain—is that we will see a University that is clearly improved over the University of a few years ago, and one that is set on the path to further improvement. ■

FOOTNOTE

6 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

IN THIS ISSUE

Merit System Study Begins

Presidential Search Progress

Message from the Interim President

DGF466223 65
MRS PENELCPE S KRCSCH
U ARCHIVES
IC WA LIB U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455