

Minutes\*

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

**Thursday, May 12, 1994**

**3:15 - 5:00 p.m.**

**Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

**Present:** Carl Adams (chair), Carole Bland, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Robert Fahnhorst (for Dianne Mulvihill), Daniel Fenney, Judith Gaston, Audrey Grosch, Richard McGehee, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring

**Regrets:** Rose Brewer, Daniel Canafax, Roger Feldman

**Absent:** Carol Carrier, Morris Kleiner, Roger Paschke, Phuong Phan, George Seltzer, James Stone, Yang Wang

**Guests:** David Berg, Darwin Hendel, Jane Whiteside

**1. Minutes**

A motion was approved to accept the April 21 minutes.

**2. Chair's Report**

Professor Adams said that a faculty member had been added to the staff within the President's Office which is hoped to facilitate communicating faculty opinions to the President.

The chair also said that he had met with the senior vice presidents of the University to speak about the document produced by SCFA: "Facilitating Transitions of Maturing Faculty." The vice presidents responded positively and will be sending a memo to the committee stating their agreement with the content.

The Faculty Retirement Program Subcommittee, chaired by Daniel Feeney, sent material to the President about compensation difficulties associated with those retired faculty who served the University, in part or completely, before 1963. Professor Adams said that there are some deficiencies with respect to reimbursement to this group of faculty emeritus. Senior Vice President Bob Erickson had said that the administration would like to move to a "floor concept" possibly higher than the \$20,000 minimum, added Professor Adams. The issue appears to be exclusively faculty related, although the committee could examine if P&A employees also have experienced similar challenges. One committee member said that some of the retired faculty have a total annual income of only \$17,000.

Professor Feeney reviewed with SCFA that the retirees came before the committee in early January. He also said that supporting data were available based on information collected by the retirees and the Employee Benefits Office. The subcommittee passed two resolutions related to this issue stating

---

\*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

that there should be a "floor" guaranteeing that all retirees are reasonably compensated, and that a policy should be established so that this matter is reassessed on a regular basis. The chair added that retirees who serviced to the University before and after 1963 were disadvantaged to a lesser degree compared to those whose entire service was before 1963. The administration is receptive to dealing with these problem. SCFA determined that the retired faculty appreciated the support, and that the administration responded quickly possibly because of the committee's involvement.

Professor Adams said that he was aware that he needed to compose several letters based on compensation policies associated with the upcoming salary increases. He expressed to the committee that he would complete these in the very near future.

The committee discussed issues associated with Ron Ostrow's presentation requesting the creation of the title "research professor" (a non-tenure track position) in place of research associate. Professor Adams said that the committee will contact Dr. Ostrow stating that it plans to present the matter before the Faculty Senate in the Fall 1994 to ascertain the faculty perception of this issue. After this occurs, SCFA will decide whether to motion to accept the proposal or not.

### **3. Health Care Subcommittee Report - Richard McGehee**

Professor McGehee said that on April 22 the subcommittee met with Associate Vice President Carol Carrier, Ms. Dianne Mulvihill, and others to discuss whether the University should seek to provide an alternative health care plan for the faculty as opposed to the current state plan. The administration expressed an interest in pursuing the question, Dr. McGehee reported. The subcommittee has been approved to conduct a survey of the faculty for the purpose of determining the extent of related problems, and options to alleviate the difficulties. Professor McGehee explained that a budget for this project has been discussed among several senior administrators. Four new members of the subcommittee have been added: W. Donald Spring, Anne Sales (representing graduate assistants), Catherine Sedo (representing P&A), and Jean Goldsberry (representing civil service personnel). Although the full subcommittee has not met to date, the original group recently did to discussed some more of the associated issues, and the type of survey to conduct. Phone surveying was recommended by one of the subcommittee members. The entire project would need to be completed by January 1996 if the use of an alternative plan was decided to be the preferred option.

Ms. Mulvihill recently told Professor McGehee that Bob Cooley is no longer with the state. He had been a key person regulating the University's lack of access to negotiating within the state health care plan. The state has also indicated that it may prefer to drop the entire University from its health care plan if the faculty sought a separate one. Professor Adams said that the state has indicated that it may now allow the University faculty to construct their own policy within the overall state plan.

### **4. Discussion of U2000 Critical Measures and Benchmarks - Darwin Hendel, Jane Whiteside**

Dr. Hendel said that Dr. Whiteside, Associate Acting Vice President George Copa, and he are in the process of developing institutional critical measures as they relate to the implementation of U2000. This project directly relates to the Board of Regents' resolution in January 1994 calling for a set of institutional critical measures developed by central administration through consultation with groups within and outside the University. The expectation is that a set of institutional critical measures used in conjunction with U2000 will be presented to the Regents in June, and then again in July for action.

The following presentation was given to the Board of Regents explaining principles generated by the Strategic Planning Working Group. The measurement process is being conducted for the following reasons:

- Publicly confirm success in reaching stated goals and objectives
- Guide and facilitate self improvement
- Serve as link between planning, performance, evaluation, and resource allocation
- Provide means for comparison with similar institutions

The principles have been used to determine the critical measures not only for the entire system, but also at the collegiate and department level. Two discussion questions that Dr. Hendel wished to address with the committee were:

1. Have we identified an appropriate set of critical measures in view of the U2000 mission, vision, and strategic directions?
2. How should we define the critical measures?

Dr. Hendel then directed the committee to examine the handout he had distributed listing the 21 critical measures. These measures were condensed from the strategic plans submitted by collegiate units. This list also indicated which of U2000's five strategic directions related to each measure. Dr. Whiteside added that the this project was focusing on developing measures that apply at the system level. Benchmarks and goals related to each measure would vary per campus. She also said that the measures vary a great deal in scope.

One committee member pointed out that the measures will be reviewing the increase in faculty performance in the following areas:

- contact with students (effective teaching)
- faculty research
- the amount of external funds they can generate in the form of grants

This appears to be an unreasonable demand on faculty according to the committee member. Dr. Hendel agreed and said that the measures are not necessarily compatible. Another added that this instrument will demonstrate that the University may have conflicting goals. This member added that processes as well as products need to be measured. Dr. Hendel mentioned that measures 1-12 are output oriented while 13-21 are focused on process. The group continued discussing issues comparing the measures to their effects on individual faculty members.

Each SCFA member was asked to complete the hand out marking the level of importance of each measure. Dr. Hendel also asked each member to select seven of the measures that they thought were most meaningful.

## **5. Faculty Salaries - David Berg**

Professor Adams said that there were data circulating that indicate state university faculty may be better paid than those of the University, and therefore requested Dr. Berg to explain this information to

SCFA. Dr. Berg presented comparative faculty cash salary mean figures which demonstrated that the University pays more to faculty than the state universities do for full professors on nine month appointments:

|                      |          |
|----------------------|----------|
| University -         | \$66,481 |
| State Universities - | \$52,136 |

The group speculated that faculty at state universities were younger and had less experience at the professor level which could effect the salary comparisons. One committee member noted that the several faculty at the University have six figure salaries which may skew these figures as well. Dr. Berg said that the University mean figure did include salaries from the Law and Medical Schools. The chair said that he would be interested to see what the figures of comparable departments would be, or institutional comparisons without the Law and Medical Schools figures. The group began to discuss the type of information they would be interested in acquiring. Professor Adams said that this issue is on the agenda of the newly formed Compensation Working Group which will present its final report at the end of Summer 1994.

Comparative salary data for P&A positions exists for librarians, lawyers, some student affairs positions, and very little on anything else, said Dr. Berg. A committee member said that there are faculty in Library Sciences with 30 years experience with \$30,000 salaries. The chair added that this would be an issue that SCFA could be addressed.

Dr. Berg also handed out some material based on a presentation made to the Board of Regents titled, "Salary and Compensation Issues: Historic Trends and Market Conditions." This presentation included:

- That faculty salaries have not kept up with inflation,
- A University comparison to other Big Ten schools
- A contrast between the University and nationally ranked public and private universities (AAUDE Study)

One graph that was included in the presentation showed how private doctoral universities began to pay more to faculty in the early 1980's than the University or other public doctoral institutions. This has occurred because of decreasing state support. Dr. Berg said that if this trend continues, the country is headed toward a two tiered system: one with high quality, high paid faculty, and high tuition for private institutions; the other with lower quality, faculty salaries, and tuition rates for public universities. Another illustration compared University faculty salaries per disciple to other Big Ten universities, and also to salary summaries from the AAUDE Study.

The chair and Dr. Berg said that some public universities have chosen to apply high tuition rates in place of state funding: University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Penn. State University, etc. This type of funding policy can only be approved if the state legislature and the institution's Board of Regents agree that this is a constructive option for maintaining quality, said Dr. Berg. The University is not in such a position at this time, added a group member. Dr. Berg said that he had conducted a study recently which showed University tuition increases have corresponded exactly with decreases in state support. State auditors have produced reports that came to the same conclusions.

The chair summarized the discussion expressing that specific data related to this matter will be produced for the Compensation Working Group. This same information will consequently be distributed to SCFA.

-- Kevin Gormley

University of Minnesota