

## **Review and Planning Committee Minutes September 19, 2001**

Meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

Present: Carlsen, Geffert, Hamlin, Kahn, Larson, Marotz, Morrison, Norton, Odell, Pence, Solid, Steen, Sonnega, Thomforde, Postlethwaite (chair), Van Wylen.

Minutes for September 12, 2001 approved as amended.

### **OPENING BUSINESS**

The chair distributed the following documents: "RPC Minutes Concerning Equity & Merit," RPC 00/01-09, "Memo of Understanding [GRECO]," notes from Tony Becker on RPC 00/01-07. The chair suggested that we post GRECO's "Memo of Understanding," along with RPC's charge to GRECO, on the RPC web site.

### **RPC RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FACULTY SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

President Thomforde distributed a memorandum revising his original charge (see minutes for 9/12/01), which now asks RPC to clarify section 4-13 of the Faculty Manual. Question: What does it mean to take into account questions of equity, merit, and market? Answer: RPC should consider whether these factors should have a bearing on discussions, and, if so, how much. We need to have clearer principles and explicit philosophical bases for future discussions of faculty salaries.

### **DISCUSSION OF RPC 00/01-09**

RPC 00/01-09 reached the floor of the last faculty meeting of 2000-2001, but it was sent back to RPC without much discussion. Dean Pence and the College attorney used this document as the basis for their summer project of dividing the faculty manual into contractual and descriptive documents.

### **DISCUSSION OF RPC 00/01-07**

General discussion: How should we handle joint appointments, or appointments in which faculty do a significant portion of teaching outside the home department? What happens if a tenured member of the department refuses to write a letter regarding an individual's candidacy? Should those who refuse be required to write a formal explanation for the refusal? Should all tenured members of large departments be required to write letters?

Discussion on Section 4: We want to be clear that individuals can initiate their own candidacy for tenure and promotion, but in striving to make this clear we have raised the question of whether a candidate can press forward in the face of opposition from the department chair or the department as a whole. Questions: Could an individual go directly to a dean without the department's support? How much authority should departments exercise in the tenure and

promotion process? Are we concerned that different departments take different approaches to tenure and promotion? How or should the college protect candidates from being blackballed by department chairs?

On the question of disgruntled candidates pushing forward in hopeless cases, the committee seemed to agree that it is better to err on the side of generosity towards the candidate, even if such generosity opens up the possibility of abuse.

The discussion concluded with agreement that we will try to clarify issues in 00/01-07 for the time being, and reconsider the larger issues in the spring. The chair urged committee members to send her recommendations for wording on Article 4 this week.

## **HERI SURVEY**

The HERI Survey is administered by the Higher Education Research Institute of UCLA on a three-year cycle. St. Olaf will administer the survey to its faculty in October of this year. Lynn Steen attended our meeting, and asked us to consider issues that should be raised in the portion of the survey that allows each school to append supplemental questions.

Discussion: What utility does such a survey possess? What use should the administration and the Regents make of this survey? Given the recommendation that the ad hoc survey administered by Jim Tallon not be repeated, which issues from that survey should be worked into the HERI survey, and how? Which questions should become permanent and common to all future surveys? There was a general sense that there is utility in such surveys if they measure satisfaction on specific issues; questions and data they yield should be as discreet as possible. Question: How can we best measure specifics when we are limited to twenty supplemental questions?

Former members of RFCC described how data from earlier surveys was presented to and received by the Regents.

President Thomforde asked for advice on how he should interpret and make use of the data. How much weight does this survey carry?

## **COLLEGE COUNCIL**

President Thomforde reported on the final form of the College Council. The Provost will chair meetings of the Council. The Council will consist of:

- three students:
  - the President of the Student Body (ex officio)
  - one junior senator elected by SGA
  - one sophomore senator elected by SGA
  -

- eight staff members, all having served the college for at least 5 years
  - four elected from non-exempt staff
  - four elected from exempt staff
- eight faculty members, all tenured and all elected at large
- six members of the President's Cabinet (ex officio)
- up to three additional members of the college community if the President deems them necessary to improve the expertise and/or diversity of the council

Faculty and Staff members will serve 3-year terms, and may be reelected for an additional 3-year term. The President's Cabinet will prepare the ballot for the election of staff members. The Nominating Committee will prepare the ballot for the election of faculty members. The Cabinet and Nominating Committee will set terms on a staggered basis.

Faculty already serving on a major college committee may-but need not-resign from that committee if elected to the Council.

The election of faculty will occur at the October faculty meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bryn Geffert, Secretary