

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs**  
**Tuesday, November 5, 2013**  
**2:30 – 4:30**  
**300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Peh Ng (chair pro tem), Chris Bourland, Teri Caraway, Arlene Carney, Randy Croce, Sam Gill, Sophia Gladding, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Scott Lanyon, Theodor Litman, Karen Miksch, George Sell

Absent: Kathryn Brown, Dann Chapman, Heath Himstedt, Joseph Konstan, Frank Kulacki, Nicholas Poggioli

Guests: Associate Vice Provost Ole Gram (Faculty and Academic Affairs)

[In these minutes: (1) Special Committee on Graduate Education; (2) annual promotion and tenure report; (3) caregiver statement; (4) changes to the Student-Rating-of-Teaching form]

**1. Special Committee on Graduate Education (SCGE) Update**

Professor Ng convened the meeting at 2:30, explained that Professor Konstan was out of town and asked her to chair the meeting, and turned to Professor Lanyon for an update from the Special Committee on Graduate Education (SCGE).

Professor Lanyon recalled for the Committee that the SCGE was charged by the provost and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) to respond to issues that FCC heard about last year and that were identified in the Graduate School survey last spring. The SCGE has four subcommittees (graduate student financing, facilitation of the graduate student experience and ensuring program quality, graduate program enrollment management, and oversight of and advocacy for the visibility and quality of graduate education). There have been about 20 reports on graduate education at the University over the last decade but the work of the last subcommittee has not been addressed. SCGE has had listening sessions (which unfortunately it appears many may not have known about); they received an interesting list of issues. The SCGE was set up to deal with specific issues, not global ones, but what they heard was that (1) people want graduate education to be more graduate-student-centered (there is the perception, and perhaps some reality, that graduate program decisions are based more on the best interest of the program or the faculty rather than graduate students), and (2) how to make sure that interdisciplinary scholarship is not disadvantaged in graduate education (concern has been focused on intercollegiate programs but they heard that the focus also needs to be on graduate students who want to do interdisciplinary work, because they are perceived to be at a disadvantage).

Professor Ng asked how graduate students doing interdisciplinary work are disadvantaged. It is believed that they do not have the same access to fellowship funds and TAs and RAs, Professor Lanyon said, and some programs do not encourage students to go beyond program boundaries. There will be recommendations about graduate student financing, but these topics were the focus of the listening

---

\* 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.

sessions. The issue of interdisciplinarity has raised an interesting question: the University has graduate programs that have been around for a long time, but many fields are changing fast, which suggests that graduate education should be flexible and meet the changing needs of employers, the disciplines, and graduate students. Graduate students and faculty members need to be encouraged to think innovatively.

Professor Lanyon said that the subcommittee chairs have been surprised at how little disagreement there has been on the issues before them, but there is one that has elicited debate: how to management graduate program enrollment. Who does it? What they have heard is that it should be program-based—but that there should be oversight. How to have responsible local control?

Professor Sell asked how graduate program size is determined. The primary driver of program size is resources, Professor Lanyon said, and has little to do with quality or graduate student success, which should also be considered.

Another topic that has come up is "what is graduate education?" Is graduate education professional education? There are similarities, Professor Lanyon said, but there are also major differences. There will be recommendations from the SCGE on this question, one that the institution is not dealing with well right now, which is recognizing the different kinds of, and range of, post-baccalaureate education offered by the University.

The over-arching issue is resources and how to deal with them, Professor Lanyon said, and also the unintended consequences of the University's budget model (these are not unique to Minnesota). Graduate education is funded in bizarre ways across the University; some programs view graduate students as employees while others view them as colleagues—and some take an in-between position. These different approaches make it difficult to manage graduate education. Every faculty member has their own perspective on what graduate education is, but they must all recognize that their personal experience probably relates to a very small fraction of the graduate programs at the University of Minnesota. Even with 25 members, the SCGE does not represent all of the approaches. It is discussing how the Graduate School can set guidelines to manage programs while also allowing programs to manage themselves.

