

Minutes*

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE
Thursday, May 23, 1996
3:15 - 5:00
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club**

Present: Dan Feeney (chair), Kent Bales, Carole Bland, Carol Chomsky, Cheryl Coryea, Mary Dempsey, James Gremmels, Richard Goldstein, Richard McGehee, Carol Miller, Naomi Scheman, Bernard Selzler

Regrets: Robert Fahnhorst, Judith Gaston, Kinley Larntz, George Seltzer, James Stone, Yang Wang

Absent: Carol Carrier, Sam Myers, Kevin O'Laughlin, Shane Swanson

Others: Don Barber (AHC), Dan Farber (Academic Affairs), Kim Isenberg (Board of Regents Office), Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

[In these minutes is discussion and action on the final proposed amendments to the Tenure Code, and recognition of members completing their positions with the committee.]

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The committee approved the agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The May 9, 1996 minutes were approved.

3. CHAIR'S REPORT

Professor Dan Feeney said that the Non-retirement Subcommittee chaired by Ms. Judith Gaston is looking into how the conversion to semesters will impact sabbaticals. This group is also has collected information on how the decision was made to discontinue paying faculty for summer classes that have low student enrollment and are canceled. This information will be made available to the SCFA members.

Grants Management: Professor Feeney said that the Grants Management Office has developed an proposal that will be addressed by SCFA in Fall 1996. Concerns have been raised by Professor Allen Goldman, Chair of the Senate Research Committee. Information is to be coming to SCFA from Vice President Brenner.

Library Faculty: A letter was sent to Professor Feeney by the Faculty Personnel Committee of the Libraries regarding how merit salaries are evaluated. There concern is how they should be evaluated in relation to their P&A colleagues. Professor Feeney referred them to the compensation policy which

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at 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.

states how faculty are to be evaluated. He also said that if they think there has been some type of unfair treatment against them, they should contact the University Grievance Officer. Professor Mary Dempsey said that she had also received a letter from this group, and had offered SCFA's assistance, if needed.

Tenure Amendments: The set of proposed amendments to the Tenure Code approved at the last SCFA meeting were presented for information to the Faculty Senate on May 16. Professor Feeney said that there several suggested changes. Overall, the faculty were amenable to the proposed changes. These items will be acted on at the May 30 Faculty Senate meeting.

4. FINAL 1995-96 TENURE DISCUSSION

A. Motion H: Peer Review of Faculty Performance

Professor Dempsey provided a brief explanation of the motion. This amendment presents more explicit language regarding the review process including review panels that can recommend limited salary reductions (7A.4). One committee member noted that this process clearly identifies that the peer review process is under the control of the faculty (rather than the administration).

Other comments made by the group:

- * Tenure codes at most other universities do not protect salary as does the University's Code.
- * If the Regents want to offer any alternatives to approved amendments, these suggestions would need to be returned to the governance structure.
- * The Compensation Policy does not require peer review and should not be reviewed in the Code.
- * The Code is aimed at tenured and tenure track faculty. Term faculty need to know what is expected of them as well. Professor Farber said that he and Professor Fred Morrison would clearly identify that there are only several provision in the Code that apply to term faculty and that everything else applies to tenure/tenure-track faculty.
- * The Code amendment in 7A.3 allows for a faculty member to incur a pay reduction for a poor review. The amendment should also state that it is possible for this faculty member to have the pay reinstated if subsequent reviews warrant it.
- * This same type of review procedure should be used for administrators of the University.
- * SCFA will need to revisit the Compensation Policy next academic year.
- * Lines 38-39 should read, "The intensive review shall be conducted by a committee create for each individual faculty member under review. . . ."
- * Any review must be conducted by faculty ranked equal or higher than the one under review.
- * If a faculty member's salary is reduced, the amount should not be taken out the department's budget because reinstatement would be possible.

The committee provided additional editorial comments to the motion and approved it unanimously.

B. Motion I: Adding "Outreach" to Possible Faculty Responsibilities

Several editorial changes were recommended to the motion. *The motion was approved unanimously.*

C. Motion J: Preamble

Recommended changes included editorial comments:

* The sentence in lines 12 - 16 was recommended to say: "The state of Minnesota is best served when faculty are free to teach, to conduct research, and to provide service without fear of reprisals, and to pursue these activities with regard for long-term benefits to society rather than short-term rewards."

The committee proceeded to offer a number of editorial comments to the preamble. *The motion was approved unanimously.*

D. Motion K: Applicability of Regulations and Continuity of Appointments:

Professor Dempsey explained that the changes to Section 2.3 were mostly housekeeping in nature. *The motion was approved unanimously.*

E. Interpretation 2: Clarifies the Consequences of Programmatic Change (associated with Section 12.2):

- * It should be explained to the Faculty Senate that this is an interpretation of the existing Code.
- * This interpretation identifies aspects that are not in under faculty control. Therefore, it is important to identify that this language already exists in the Code.
- * Lines 1-2 of this section should read, "Section 12.2 of the tenure regulations records an understanding that in case of programmatic change. . . ."
- * This interpretation should not be approved by the Tenure Subcommittee until the Faculty Senate has had the opportunity to provide some helpful suggestions.
- * The definition of "program" needs to be described. It may be that a program is not less than a department.

SCFA agreed with the interpretation given the proposed changes. The committee proceeded to discuss how to define what a "guaranteed salary" is. One member said that he would like the Code to state that the base academic salary is the "base salary" discussed.

F. Proposed Resolution for June 6

Professor Feeney said that FCC approved the resolution earlier in the day. The committee agreed the resolution allowing Professors Dempsey, Feeney, and Ed Fogelman to speak on behalf of the Faculty Senate to the Board of Regents regarding the proposed amendments to the Code.

5. RECOGNITION OF SERVICE

Professor Feeney thanked Professors Carol Bland and James Stone who were completing their service with SCFA. In addition, he thanked the student members Kevin O'Laughlin and Shane Swanson. Professor Dick McGehee thanked Professors Feeney and Dempsey and the Tenure Subcommittee for their work on the Code amendments.

-- Kevin Gormley