

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, January 19, 2006**  
**1:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Jean Bauer (chair), Gary Balas, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Barbara Elliott, Dan Feeney, Megan Gunnar, Mary Jo Kane, Kathleen Krichbaum, Scott Lanyon, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Fred Morrison, Terry Roe, Steven Ruggles, Martin Sampson, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor

Absent: Morris Kleiner, Marvin Marshak

Guests: Carol Carrier, Nan Wilhelmson, Becky Hippert

Other: Katie Stuckert

[In these minutes: (1) Use of courtesy titles; (2) Discussion of Senate Representation for Clinical Faculty; (3) New Faculty Senate Numbers and UMD Medical Numbers; (4) Election of 2006-07 FCC Chair

Professor Bauer convened the meeting at 1:20 pm.

**1. Use of Courtesy Titles**

Professor Bauer welcomed Carol Carrier to the meeting. Ms. Carrier discussed academic appointments: she defined current use of courtesy and adjunct appointments and the use of the term affiliate, outlined reasons for P&A teaching appointments and discussed current usage of without salary (WOS) appointments. One reason for use of WOS appointments is to indicate teaching effort by assigning a courtesy faculty rank or an academic professional (teaching specialist or lecturer) appointment when the primary appointment held is an academic professional or administrative position with non-instructional duties. The committee discussed this use of courtesy faculty titles. There was general concern expressed that faculty titles are given too freely, and Professor Martin said there was discomfort among faculty with this practice. She said that it was confusing because those with courtesy titles are not distinguished from regular appointed faculty, and Professor Gunnar pointed out those faculty do not go through the tenure process. Professor Roe asked what happened when a title is taken away after it is bestowed. Ms. Carrier referred to a proposal that was under discussion that requires a review of the courtesy WOS appointments with faculty title on a yearly basis prior to any renewal. Professor Morrison felt titles were devalued: he questioned the number of associate professors, and said that he felt the appointments should go through a review process similar to the promotion process. Dr. Carrier said that every college must submit a plan on how it will use titles. She asked the committee if there should be more stringent policies. Professor Martin said she felt the title should be "adjunct" professor if the person did not go through the review process.

The committee discussed the faculty hiring process. Professor Lanyon raised the issue of how such hires present themselves to the community, and that they should identify themselves as adjunct. Ms.

---

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

Carrier said that certain restrictions on use of the title could be noted in the letter of hire. Professor Carpenter said she felt that an adjunct title would not work on the Morris campus, and Ms. Carrier clarified that this was in relation to WOS positions. Professor Roe asked about adjunct professors who may be tenured faculty in other departments. Ms. Wilhelmson clarified that if someone has an appointment, he or she can also have an adjunct position in another department as well. Professor Krichbaum asked if there might be clarification of internal uses of titles, and cited an example where someone hadn't gone through the hiring process but used the "professor" title. Professor Lanyon felt that some working titles should be permitted, but that units needed to monitor courtesy appointments. Dr. Carrier suggested incorporating stronger language in the hiring contract, and said that while it won't guarantee anything it could help to establish regularity. Professor Feeney asked if there were regulations as to how titles could be used, for instance, on business cards and the like, and expressed his concern about people portraying an affiliation which does not exist. Dr. Carrier said this would be difficult to regulate, if some sort of affiliation does indeed exist. Professor Feeney stressed his feelings that there should be some mechanism for regulation. Professor Morrison suggested that "adjunct" not be the only adjective used, and that perhaps "clinical" or "auxiliary" might be used in certain cases. Professor Sullivan said that in the School of Law, some people have joint appointments, even joint tenure, but that even those with courtesy appointments receive a letter of appointment that says they can use "Professor of XXX and Law." He asked if there should be internal policies in place. Professor Gunnar pointed out that this might work against the university, and that they may wish to be careful about being too regulated because the University has many ties to the community. Dr. Carrier again stressed the freedom among the different colleges about how to approach it. She recapped the committee's ideas: the committee wants to ensure the annual review of titles; the committee wants the appropriate qualifications for titles; and the committee would like a statement in the letter of appointment about how a title is used. Dr. Carrier also suggested that Professor Bauer write a note to Provost Sullivan expressing the committee's opinion. Professor Windsor asked if there would be an annual review of internal appointments as well, and Dr. Carrier replied yes and that periodic reviews are determined by units. Professor Bauer suggested recommending criteria for review for each department and Professor Chomsky suggested following up on instances of misuse.

