

Minutes*

**Tenure Committee
Friday, October 14, 2005
9-10:30 a.m.
238 Morrill Hall**

Present: William Durfee (chair), Tracey Anderson, Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Tom Clayton, Nancy Ehlke, John Mowitt, G. Edward Schuh, Ronald Siegel, Jennifer Westendorf

Absent: Ruth Okediji

Guests: Adrianna Rizzotto

Other: Nan Wilhelmson

[In these minutes:

1. College Personnel Plans

Professor Durfee convened the meeting at 9:05. He introduced new members to the committee and confirmed the next meeting on November 11, 9-10:30 a.m. He noted the two agenda items for this meeting, College Personnel Plans and College Reorganization Plans and said that Carol Carrier, Vice-President for Human Resources and head of the office of Human Resources, has been charged with implementing the policy hiring appointments and reassignment and academic appointments. He continued with some background on the plan, saying is the job of Tom Sullivan to review and approve the plan for consultation with this committee. Furthermore, the provost, in conjunction with the vice-president for human resources, will produce an annual report documenting the number of individuals falling within each of the categories, broken up into department, college and campus. That information will be used by the Dean and other administration, and it will inform the Tenure Committee which will review the information for consistency in the academic mission of the University. Representatives of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee will be invited to participate in the meetings of the Tenure subcommittee.

Vice- President Carrier continued by saying that Arlene Carney was now a part of the Provosts Office and would be involved as well. Vice-President Carrier said the policy was created by a joint faculty and administrative group in 2000 and worked on for a couple of years. It attempted to address the fact that the appointment system for instructional personnel had gotten out of control at the University of Minnesota. Many felt there were too many categories, they weren't monitored, titles were being used in too many different ways by too many different parts of the organization, and it was difficult to keep track of who was regular faculty and who were under different kinds of appointments. There was concern that there was no monitoring of the ratio of tenure-track faculty who were teaching versus everyone else. After a couple years work, the University policy was established and as part of that, each college was asked to create its own plan to correspond with the University-wide plan. She wanted to provide summary data to

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

the committee in case there were issues that need to be looked at further or other kinds of analysis that might be appropriate. She distributed reference materials.

Referring to the first page of the handout, it showed the units that had completed an approved collegiate plan. There are several units that have not completed plans, although they are mostly completed. Durfee clarified as a point of order that the committee did approve or was consulted about the individual plans. Vice-president Carrier confirmed this, and said the plan had been approved in 2001 and that the unit plans had been coming in since then. Referring to the summary page of the handout, she pointed out highlights. Regular faculty increased between 2004-05 by 25 FTEs. There was also some decrease in temporary and adjunct faculty from outside the University. There is also some increase in contract faculty, and the P&As being used for instructional purposes decreased somewhat. (Title) Nan_____ said that regarding contract faculty, in some cases each of the colleges were implementing the appointments of contract faculty so some people who were in other positions were moved into contract faculty.

Vice-president Carrier summarized the categories. Regular faculty at the University of Minnesota are tenure-track and tenured, and the term "regular" is used broadly to include all tenure-track and tenured. Contract faculty is the newest concept and those individuals are used mostly but not exclusively in the Academic Health Center colleges. The whole category of medical school faculty (clinical scholars) is under the contract faculty heading as they are on terms which can be repeated. She noted that that category was created primarily because of the interest in a greater degree of flexibility and the belief that many contract faculty would be doing different levels and types of research from regular tenure-track and tenured faculty.

In putting the plan in place, Vice-president Carrier said it was important to reduce the number and the use of temporary faculty. The category had grown considerably in many of the units, and there are some disadvantages in being in a temporary category, which have been addressed in this system. However, the temporary designation is still being used, in the instance of someone replacing someone taking a sabbatical, but general it is a one-year term. Another category is "Visiting" which has not changed considerably, and includes people coming from other institutions to spend a year on a special kind of appointment. Adjunct faculty from the outside refers to those hired a year at a time who do instructional work and carry a title, but are not regular faculty nor contract faculty.

