

Notes\*

**Tenure Subcommittee of the  
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Monday, February 25, 2002  
Room 238 Morrill Hall  
3:30 - 5:00**

Present: William Garrard (chair), Kent Bales, Carol Carrier, Tom Clayton, Amos Deinard, Nancy Ehlke, Robert Jones, Cleon Melsa, Carston Wagner

Absent: Dale Carpenter, Richard Goldstein, Deniz Ones

Guests: Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources)

**1. Review of P&A/Contract Faculty Appointments**

Vice President Carrier and Ms. Wilhelmson reviewed with the Subcommittee the categories of academic appointments, the data in preliminary college plans for hiring contract and P&A faculty, and provided four examples of college plans for the use of such faculty. The Subcommittee agreed that each of the Subcommittee members would review the four plans before the next meeting and bring any comments they might have. One question is how to certify that the Subcommittee has reviewed these plans, which it is charged to do.

One issue brought up is the role of the regular faculty in hiring those who will have responsibilities for delivering the teaching (or doing the research) and in changes in responsibilities of individuals not originally hired to teach (e.g., an administrator who takes on teaching responsibilities). Professor Bales suggested the Tenure Subcommittee could issue an opinion that review of appointments of individuals with faculty-like responsibilities should be within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee. It could act similarly with assignment of faculty-like responsibilities to employees who are not faculty.

**I DIDN'T GET EXACTLY WHAT THE THREE ITEMS FOLKS WERE TALKING ABOUT AS IMPORTANT FOR THE TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE (OR THE FACULTY IN THE UNITS? OR BOTH?) SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN**

**2. Statements on Issues**

The Subcommittee approved four items, as follows:

**A. A request to Professors Chomsky and Morrison that they be available to help the Subcommittee:**

Dear Carol and Fred:

As the Tenure Subcommittee addresses various issues that come before it, we are in need of technical assistance that we hope one (or both) of you might be willing to provide.

---

\* 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.

The Subcommittee will deliberate substantive issues but I can say, speaking for myself, that we will not always be certain how to implement most efficaciously a change we may wish to recommend. Should a recommendation be an Interpretation of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure? Should it be an amendment to an administrative policy? Should it be an amendment to the code itself? Should it be added as a footnote? It is on these kinds of questions we hope you will be willing to assist us.

This request for help does not mean that we would ask you to attend meetings. But if you would agree to be available for a request for help from me and my successors (and Gary Engstrand, who may be asking for help on our behalf), we would appreciate it a great deal.

Thank you.

Professor Garrard will send this to Professors Chomsky and Morrison.

B. A statement on voting on faculty personnel matters:

The Tenure Subcommittee was asked by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to consider issues associated with voting on faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure. The Subcommittee takes the following position:

- Only tenured full professors may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion to full professor. The full professors may consult with other tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The final deliberations and vote, however, shall be open only to the full professors.
- Only tenured associate and full professors may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion to associate professor. The tenured associate and full professors may consult with other tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The final deliberations and vote, however, shall be open only to the tenured associate and full professors.
- Only tenured faculty may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for tenure. The tenured faculty may consult with non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The final deliberations and vote, however, shall be open only to the tenured faculty.
- Only the regular faculty may vote on whether to recommend hiring a candidate for a position in the unit. The regular faculty may consult with P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others it wishes. The final deliberations and vote, however, shall be open only to the regular faculty. It is not required that all regular faculty in a unit participate in the decision to recommend that a candidate be hired, but any decision-making body shall be comprised only of regular faculty (that is, there may be a search committee or hiring committee within a department, rather than a decision by all regular faculty; any such committee must be composed only of regular faculty).

The Subcommittee will prepare appropriate language changes to implement these statements.

Subsequent emails among Subcommittee members suggested that there may not have been full agreement on the fourth bullet.

C. A statement on promotion from associate to full professor:

The Tenure Subcommittee was asked by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) to respond to a question about the standards that should be used by a department in making a decision about promoting an associate professor to full professor.

The Tenure Subcommittee believes that the standards and process used to make a decision about promotion to full professor should be consistent with the unit's statement required by Section 7.12 of the "Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure."

The Subcommittee will recommend appropriate changes or clarifications to the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure or applicable administrative policy in the near future.

D. A statement on timelines for investigations of allegations of academic misconduct:

The Tenure Subcommittee was asked by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) whether the timelines for allegations of academic misconduct are appropriate. The question was prompted by what appeared to unreasonably long delays in completing various steps in one particular case.

The Tenure Subcommittee met with Professor George Sheets, Chair of the Senate Judicial Committee, to discuss the specific case and the guidelines generally. In the judgment of the Subcommittee, based on Professor Sheets' comments, the timelines for investigations of academic misconduct appear to be acceptable.

In the specific case, the internal guidelines were followed, although there was a lot of back-and-forth about the statement of the case and jurisdiction. It may be that the University administration was too fastidious in seeking to identify rules that were broken, but no one was denied due process. We understand the administration was informed that it is inappropriate to use tactics that may stop an issue from being heard through the normal process.

It was agreed that these statements, once approved, would be forwarded to the appropriate individuals. Follow-up work will be required if changes to the tenure code or administrative procedures are to be adopted.

-- Gary Engstrand