## **2. Senate Representation for Clinical Faculty**

The committee began a discussion of clinical faculty representation from the Medical School in the University Senate. As presented by a subcommittee comprised of Professors Feeney, Martin, and Morrison, the issue is the increasing number of contract faculty who want representation in the Faculty Senate and how granting this could create disproportionate representation for a college in the Faculty Senate. One solution would be to treat them as teaching faculty and therefore have them counted for purposes of determining Senate representation, but impose a limit so that no single unit could have more than 25% of the total number of Faculty Senate seats. According to the proposal, the total number of seats could not go above 39 for any collegiate unit based on the size of the Senate. Professor Morrison pointed out that teaching specialists would be allowed to vote but that they didn't want the Faculty Senate to be overloaded with representative from this classification. He asked if this approach was acceptable to the committee. The committee discussed the issue. To Professor Lanyon's request for clarification, Professor Morrison said that while the proposal caps the number of seats, it would result in an increase in the representation of the units adding new voters from this classification. Professor Gunnar expressed concern that non-teachers may be having too strong an influence on teaching policy. Professor Feeney pointed out that non-teachers too are dependent on the development of undergraduates. Professor Sullivan asked what the actual number would be after the change. Professor Morrison replied. 33.

Professor McCormick asked if there was any danger in making the cap 25%; for instance, what if there are four large colleges resulting in the reorganization which could take 100% of the Faculty Senate seats. Professor Morrison clarified that each college must have a minimum of two representatives; the actual danger lay in larger units being under-represented but smaller units being over represented. Professor Krichbaum pointed out that this was a significant issue for the Medical School. Professor Sullivan said that according to his calculations, one out of three representatives would be from AHC, and he was concerned that it was weighted too heavily to the AHC. He asked about the possibility of restating the draft policy to 20% from 25%. Professor Morrison said they would try but it wouldn't reduce any current representation. Professor Krichbaum said that she didn't feel that the Faculty Senate was in danger of being taken over by AHC, and that new faculty are interested in the direction of the university and participating in the process. Professor Bauer asked the committee if they'd like to propose 20% vs. 25%. The majority of the committee agreed to propose 20%, with Professor Balas voting for 25%. It was agreed that the motion would be amended and the committee would revisit the issue before April.

### **3. New Faculty Senate Numbers and UMD Medical Numbers**

Professor Bauer welcomed Becky Hippert, who presented information about current and proposed changes in Faculty Senate seats due to University Strategic Positioning. She distributed information which illustrated the breakdown of Faculty Senate seats and tenure, tenure-track, and academic professionals by college. The committee discussed the information, and faculty, faculty-like, and P&A representation. There was concern expressed about the equal numbers of faculty and faculty-like representation, which could suppress tenured faculty representation, indicating a potential shift in the Faculty Senate. The committee discussed the Medical School-Duluth representation, and Ms. Hippert clarified that while the Medical School-Duluth still has a separate decanal position, that dean does report to Dean Powell of the Medical School-Twin Cities. Professor Elliott added that this was imposed by virtue of the accreditation process, and that both programs are accredited as one school. The committee then discussed appropriate representation. Professor Gunnar said she felt that, for historical reasons, the Medical School-Duluth should not be forced to be represented through the Twin Cities college. Professor Feeney said they should keep it simple and stick with the major academic units and cap them at 20% of representation in the Faculty Senate. Professor Balas said that making special cases, based on historical configurations, opens a can of worms and could then be used by the colleges that are now being merged. Professor Elliott agreed with the logic of the proceedings, and while acknowledging the school's small size, expressed concern that the Medical School-Duluth faculty may become disenfranchised. Professor Martin said that she felt that the committee should not tell units how to divide representation, but that Medical School-Duluth faculty should work on guaranteed representation within the Medical School procedures. Professor Chomsky said that the Committee on Committees should be alerted to consider this matter to ensure proper committee representation. Professor Bauer referred the motion to the March 2 Senate meeting.

### **4. Election of 2006-07 FCC Chair**

The committee elected Professor Carol Chomsky Chair of the FCC for 2006-07.

### **5. Other Business**

Professor Bauer called for any additional business for the committee to address. A discussion regarding the adoption of a statement regarding tenure-track faculty ensued. Professor Feeney felt

individual units should be given discretion to identify faculty accordingly, and felt it was not the Senate's purview to make these determinations. Professor Bauer said that according to her figures from the University Accountability Report, there were 2377 tenure and tenure-track faculty, and 739 other faculty. She expressed the need to bring up the issue with Provost Sullivan. The committee agreed that there needed to be distinctions made in the hiring process and that it was necessary to communicate those distinctions accordingly. Professor Lanyon said that it was important that the faculty be aware of the policy, and that should be communicated from Professor Bauer. Professor Martin said that it would be helpful for people to know that the provost supports it. Professor Sullivan suggested that the provost notify the deans, and Professor Bauer said she would write a statement to circulate for the committee's feedback.

The meeting concluded at 3:04 pm.

--Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota