

Notes\*

**Tenure Subcommittee  
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
January 28, 2002  
3:30 - 5:00  
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: William Garrard (chair), Kent Bales, Dale Carpenter, Carol Carrier, Tom Clayton, Amos Deinard, Nancy Ehlke, Richard Goldstein, Robert Jones, Cleon Melsa, Deniz Ones

Absent: Carston Wagner

Guests: none

The Subcommittee agreed on the following matters:

-- Bill Garrard and Gary Engstrand will meet prior to the next meeting in order to figure out where in the tenure code (or in the administrative policy) there should be inserted language about who can vote on faculty promotion, tenure, and so on.

-- Bill Garrard and Gary Engstrand will meet prior to the next meeting to refine the proposed language clarifying the role of the department head vis-à-vis probationary faculty.

-- It accepted a report from Vice Provost Jones about post-tenure review. Post-tenure reviews nationally find 92-96% of faculty performing at or above an acceptable level. Perhaps 4-6 faculty at Minnesota retired rather than go through a post-tenure review. There will be a more comprehensive review of the system after it has been in place for five years. The deans find the process works; there have been no complaints from faculty that it is a waste of time.

-- The Subcommittee will avoid getting into controversies in specific colleges over titles for P&A "faculty" but will examine college documents. Kent Bales said the academic appointments document allows working titles but there is a vexed relationship between that document and the tenure code; one problem is that enforcement of the academic appointments document resides with the Provost and there is no interpretive body like the Tenure Subcommittee for the tenure code. There should be such a body.

-- The timelines for investigations of academic misconduct appear to be acceptable. Professor Sheets joined the Subcommittee and explained the circumstances surrounding Professor Polla's 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. The administration has heard the message that its actions may have stopped an issue from being heard through the appropriate process. But Professor Sheets said the case was probably a singularity.

---

\* 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.

Tenure Subcommittee  
January 28, 2002

2

Professor Garrard will send a note to FCC about the timelines.

-- Gary Engstrand