



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 1/17/85

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING WITH PRESIDENT KELLER AND PROFESSOR MORRISON

December 18, 1984  
300 Morrill Hall  
11:30 - 1:30

FOR DISTRIBUTION ONLY TO PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER FCC MEMBERS

Members present: Shirley Clark, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Jack Merwin, Chr., Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman.

Guests: President Keller, Fred Morrison.

Agenda: Amending the tenure code draft approved by the Faculty Senate.

Note: FCC members had agreed by vote without dissent in an open meeting on December 6 to hold this closed meeting.

Professor Merwin defined three tasks for today's meeting to address:

- a) Work out remaining differences between representatives of the faculty on the one hand and the Regents and central administration on the other hand with respect to Section 7.11 of the tenure code draft approved June 7 by the Faculty Senate;
- b) Determine whether the special Faculty Senate meeting can be held as soon as January 17;
- c) Determine who will propose any compromise language to the Faculty Senate.

Professor Morrison reported briefly on the open hearing the Tenure Committee held on December 7, and on subsequent developments. He told FCC there no longer appear to be deep differences regarding the definition of "service" and he recommended that the revised definition be offered to the Faculty Senate as one amendment.

He distributed copies of the latest revised draft wording for Section 7.11.

President Keller told the meeting that half a dozen denials of tenure for programmatic reasons have accrued over the past several years. Although the criterion is used rarely, the University must be able to use it when necessary, he said; hence the programmatic criterion needs to be in the tenure code.

President Keller noted that the Regents have accepted some substantial and good changes from the existing tenure regulations, in the Faculty Senate's draft of a new code. It is not unreasonable, he said, for the Regents themselves to request two or three changes. He thought the faculty might decide the proposed new wording not an unreasonable compromise of their interests.

The president called "conceptually important" the following sentence in the proposed revision:

"The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the achievements of an individual have demonstrated the individual's potential to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching, research, and service over the course of the faculty member's academic career."

He said he would also support restoring this Tenure Committee wording which the Faculty Senate voted in May to delete:

"Although the decision will be based primarily upon the faculty member's performance, the program area needs and priorities of the academic unit at the time of the decision may be considered in deciding whether to award tenure."

Several FCC members voiced their support of the "potential" sentence, and of locating it as the opening sentence of 7.11.

Professor Morrison told the meeting that, in light of several comments and questions about just what it is the faculty committees are trying to do in recommending the change to include the "potential" sentence, it would probably be best to have a fairly clear statement of the position of central administration and of the Regents, with the latter coming preferably from someone representing the Regents. If the FCC and the Tenure Committee submit to the Faculty Senate wording which is clearly not what the Senate wants but which it may be willing to accept, it cannot come as the proposal of the FCC or the Tenure Committee. He advocated making a strong effort to persuade the Senate to accept the new revision.

President Keller volunteered to seek certainty from the Regents that if the Senate should adopt the presently proposed language the Regents would adopt the document as a whole. FCC members agreed they would like to use their January 10 dinner meeting with the Regents to discuss the document and to gain a sense of the Regents' position. The president offered to send to the Regents, prior to that dinner meeting, an introductory letter with the revised language proposals.

The participants agreed that it would be possible to hold the Faculty Senate meeting on January 24 or 31 and still have the document ready for official submission to the Regents in February. The Regents, said President Keller, could choose whether to vote then or at their March meeting.

The group tentatively rescheduled the Faculty Senate meeting for January 24.

Informing the Senate. When the Tenure, Consultative, and Faculty Affairs Committees have decided exactly what they will do, Professor Morrison will send to all senators all the amendments, both technical and substantive, together with an explanatory cover letter.

Procedures. Professor Morrison proposed that the motion to amend 7.11 be made by President Keller. Committee chairs Morrison (Tenure), Merwin (FCC), and Clayton (Faculty Affairs) might join in making the motion. Their committees might endorse the motion. Using such a means would show clearly that the proposal is a compromise between the committees and the Regents. Professor Merwin commented that in signing, the chairmen would be endorsing the amendment motion as an acceptable compromise on a critical question.

Professors Morrison, Merwin, and Clayton will arrange to meet early in January.

There followed a short discussion on a separate question, the modified definition of "research." The president and FCC members recommended further changes.

President Keller and Professor Morrison left the meeting at this point.

Preparation for the January 10 meeting. The FCC chair and secretary will distribute to FCC, as soon as available, information regarding the meeting with the Regents and the exact language proposal on amending the tenure code draft.

Follow-up on Senate action on retirement funds. FCC members addressed very briefly the Faculty Senate's action to permit retiring faculty members to roll over their annuity funds into an IRA of their own choosing. The administration has attended to that action of last May and is bringing it to the Regents for their information in December, but is recommending against it.

For future meetings with the Regents, Professor Stuthman reminded his colleagues that the FCC has an obligation to reply to the Regents' earlier request for an understanding of how faculty governance works and how motions get from the Senate to the Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,  
Recorder

Motion 7

President Keller will move to amend section 7.11, page 9, lines 11-13, as follows:

7.11 General criteria. THE BASIS FOR AWARDING INDEFINITE TENURE IS THE DETERMINATION THAT THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL HAVE DEMONSTRATED THE INDIVIDUAL'S POTENTIAL TO CONTINUE TO CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY AND TO ITS PROGRAMS OF TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE OVER THE COURSE OF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S ACADEMIC CAREER. The primary criteria for awarding indefinite tenure FOR DEMONSTRATING THIS POTENTIAL are effectiveness in teaching . . .

[continuing as above]

Motion 7-A

The Tenure Committee will move to amend motion 7 by adding a footnote to qualify the word "primary" in line \_\_. The text of the new footnote would read:

3a. Criteria other than those expressly listed in this sentence must be explicitly stated and justified in terms of the mission of the University. Such additional criteria may not impinge upon the academic freedom of the probationary faculty member. [Criteria which affect only one or a few faculty members will be subject to special scrutiny.] - drop

This and following footnotes would subsequently be renumbered.

President Keller will move to amend section 7.11 as follows:

7.11 General criteria. The primary criteria for awarding indefinite tenure are effectiveness in teaching<sup>4</sup> and professional distinction in research<sup>5</sup>; High quality OUTSTANDING discipline-related service contributions<sup>6</sup> may WILL also be taken into account WHERE THEY ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE MISSION OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT. The relative importance of the criteria may vary in different academic units, Both of the two primary BUT EACH OF THE criteria must be considered in every decision<sup>7</sup>. but in some academic units a faculty member will not be expected to have made significant service contributions during the probationary period.

The individual's PARTICIPATION IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE INSTITUTION AND OTHER SERVICES TO THE UNIVERSITY AND service to the academic unit and other service contributions to the University MAY BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION may also be relevant to a decision, but are not in themselves bases for awarding tenure.

Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time when the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if it appears that the appointee will not satisfy the criteria within that period.

-----  
[footnotes to section 7.11]

4. "Teaching" is not limited to credit-producing classroom instruction. It encompasses other forms of communication of

knowledge (both to students registered in the University and to other persons in the community) as well as the supervision or advising of individual graduate or undergraduate students.

5. "Research" is not limited to the publication of scholarly articles. It also includes other activities such as artistic production AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC PROCEDURES.

6. "Service" means high quality performance within the faculty member's academic expertise and within the mission of the academic unit, rendered to the community at large. As a criterion for faculty tenure, it does not include the rendering of routine professional services, even if those are within the faculty member's job description. It also does not include service in PERFORMANCE OF quasi-administrative functions, such as service MEMBERSHIP on faculty or Senate committees or other similar activities; those activities are relevant only to the limited extent set forth in the following paragraph.

WHERE SERVICE IS NOT AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE MISSION OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT, A FACULTY MEMBER'S SERVICE MAY BE CONSIDERED, BUT IS NOT A PREREQUISITE TO THE AWARD OF TENURE.

7. Because of the special mission of the Crookston and Waseca CAMPUSES faculty members these need show only effectiveness in teaching and disciplined inquiry in their fields of endeavor MAY BE SUBSTITUTED FOR RESEARCH IN APPRAISING FACULTY MEMBERS THERE.

Other exceptions may be made only in exceptional circumstances by means of special contract, as provided in section 3.6.