Other categories that were addressed in the new plan include: four categories are now designated for those who have teaching responsibilities but do not have research or other kinds of responsibilities: Teaching specialists, Senior Teaching Specialists, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. One of the benefits of the new system is that people in these categories now have regular benefits. Another category of people who do instructional work are P&As with other titles who also happen to teach, so they have an instructional appointment as a secondary appointment, which allows the system to track how many of them are actually teaching in any given semester or year. Professor Schuh asked if the information was sent by the units or if it was derived from personnel records. Vice-President Carrier said that it was pulled from the PeopleSoft data. Professor Schuh asked for clarification as to where some of the fellows and senior fellows might show up in the categories. (Title) Nan _____ said they do not appear in other categories because they are not considered a teaching title. However, if they do teach and carry a senior fellow title, then they should be given a courtesy title which is described, and thus would show up in the last column (P&A – Instructional Secondary Appointment). To Professor Schuh's point that most of them do some teaching but it is not their main function, Vice-President Carrier emphasized that they're either getting

courtesy titles or official secondary titles. However, if the unit is not doing that and if there is not a consistent plan to do it, it will not be reflected in the data.

Professor Siegel referred to field faculty and clinical preceptors, and asked how they fit into the categories. Vice-President Carrier said some of them might be contract faculty (depending on their role) or some of them might be P&As, since there are a number of P&A titles which apply to people in particular departments. They wouldn't be reflected in the category unless they played an instructional role. Professor Siegel asked if there was a differentiation between experiential and instructional. Vice-President Carrier said that would be a unit-based decision on how it would be coded. Professor Schuh asked if there was comparable table for those just on research appointments and asked if that was a large number. Vice-President Carrier said that there were many research associates but there was not a comparable table.

Vice-President Carrier went on to say that one thing they try to monitor is that there not be P&A or contract faculty or the combination compromising more than 25% of the instructional service in a unit. It was a policy decision that was made so that a unit does not have all its instruction provided by P&A instructional people or contract faculty to ensure that regular faculty are part of the instructional process. In addition, individuals would have to make a case to exceed that proportion by submitting a supplemental plan. She cited CLA as an example, which has submitted a supplemental plan because they are teaching many language sections and service sections and are primarily using P&As to do that.

Professor Mowitt referred to the charge document which emphasized that there were concerns about the use of such people and asked for clarification on these issues. Vice-President Carrier said there was concern about people outside the University or P&A instructors being given too much of an advising load, sometimes substituting for advising that needed to be done by regular faculty. One goal was to monitor that through this system. Professor Mowitt asked if this was an issue of exploiting those people or there being an absence of quality. Vice-President Carrier suggested it was the latter issue. There was also concern about people using faculty titles but having no research obligation, so the contract faculty category was created to be more explicit about needing to be involved in all three categories of faculty work.

Professor Durfee pointed out that that in his department (Mechanical Engineering), defining teaching categories was very useful because there were many in his department who helped with the instructional program who are excellent teachers, and their previous titles were not appropriate for what they were actually doing. Westendorf asked if a unit is over the 25% and submits and supplemental request, then what level above that is acceptable. Vice-President Carrier said there was no definite number but it should be monitored. In the heavily service-oriented units, for example, it might go up to 40-50% and beyond that it should be addressed, which Professor Durfee said was the committee's role.

Professor Siegel said that to his recollection, one problem that arises is that some units bring in too many non-regular faculty and thus start competing for space resources. Vice-President Carrier confirmed that there was a lot of concern regarding benefits that regular faculty would receive versus non-faculty, not just in terms of space, but leaves, professional development funds, and the like. Now colleges are codifying expectations so it can be clear when someone is hired. Professor Siegel said another aspect might be that many non-regular faculty might be appointed who have large grants, then the unit starts asking for more resources which is problematic. The question becomes what responsibility is owed

them? Vice-President Carrier said that these issues had also been discussed and were in part being addressed so the policies were in place with each new hire.

Professor Schuh asked if the role in the decision making process of each unit was also a college by college decision. Vice-President Carrier said there was such language in the policy on governance and city the policy which states, "Individuals holding academic and professional appointments with responsibility for instruction have input into decisions in their units relating to the policies, courses and program in which they are involved. They do not participate in the decisions regarding the appointment, promotion, tenure, or retention of faculty." So the policy as it stands addresses some of the issues and she said she thought that the colleges seem to be sorting this out as there had been no complaints raised or grievance processes thus far.

Professor Durfee asked a question regarding data. He said that one of the purposes of the policy was to ensure that students are being instructed by regular faculty and the data doesn't indicate who teaches the course. For instance, if a faculty gets a large research grant and buys out of their courses, and the department chooses to hire an adjunct to teach the courses, how does that affect the ratio? Is there a way to correlate the data to what the instructor of record is? Vice-President Carrier said this issue had been raised in other committees and they are still working on a solution. One of the problems is that some courses have very late assignment of faculty. Vice-Provost Carney agreed that even quite late into the semester there may be no instructor of record listed in OneStop. Professor Durfee supposed that these questions might be raised with the Regents, and he suggested that this try to be addressed with PeopleSoft. Professor Schuh also pointed out that this has an effect on students choosing their classes, and Vice-Provost Carney agreed, saying that students often avoided taking a course when there was no information about the instructor, feeling it was too risky. Professor Westendorf asked if the majority of classes were advertised on the web. Carney said this was an on-going discussion at the Counsel of Undergraduate Deans, and that there was encouragement for faculty to use the course guide as the regular place to put information about the classes so students could recognize it as a central location for information. Vice-Provost Carney confirmed that it is no longer contained in a booklet and that it is all on-line, and that it is easy for students to navigate. However, she reiterated, if there is no faculty member listed, they will look for another course if it's not required for their major.

Professor Siegel said that in his department, in the past the past they'd wanted to give people appointments but there was no PeopleSoft category to do so, and he wondered why the software was driving the decisions. Vice President Carrier said that those issues have been worked out, and that there was now a category for almost everything. Durfee asked if there was a handle on the "Graduate Teaching Assistants" category and how it might affect the ratio of tenure and tenure-track faculty. (Title) Nan ____ said that the number of graduate assistants who are teaching had not been totaled, but they were working with data warehouse to generate those reports a couple of times in the year. Professor Durfee said that the challenging issue is that there is a significant difference between graduate students who are instructor of record for a course compared to graduate students who are assisting, and he wondered if there was a way of distinguishing between the two in terms of their appointments. Vice-president Carrier said there were specific appointments that were made, one that is for graduate assistants who are instructors of record, as well as one for graduate assistants, and the distinction is made. Professor Durfee thanked (Title) Nan ____ and Vice-president Carrier for the information they presented.

2. College Reorganization Plans

Professor Durfee moved onto the second agenda item, College Reorganization Plans, and specifically how it affects tenure and tenure-track faculty. He referred to the section of the tenure code entitled "Programmatic Change" which deals with tenure and tenure-track faculty when reorganization occurs or a department closes. He cited in the code, "In cases of programmatic change, an officer designated by the President will make the reassignment or offer of training. The officer will consult with the faculty member in the receiving unit and will seek a mutually satisfactory assignment." He asked Vice-Provost Carney and Vice-president Carrier to review the rules and guidelines, and discuss issues relevant in the context of the programmatic change at the University. He noted that the role of the committee is to establish whether the policy seems to be working and whether there are things that should be brought to the attention of the committee for recommendations.

Vice-Provost Carney said that the discussion about the college reorganization has been ongoing and that they are currently focusing on "Wave 1" colleges, which would be the colleges most affected by the change. These include COAFES, College of Natural Resources and College of Human Ecology. New units are being created, and faculty from the department of Design, Housing and Apparel and the College of Human Ecology will become part of the new college of design, which will also include the current College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, and the faculty from Design, Housing and Apparel. Faculty from the School of Social Work and Family Social Science will be moving into a newly constituted College of Education and Human Development (as it is currently being deemed). The General College faculty are moving as a group to the College of Education and Human Development.

However, Vice-Provost Carney said that there are faculty who wish to go to a different destination than the group destination, and that she'd met individually with each of those faculty members. Some want to go to colleges that are not part of Wave 1. The question is how Section 12 of the Tenure Code should be interpreted by General Counsel, and many meetings have occurred with Human Resources and General Counsel. For instance, if a faculty member from an affected unit wants to move to another department independent of the group moving, what would the process be? When people are moving as a group, the receiving faculty do not get to vote as to whether the other faculty get to join them because that is a major reassignment to a merging unit. However, if a faculty member wanted to join on an individual basis, that's a different process. Should it be treated like an interview situation, in which a person would present a colloquium and meet with faculty in the department, and the faculty would vote on the person? According to Section 12, presumably the Provost's office could assign a person to a department. She suggested this would not be very popular among faculty as they have typically voted on hiring. Many of these people are already tenured, so they are not technically being hired – they are looking for a tenure home. Some are probationary faculty, which complicates the issue further. Carney pointed out that if a faculty member wanted to change units, the reorganization notwithstanding, the person would go through the process of interviewing and faculty voting on them. Although no permanent decision had been made, it was recognized that it would be very difficult for a faculty member to be reassigned to a department where other faculty might be hostile because the person joined them without a vote. However, if the tenure code states that they cannot vote again, are the faculty members' rights being violated? If the department votes against having a faculty join it, then the person goes back to the designated assignment and she pointed out while no conclusion had been reached, there could be some difficult outcomes. She said that an opinion is being drafted by General Counsel.

Professor Schuh asked what had been learned from the closing of the Waseca College, which presented the same issue. Vice-president Carrier said there had been a lot of individual consultation and negotiation to get tenured faculty placed at the Duluth, Crookston, Morris or Twin Cities campuses. Vice Provost Carney pointed out that in this instance there was not voting by the units; that every arrangement was individually negotiated. Professor Siegel said that from his point of view as a department head, one had to wonder where the resources would come from to accommodate additions to a department. Vice – Provost Carney and Vice-President Carrier agreed that space and resources would have to be considered.

Vice –Provost Carney said that as a group the General College faculty were to move to a department whose name has yet to be determined by the task force, and there will be a head of the department. She emphasized that the overall number of the freshman class would not be reduced. Professor Ehlke asked how it affected faculty already on tenure-track and Carney clarified that a new 712 statement would have to be written to reflect the culture of the new unit, since different faculty had been operating in different cultures and different 712 statements. She also discussed how this affected faculty salary, and said that any tuition generated by faculty would move with them and contribute to the overall budget.

Professor Mowitt asked if Vice –Provost Carney would recommend not doing anything on the issue until the final opinion had been received and she affirmed this. Mowitt also asked if fairness required two 712 statements to accommodate both incoming faculty to a unit and the current faculty. Professor Westendorf asked if this was considered a recommendation by faculty or a final decision. Vice –Provost Carney said that they were waiting for final word from General Counsel and she supposed that whatever the hiring policy the department has written must be the one that would be followed. Westendorf pointed out that the Dean can make the final decision and can reverse the decision by the faculty, and Vice-president Carrier confirmed this.

Professor Anderson asked if these negotiations included coordinate campuses and how it might affect relocation to coordinate campuses. Vice –Provost Carney said at this point no one had requested relocation so the issue had not come up, and stressed the importance of doing it right since it's setting a precedent. Tracey asked about salary disparities among different units and different campuses, and asked if that will enter into the equation. Vice –Provost Carney said that there would be people moving from one salary structure to another and that salaries may differ. The dean of each college and the department chair would address the salary structure. Professor Siegel said that the 712 should go with each faculty member, and Carney stressed that this was the case and that probationary faculty would be protected. Professor Durfee asked if the issue of exception to maximum period of probationary service had come up and if this would affect their ability to get tenure. Vice –Provost Carney said she had not seen that kind of provision. Vice-president Carrier said that on occasion there had been extenuating circumstances and the committee cited such instances. Professor Durfee asked that this be addressed and Vice-Provost Carney agreed that there should be some standardization to this and that every precaution should be taken to ensure that there is no disadvantage to making the relocations.

Durfee had two requests for Vice –Provost Carney on behalf of the committee. First, when the General Counsel completes the University interpretation of Section 12 that the committee be made aware of it, if it is a public document. Second, he asked her and the General Counsel to review the language in Section 12 and make recommendations for changes to the committee.

Vice Provost Carney brought another matter to the attention of the committee. The University of Minnesota has been approached by a group called the Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher

Education at Harvard University regarding a nationwide study that looks at the satisfaction of new faculty members. The pilot data were conducted with a survey of new untenured faculty. She cited many colleges participating, including Berkeley, Brown, Duke, University of Arizona, University of Illinois and University of Washington, as well as some selective liberal arts colleges. At this point, a fairly large number of public research universities had agreed to participate in the project. The University of Minnesota would provide the names of tenure-track junior faculty to Harvard, which would then send out a letter from the University of Minnesota that would go out to the junior faculty. The survey would take about thirty minutes to fill out, and asks questions regarding climate, family-friendliness, barriers toward tenure, ability to succeed, etc. The data would be analyzed and provide information from peer institutions against which the University could compare itself. It is a long term, longitudinal study with data collected at three-year intervals. Vice Provost Carney said the data would come back about the time the Faculty Culture Task Force is completing its work and would enhance their work, and she felt that it was a worthwhile project for the University to be involved in to garner useful information for the University. . It will cost \$20,000 to participate over a three year period, and cost would be shared by Vice-President Jones' office and the Provosts' Office. Professor Schuh said that protecting individual identity would be critical and Vice Provost Carney stressed that participation was optional, and with the option chosen by the University of Minnesota there is no way to track individuals, unless the individual participant chose to identify him or herself -- it would all be aggregate data. Other institutions would have access to the University's information as well, and not only would it set objective measures, it would help the University of Minnesota address the big picture issues. Professor Durfee suggested committee members offer their input to Vice-Provost Carney regarding this issue if they see fit.

Professor Durfee concluded the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

-- Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota

