

AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 24, 1998

Minutes of the Meeting

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

PRESENT: Cynthia Gross (chair), Carole Bland, Muriel Bebeau, Peter Bitterman

REGRETS: Dan Feeney, Fred Hafferty, David Hamilton

GUESTS: Mary Dempsey

[In these minutes: Post-tenure review and general housekeeping business]

IMPLEMENTING POST-TENURE REVIEW

Professor Mary Dempsey met with the AHC FCC to discuss the document regarding Post-Tenure Reviews. The conversation started by members talking about setting standards relative to post-tenure review among divisions and departments, especially in those departments that are very small. Professor Dempsey suggested handling Post-tenure Review the same way P&T is handled. Members then spent time talking about processes used in their respective areas. For example, in the College of Pharmacy there is debate whether P&T will be college-wide or departmental. Professor Dempsey said that it was her observation that it should be department because of the differences of clinical versus basic sciences. Professor Gross responded doing it at the department level could mean very small groups. In certain departments that could mean five or six tenured faculty.

Professor Dempsey explained that the memo was meant to tell people that they should decide what is good for them - what will work for them. They can do it with five people if that is what they choose. Professor Gross responded that it would be awkward for five people to review themselves. Professor Dempsey offered that they could choose the model where the department head does the review and maybe three of the five could be the post-tenure review committee. This puts the department head in a very pivotal position and that seems contradictory to the initial statement that this is a peer driven process, Professor Gross responded. Professor Dempsey pointed out that it is up to the peers to decide if they want it done that way.

Attention was drawn to page 3, #3....."You and the other tenured faculty in your department are required to meet and formally adopt two policy statements...." Members said that perhaps there should be a footnote clarifying what "department" means. One member asked whether there could be any disadvantage to faculty if the unit is determined one way for post-tenure review and another way for P&T? Again, Professor Dempsey stated that the faculty should decide how it should be done. Since this deals with post-tenure review, shouldn't it follow what is done for tenure, another queried? And, shouldn't it be the tenure unit? Professor Dempsey responded that this could work and seems logical.

Another member commented that the process was far too flexible. It could be advantageous both for assignment of duties and for other reasons to not have the department head be able to manipulate the configuration of the committee. It should also be required that the review be done by the faculty and not let the faculty vote to have it done by the department head.

Professor Dempsey commented that one school is proposing to have one committee to make up the P&T, Post-Tenure Review and Compensation Committees. This would be an elected committee she added and would report to the department head. Members commented that they thought this would be a lot of work for one committee. Also, tying merit, compensation and post-tenure review within the same committee implies in a sense that the decisions are going to be related to each other and subverts the post-tenure review, another member commented. Post-tenure view identifies people who are lagging behind in performance and the merit review process identifies individuals meritorious productivity.

Is there a unit for which the faculty driven model has worked well, it was asked? The Institute of Technology was identified as a unit where it has worked well. Professor Bland explained in her department the department head has been elected to conduct the annual review and to refer back to an elected committee any cases where substandard performance has been identified. This elected committee is separate from the Merit Committee, she said.

Professor Dempsey informed the group that the document was forwarded to Sr. VP Cerra and that Provost Bruininks has asked for it as well. The provost is proposing to send it out to all deans, department head, and chancellors. Sr. VP Cerra intends to send it out to his deans and departments in the AHC. Professor Dempsey plans to send a note to the faculty informing them the document is available on a website and that paper documents are available in the Senate Office.

Somebody has to be responsible for calling the deadlines and convening the faculty, it was pointed out. Professor Dempsey said that the letter from Bruininks and Cerra would identify the November 16th deadline. It will be the responsibility of the administration to convene the faculty. It was also pointed out that the documents entitled -- "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review" and "Faculty Compensation Policy" are read carefully. It was further pointed out that it is the responsibility of the faculty to read the necessary documents.

Careful attention needs to be made to separate the goals of post-tenure review from other annual procedures such as merit or compensation and that to ensure that the goals of post-tenure review as outlined by the Senate are carried out most appropriately, it was stated. The AHC FCC encourages faculty to seek an option that provides for an elected peer review committee to make the determination. However, other models of procedures are permitted because the policy is intended to be flexible to suit the needs the diverse groups and units.

Members of the AHC FCC were not in 100 percent agreement - some member of the committee preferred that the process should be more specifically prescribed and others thought it should be left general.

The AHC FCC meets with Sr. VP Cerra the week of September 28th and will convey the concerns raised at this time.

Members thanked Professor Dempsey for her time and hard work with respect to the post-tenure document and taking time to meet with the Committee.

GENERAL HOUSING KEEPING ITEMS

Professor Gross asked that members inform Vickie Courtney whether they are able to attend the upcoming meeting with Sr. VP Cerra. Vickie will call those not in attendance.

Professor Sheila Corcoran-Perry has resigned from the committee. Professor Gross will contact Sheila regarding a replacement until the election is held.

Vickie Courtney presented a proposed timeline for the AHC FC election process. The new members will meet jointly in December and constitute the new membership beginning January 1999.

Professor Gross announced that the FCC select a new chair for 1998-99. She suggested that this person should be an on-going member and not up for re-election. Motion was made and seconded that Muriel Bebeau serve as the FCC chair for 1998-99. She agreed to assume the chair position beginning January.

Professor Gross distributed a list of issues the AHC FCC dealt with over the past year. She asked members to review the list and get back to her with any additional items. This document will serve as the annual report.

Dates proposed for the next AHC FCC meeting are: October 6, 7, or 12th. Dates proposed for the AHC Faculty Assembly meeting are: October 30, November 2 or 6th.

Vickie will be contacting members regarding dates. November and December AHC FCC meeting dates are yet to be determined.

Agenda items for the next AHC FCC meeting include subcommittee assignments and appointing subcommittee chairs.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Vickie Courtney
University of Minnesota
AHC

[Return to AHC FCC Minutes Page](#)