Professor Sell asked about the difference between Master's and Ph.D. degrees. In his field, for example, the Master's degree is a "booby prize" for those who could not successfully complete the Ph.D. program. That differs across fields, Professor Lanyon said, and in some programs the Master's degree is the goal. This is an example of how having a single policy to govern all graduate programs will not work. Cultures are very different—and they are changing. If a Ph.D. program is admitting a large number of students who are not obtaining the Ph.D., one can question its admissions standards. That is part of what the SCGE is doing; the hope is that it will be possible to come up with discipline-specific metrics to measure quality so that it is possible to identify where the best programs in the disciplines are. As long as that remains the goal—to identify the best programs in a discipline—then the use of different metrics across fields is justified. But the programs must use high standards in creating the metrics and targets for those metrics.

Professor Grier-Reed asked if the SCGE has talked about the GRIP program. [[http://www.grad.umn.edu/deans-office/projects\\_initiatives/grip/](http://www.grad.umn.edu/deans-office/projects_initiatives/grip/)] Not specifically, Professor Lanyon said; SCGE is working at the 30,000-foot level. Personally, he said, he hopes to see culture changes to make programs more student-centric (e.g., offer writing skills training for those who believe they need it).

The University is at a turning point for graduate education, Professor Lanyon said. For many graduate programs, the goal is "to replace ourselves." That can no longer be the case; it is one part of what graduate programs do, but they must also provide training for a wide array of jobs. Many graduate programs, however, have not changed to meet the changing needs of students and society.

Mr. Croce asked if there has been any thought about the needs of society for certain programs. He said he did not know how one would identify or measure those needs, and they could be market driven. Professor Lanyon said that if a discipline develops, and matures, and is getting more applicants, it is responding to societal needs, although the process can be slow—but at least the University should do that. The institution needs a way to respond when a group of faculty or students say they have a new idea and area to work in. That process needs to be facilitated—as does a way to say "that didn't work." Higher education is bad at stopping doing things. The SCGE has been charged with recommending a process for closing graduate programs. There is an excellent opportunity to do so because of the breadth and quality of the faculty at the University of Minnesota.

Professor Ng thanked Professor Lanyon for his report.

## **2. Annual Promotion and Tenure Report**

Vice Provost Carney next provided the Committee with the annual promotion and tenure report and P&A continuous appointment report that she and Provost Hanson make to the Board of Regents each year—each May—and that they made last May for 2012-13.

She reviewed with the Regents (and now the Committee) the pertinent elements of the Regents policy *Faculty Tenure*, including the process by which candidates for tenure are reviewed and the standards by which they are judged. She noted that where a college is like a department (there are five), because the tenure policy requires a second-level review of files, there is an all-University promotion-and-tenure committee composed of representatives from the five colleges (who recuse themselves when faculty members from their own colleges are being evaluated).

She turned then to the 2012-13 data but pointed out that there are no faculty members from the Rochester campus included yet (because none have reached the point of being candidates for tenure and promotion), and that the faculty from the Duluth campus are included in the data but their files do not receive provostal review, in accord with the provisions of their collective bargaining contract.

There were 154 tenured and tenure-track candidates (regular faculty promotion to tenure and/or promotion in rank) systemwide and 33 non-tenure-track faculty candidates (contract faculty promotion in rank), for a total of 187 candidates for promotion and/or tenure. Of the 154 regular faculty candidates:

88 were assistant professors promoted to associate professor with tenure.

1 was an assistant professor who was not reappointed

7 were associate professors without tenure who were granted tenure in rank

58 were associate professors with tenure promoted to (full) professor with tenure.

In the case of the 7, Dr. Carney explained, the Law School only hires at the level of associate professor, usually without tenure, and then decides on tenure later, and there are occasionally hires made

(across the University) from other institutions where the person has gone through the probationary period, so the unit hires at the associate professor level but decides later on granting tenure.

In the case of the 58, that number has been increasing in the 8 years she has been in her position, Dr. Carney said, and she feels good about that because she has done considerable work to encourage associate professors to do the work necessary and put themselves up for promotion.

Dr. Carney also presented data on gender; of the 154 regular faculty candidates, 87 were men and 67 were women. Of the 88 promoted from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, 50 were men and 38 were women. Of those going from tenured associate professor to professor, 32 were men and 26 were women—and that is a change, Dr. Carney commented, because more women are now being promoted to professor than was true in the past. (The 1 non-reappointment was a woman; of the 7 associate professors granted tenure, 5 were men and 2 were women.)

In terms of the faculty overall, at present 66% of tenured and tenure-track faculty are men and 34% are women; of the 2012-13 cohort of candidates, 56% were men and 44% were women. Dr. Carney pointed out that about 50% of the faculty are professors, about 25% are associate professors, and about 25% are assistant professors. To change the overall percentage of men and women requires large changes at the professor level. The University is in a good position because there are a significant number of women in the pipeline. But there are also changing retirement patterns, with faculty members staying on the job longer, so the change in overall statistics will be slow.

Dr. Carney also presented data on the race and ethnicity of the 154 regular faculty candidates (by gender).

	Men	Women
White (non-Hispanic)	62	47
African American	2	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	19	11
American Indian	1	2
Hispanic	3	4
	87	67

So the University has a ways to go with under-represented minorities, Dr. Carney concluded. Overall, regular faculty are 81% white non-Hispanic and 19% faculty of color; in the 2012-13 cohort the numbers were 71% and 29%, respectively.

Professor Sell asked if there is any goal. The goal is to promote and tenure people who meet the criteria for tenure, Dr. Carney said, but no one has a particular number in mind; they trust the units to decide who meets their criteria. She said that she reads all the files and checks for procedural irregularities, and tells departments they have to start over if she finds any (they are now catching mistakes earlier in the process, and the most common one is use of the wrong 7.12 statement). Professor Sell asked what a 7.12 statement is; Dr. Carney explained that it is the statement each department has developed that identifies the criteria for tenure and promotion in that department. She also explained that many departments have revised their statements in recent years so that they are clearer and more explicit,

but faculty members hired when a previous 7.12 statement was in effect may opt to continue to be judged by the version in place when they were hired. So her office has to make sure that each faculty member being evaluated for tenure and/or promotion is being judged by the standards of the correct 7.12 statement.

Of the 33 contract faculty who were promoted, Dr. Carney reported, 24 were men and 9 were women. There is also somewhat less diversity in the ranks of those 33, with 23 white non-Hispanic, 5 Asian/Pacific Islander, 2 African Americans, 2 Hispanic, and 1 unknown.

Dr. Carney explained to the Committee, as she does annually with the Board of Regents, that because only 1 of 89 faculty members evaluated for promotion and tenure was denied tenure, it is incorrect to assume that almost all faculty members receive tenure at the University. The University has a robust annual review process, faculty members leave during the probationary period because of feedback they receive, and some are not reappointed. The reason that the vast majority of those who come up for tenure receive it is because the review process is so robust.

What they do, as does Michigan, is look at cohorts of assistant professors (who come to the University the same year) seven years after they arrived, Dr. Carney said. After seven years, except for those in the Medical School and the Carlson School (which have longer probationary periods), those assistant professors should be one year past the tenure decisions. What is measured is the "tenure success rate" and there are four possible outcomes for the assistant professors:

- received tenure and remain at the University;
- received tenure but left the University (e.g., recruited away);
- left the University without tenure (e.g., did not meet criteria, recruited away, left for other reasons); or
- are still at the University on the tenure clock (i.e., extended their probationary period).

The tenure success rate is the percent of probationary assistant faculty members who received tenure and stayed at the University plus those who received tenure but did not stay.

Dr. Carney said that she looks at three-year rolling averages in order to smooth out bumps in the data. She provided the tenure success rates (percents) for three cohorts.

<b>Year entered/Overall</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>White Fac</b>	<b>Fac of Color</b>	
2003-05	65.8	67.9	62.9	68.9	61.4
2002-04	58.9	63.5	52.8	62.4	53.7
2001-03	57.6	63.2	50.3	60.6	52.2

The tenure success rate was a little higher for the most recent three-year set of cohorts, but it is not clear why that is so, Dr. Carney said. The first promotion-and-tenure decision is the initial hiring decision; perhaps departments are hiring faculty members with a better chance of earning tenure. It is not the case, however, that only 1 of 89 did not achieve tenure.

The tenure success rate appears to be lower for women, Dr. Carney said, but that is not so. The category of "still at the University" has more women than men in it and it has been increasing in recent years. More women than men opt to extend their probationary periods for childbirth, adoption, and caregiving. There are also more women in the Medical School and Carlson School with longer probationary periods. In the future they will look at cohorts after 7, 8, and 9 years, and Dr. Carney commented that tenure is rarely denied to individuals who choose to extend the probationary period. The tenure success rate for women has grown steadily since the 1999-2001 cohorts, from 47.8% to 62.9%, and the percentage of women still on the tenure clock after seven years hovers at about 20%.

The goal is to hire the best possible people and provide them the resources they need to achieve tenure, Dr. Carney said. The weakest link in the process is probably mentoring, something the COACHE survey will ask questions about (and about promotion and tenure, climate, and it also include contract faculty members).

Professor Lanyon inquired how often there is a conflict between a department and college or elsewhere in the system. That is difficult to track, Dr. Carney said. Most often it arises because of a split vote in a department, after which the department head must make a recommendation one way or the other, as does the college committee and the dean. In some cases the provost may overturn the dean or a department, but it is extremely rare for the provost to say "yes" when a department and college have said "no." She has seen that 2-3 times while in office, and typically the reason is that there is information available to the provost that was not available to the department and college at the time (e.g., someone received a major grant). Dr. Carney said she did not know of a case where the department and college had said "yes" and the provost said "no." At some institutions the president is involved in the decisions, but not at Minnesota; if there is a dispute, the president is the appellate body after a recommendation from the Senate Judicial Committee.

Professor Lanyon asked how many difficult cases there are per year. There are a few, Dr. Carney said, and it is a small proportion of the files. Some candidate files come forward with negative votes; 20-3 is not a problem but if 30-40% of a department is voting "no," that signals a problem. The reason there are not more such cases is because in the annual reviews there may be more, but people resign because it becomes clear the fit is not right, so she believes the process is a good one. Departments are terminating earlier, and if people feel they are not meeting the criteria, they will resign.

Of those who are not successful, Professor Miksch asked, what percentage are not a good fit and what percentage make a lateral move? That is difficult to ascertain, Dr. Carney said. People are reserved about saying anything because they do not want to burn bridges. This Committee commissioned a survey of faculty members who left, and while those who left were circumspect, it became clear that the head/chair plays a big role, as does the unit (if someone feels alienated, for example). Dr. Carney noted that the CIC schools do not all use the same method for calculating "tenure success" so it is difficult to make comparisons, but in those cases when she's been able to do so, it appears that Minnesota's tenure success rate is comparable to that in its peers.

Professor Ng asked about the rate of those who are let go before tenure. It is low, Dr. Carney said, perhaps 1-2 per year. Departments are asking about this more, perhaps because of budget constraints, but most departments try to nurture candidates. It is expensive to have a lot of turnover. She hosts sessions with department chairs and emphasizes the use of annual reviews and 7.12 statements; she suggests they go over the 7.12 statements line by line and provide feedback to candidates accordingly.

Professor Ng thanked Dr. Carney for her report.

### **3. Caregiver Statement**

Professor Ng asked Committee members to review a draft statement that Professor Konstan prepared following the discussion at the last meeting. The draft read as follows (between the \* \* \*):

\* \* \*

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is concerned that the University's support for faculty caregivers--particularly faculty parents but also faculty who are caregivers for dependent adults--is lacking in important ways that can result in disproportionate burdens and potential challenges in recruiting and retaining an excellent and diverse faculty. We are mindful of research that shows significant career disadvantages for women faculty with children--particularly in STEM disciplines where they are already underrepresented. Accordingly, we urge the administration to take the following actions:

- 1. Address the shortage of on-campus or near-campus childcare.** Faculty parents need to know that they have available nearby high-quality childcare available on a regular schedule. Faculty parents also need access to drop-in emergency and short-notice childcare that includes off-hour options to support a variety of cases, including participation in occasional early-morning or late-evening activities, care for sick children or for children during school breaks and holidays, and other non-regularly scheduled uses. The committee encourages the administration to explore the full range of alternatives, including extending the services available through the UMN Child Development Center (which currently suffers from long waiting lists and limited flexibility) and exploring partnerships with commercial child care firms. The research and commentary available to the committee suggests that on-campus care is extremely important, especially to mothers of young children, and we urge that the possibility of sites on campus be given emphasis.
- 2. Raise awareness of unit-level practices that may adversely affect faculty caregivers.** Our review identified a range of issues and practices, including scheduling important meetings and events (seminars, faculty meetings, recruiting meetings, etc.) in the early morning, late afternoon, or evening. We are particularly concerned about the potential prejudicial effect on tenure and promotion of a faculty caregiver of the unspoken assumptions that failure to attend evening or early morning events may reflect "a lack of seriousness and commitment rather than simply restrictions on available time. And we are similarly concerned that not all faculty voting on tenure cases have internalized the concept that "stopping the tenure clock" does not entail an expectation of another year's worth of contribution. Of particular importance is ensuring that unit heads are well-trained and well-mentored on the University's goals and policies supporting faculty caregivers, and on how they can structure department activities and evaluation to support them.
- 3. Raise awareness of the availability of special contracts for faculty who have a temporary need to reduce their appointment.** The university's flexibility in this area is significantly greater than most faculty are aware of. These possibilities should be better-promoted to allow those who have a temporary need to reduce their appointment below full-time to do so appropriately, rather than face the stress and uncertainty that otherwise may result.

**4. Explore, with the committee, the possibility of reduced-time appointments for faculty members who are parents of young children, such as multi-year (or permanently) reduced-time appointments that are nonetheless tenure-track and tenured.** Questions about fringe benefits while holding such appointments would have to be addressed, as would options (if available) to move from (for example) 50% time to 100% time. We believe, however, that such appointments, if available more generally than by special arrangements, could make the University more attractive to faculty members with children who it wishes to recruit (or to faculty members who may be thinking about having children).

**5. Provide clear guidance on mechanisms to permit financial support to offset additional expenses of faculty caregivers' professional activities.** It is in the University's interest to support the professional development and advancement of its faculty. Accordingly, the University has policies and procedures under which University-managed funds -- including sponsored and non-sponsored funds -- can be used to support faculty travel to conferences and meetings, research travel, academic visits, and other professional activities. For faculty caregivers, such travel has additional burdens associated with alternative caregiving or in some cases co-travel (e.g., with a nursing child). Faculty members and units need clear guidance on how and when such additional expenses can be paid for by University-managed funds, and on how units can make such support available without adverse tax consequences for the University or for the traveling faculty member. To the extent that current policies do not permit such support, SCFA recommends that the administration revise such policies to explicitly permit such support, both at unit expense and through sponsored research funding, to the greatest extent possible.

\* \* \*

Ms. Bourland commented that she does not see in industry provisions calling for the availability of emergency and drop-in child care. Professor Grier-Reed noted the recent Human Development index, which ranked the U.S. 42 in the Gender Inequality Index, and said she supported the provision; she suggested it would be a good idea to push the envelope on this matter. Mr. Croce said that at the least the University could provide information about services available. Professor Lanyon said that the only reason this can be conceived of is because of the sheer size of the University. He agreed with Professor Grier-Reed that the Committee should push the envelope on this. Ms. Bourland said that these services were not an option at another large organization for which she worked; she had to make those arrangements herself.

Dr. Carney suggested that the recommendation should not privilege the faculty; the services should be available to all employees. Committee members concurred.

Committee members discussed the language in #2 about extension of the probationary period and concluded that it needed to be redrafted so it aligned with the tenure policy and accompanying procedures; Professors Miksch and Ng agreed to work with Dr. Carney to craft the appropriate language. With the understanding that the language of #2 would be revised, the Committee voted unanimously in favor of the statement and that it be forwarded to the Faculty Consultative Committee for placement on the Faculty Senate docket for action.

#### **4. Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching (SRT) Form**

Professor Ng welcomed Dr. Gram to the meeting to continue the discussion of changes to the SRT form and suggested the Committee focus on the general issue of automatic release rather the specific



wording of the questions, which will be changed following discussions with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and other groups.

Dr. Carney said the crux of the matter is that the situation now is untenable: students want more information but only a small percentage of faculty members authorize the release of the data for the student-release questions on the current form. There is also overlap between the "core" questions that are used in personnel decisions and the student-release questions.

Professor Lanyon said that as he has talked to people about this, he's concluded that students are not going to get much useful information from the questions—but if they want it, he favors release of the results.

Professor Ng said she had conversations with colleagues at Morris; one question they asked is if, under the proposal, someone can opt out (they cannot, Dr. Carney said).

Professor Ng said although the Committee does not want to get too deeply into the wording of the questions, many faculty and students with whom she has spoken found useful the question about the number of hours students say they spent on a course. Dr. Gram said that if there is a strong desire on the part of students for that question, they would be amenable to including it. It may be subjective, however.

Professor Caraway said that in the item "the grading methods for this course were fair," it is tricky to assess "fair." Dr. Gram explained that this is a rewrite of the current student-release question about grading being reasonable. Those who worked on the rewording believe the proposed wording is better while remaining as close as possible to the spirit of the current question and conforming to best practices. That does not mean it is informative, but it is what students want. That does not mean the University should include it, Professor Caraway responded. Right now the students are not being provided with any information they want, Dr. Carney said, and they are trying to respond to that request.

Mr. Croce didn't agree with the proposition that the number of hours a student said he or she put in was more subjective; it seems less subjective and something students would want to know. That could be the most useful piece of information provided.

Professor Ng asked why the question about the physical environment would be released; at Morris, for example, the same class can be held in different rooms from one semester to the next. Dr. Gram agreed the results of that question shouldn't be released. Dr. Carney said the results are important for staff who manage classrooms but agreed that releasing the information does not make much sense.

Professor Sell said that what is missing is providing students a way to make a statement about improving a course. Students could do so quickly and it can be useful feedback; asking them to write an essay is too much.

Professor Caraway said there is a context for the SRT form, at a time when there is concern about grade inflation; if the answers create the impression that a course is easy, the results can lead to chasing enrollment and pit faculty member against faculty member. Professor Grier-Reed agreed that there is an emotional element to the questions and suggested that "clear" would be a better word than "fair" in the question about grading. Professor Gladding observed that there is a difference between "fair" and "clear" and said the latter was better. Professor Grier-Reed said that "fair" can mean "did I get what I deserved or

was entitled to." "Clear" is better than "fair" because that means the grade did not just appear out of nowhere—"the work I did was clearly connected to the grade I got." "Grading expectations were clear," suggested Mr. Croce.

Committee members deliberated briefly over other questions and agreed to take up the issue again at an upcoming meeting, when the revised proposal is ready. It is hoped that the matter will be on the May Faculty Senate docket for action.

Professor Ng thanked Dr. Gram for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota