

Notes*

**Tenure Subcommittee
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
December 10, 2001
10:30 - 12:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

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

Absent: Carol Carrier, Carston Wagner

Guests: none

The Subcommittee agreed on the following matters:

-- Its charge would not extend to the rules of appointment and employment for P&A staff.

-- It would consider the use of "T" appointments.

-- It would supply language, possibly an addition to the tenure code, to the effect that only tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote on hiring, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and merit salary increases for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Robert Jones and Gary Engstrand are to provide language for review by email. Gary Engstrand will draft a letter for Professor Garrard to send to Executive Vice President Bruininks concerning possible new language in the tenure code. In this regard, the subcommittee will also review the new academic appointments policy.

-- Dr. Jones will report at the next meeting on the results of the post-tenure review process, including anecdotal information.

-- The subcommittee will review the plans provided by the colleges as required by the new academic appointments policy; it will also look at the data. Dr. Jones will also identify outlier departments within the colleges. Professor Bales noted that one goal was to be able to count TEACHERS, but colleges may not be using appointment titles in such a way that such (accurate) counting is possible. One goal of the academic-appointments committee was to have a method to be sure that what people were called accurately represented what they were actually doing.

-- The subcommittee wishes to study jurisdictional issues as they may affect investigations of misconduct, in order to be sure that faculty members receive due process. One reason Professor Polla may have had difficulties having the allegations resolved is that it was never clear who had jurisdiction. FCC has asked that the timelines on misconduct investigations be reviewed.

* 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 review the language in the tenure code and the rules for review of probationary faculty with respect to the role that a department chair/head should play, whether objective or advocatory, for example. This will include discussion of the right of the chair/head to obtain information.

-- In terms of the review of candidates for promotion from associate to full professor, the subcommittee agreed that the review should be as rigorous as the decision whether to grant tenure to a probationary faculty member because the decision is an important one. The departments decide how extensive the review will be. It was agreed that the subcommittee would send a statement to the Faculty Consultative Committee, which originally conveyed a concern on this subject from department heads/chairs.

-- Other topics the subcommittee took up but upon which it did not reach any conclusions included civic engagement, its relation to service, and the language of the tenure code related to these topics; it agreed to look at the appropriate tenure-code language.

It was agreed that the Senate office would contact subcommittee members to set a meeting schedule for spring semester.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota