

Notes*

**Tenure Subcommittee
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Monday, April 16, 2001
3:00 - 4:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: William Garrard (chair), Carol Carrier, Robert Jones, Deniz Ones
Regrets: Cleon Melsa
Absent: Dale Carpenter,
Guests: none

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 3:00 and turned to the agenda items.

1. Review and modify Illinois letter given to faculty who have been awarded tenure: it was agreed that the Subcommittee would recommend to SCFA and FCC that changes should be made in the letter that is now sent to newly-tenured faculty members that emphasize both the rights and the responsibilities of individuals granted tenure. Professors Garrard and Goldstein will draft language.
2. Evaluate post-tenure review process: a report was provided to the Board of Regents on the post-tenure review process. At the end of this year there will be a report on the outcomes of those who went through a special review. In 2-3 years there will be an assessment of the process to learn if it has value as a professional development tool. The Subcommittee will be provided a report in the fall, including statistics and an estimate of the number of individuals who retired rather than go through a review.
3. Timelines on misconduct allegations: there are timelines in the academic misconduct policy. It was agreed that a representative from the General Counsel's office should be invited to join the Subcommittee to talk about the case that prompted the concern (which led FCC to ask the Subcommittee to consider the matter).
4. Should promotion from associate with tenure to full with tenure be as burdensome as promotions in which tenure is involved: this was a question raised in lunch discussions between FCC and members of the Faculty Senate. The Subcommittee concluded without dissent that the answer to the question should be "yes" and that the same level of scrutiny should obtain for promotion to full professor as to associate.
5. Does the candidate for promotion and tenure have too much control over the process: this item also came from FCC discussions with Faculty Senators; it was said that the department chair is seen to have an obligation to be an advocate for a tenure candidate and that the candidate had too much influence

* 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.

over the process. It was agreed that the Subcommittee would examine the language of the tenure code to see if this is the expectation. There should be an advocate, but not the chair. It may be that the Subcommittee will issue an Interpretation of the code to clarify responsibilities. The Subcommittee will also look at the administrative procedures, which Vice President Carrier will provide.

6. Tenure in cases in which an appointment is shared: the original request came from Morris; there are other schools who make shared appointments. Permitting such appointments would require amending the tenure code (which provides that one must have at least a 67%-time appointment to be tenured). It was agreed that Vice President Carrier would provide the information from Morris. It may be that such appointments could be made on a "special case" basis, rather than amending the entire tenure code to allow them.

7. Vice President Carrier pointed out that the Subcommittee has the responsibility for reviewing college staffing plans with respect to the new academic appointments policy; it also is to review the data on number of appointments of tenured/tenure track versus term/P&A faculty. The Subcommittee will have to decide on the level of review in which it wishes to engage; Vice President Carrier will provide the materials to Professor Garrard and the Subcommittee will invite Professor Bales to join it for a discussion.

8. The procedures that accompany the tenure code need revision, Vice President Carrier said; it was agreed she would provide the Subcommittee with copies and that it would review them at a future meeting.

It was also agreed that Committee members would be asked about meeting times for next year.

Professor Garrard adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota