

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Tuesday, January 24, 2006  
2:30 – 4:15  
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Morris Kleiner (chair), Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Vladimir Cherkassky, A. Saari Csallany, Will Durfee, Janet Ericksen, John Fossum, Patricia Frazier, Theodor Litman, Steven McLoon, Jane Miller, Kelly Risbey, Rod Squires, Larry Wallace, Timothy Wiedmann, Virginia Zuiker
- Absent: Matthew Bribitzer-Stull, Carol Carrier, Darwin Hendel, Eric Gupta, Oriol Valls, Lori-Anne Williams, Aks Zaheer
- Guests: Dr. Connie Tzenis, Dean Steven Rosenstone, Associate Dean James Parente, Dr. Peter Zetterberg

[In these minutes: (1) Report from Committee Members on Endowed Chair Review Processes in their Colleges; (2) Request and Discussion with Dr. Tzenis on Evaluation of Instruction; (3) Endowed Chairs in CLA; (4) Faculty Cultures

Professor Kleiner convened the meeting at 2:35 pm.

**1. Report from Committee Members on Endowed Chair Review Processes**

Professor Kleiner solicited reports from various committee members regarding endowed chair review processes in their particular colleges. Professor Wiedmann said that in the College of Pharmacy it is an informal process whereby the dean and the head of the department discuss the endowed chair, and there is no faculty involvement. He added that there are four endowed chairs and they are permanent appointments. Professor Litman asked if the Chair remained in the department, and Professor Wiedmann replied that the chair is defined within a discipline so it would difficult to move.

Professor Durfee said that in Mechanical Engineering, endowed chairs were determined department by department.

Professor Frazier said that in Psychology, the chairs are in perpetuity though they are supposed to be reviewed.

Professor Wallace said that in Veterinary Clinical Sciences, there are a couple of endowed chairs underway: one has funding and the other has a search committee established. However, as of yet, there is no one in those chairs. He added that two other departments have endowed chairs with people who've been in them a long time.

Professor Csallany reported that in Food Science and Nutrition, there is one endowed chair and the money for the chair is to the department, not the individual.

Professor Fossum said that in the Carlson School of Management most chairs are not additional positions, just funding for a position. Endowed chairs pay a faculty salary and term professorships are appointed on a three-year basis. There is an evaluation committee comprised of faculty, and some chairs are for specific positions as indicated by the donor. Some chairs reside in a specific department. Term

---

\* 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.

professorships are renewed every three years and chairs are renewed every five years, and both are required to complete annual reports.

Professor Kleiner's report summarized how chairs function in the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs: titled faculty are evaluated by an elected faculty committee, and the Dean evaluates each faculty member. Chair faculty and regular faculty are evaluated in similar manners. Professor Kleiner suggested that his written summary could be used as a template for further evaluation and research on the matter. He also noted variances in each of the department endowments, and said that the committee would continue gathering data to see if a policy should be developed. Professor Durfee asked Professor Wiedmann to follow up with people on collecting further information, and said that Professor Kleiner's template is helpful in moving forward.

## **2. Request and Discussion with Dr. Tzenis on Evaluation of Instruction**

Professor Kleiner welcomed Dr. Tzenis from the Center of Teaching and Learning Services. Dr. Tzenis told the committee about Dr. Raoul Arreola's upcoming visit to the University to facilitate a conference on teaching evaluations. Dr. Tzenis said she felt it was a priority for Dr. Arreola to work with the committee and asked members for help in establishing how best to use his time at the University. She noted that she had met with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and had developed a plan based on their suggestions, and that she would now like to incorporate this committee's changes and additions. The committee reviewed Dr. Tzenis's proposal and a discussion followed. Professor McLoon expressed skepticism that a student survey was an accurate measure of the mission of education in the first place, and wanted Dr. Arreola to take a position on this. Dr. Tzenis said that she would ask Dr. Arreola to address this. Professor Kleiner asked if Dr. Arreola was going to address evaluation of outcomes and Dr. Tzenis suggested that the committee present this in their small groups. She said she would send information to the committee members about Dr. Arreola's background and a summary of student evaluations. Professor McLoon expressed the need to adopt change but that faculty must be convinced and therefore should be invited to Dr. Arreola's presentation. Dr. Tzenis clarified that all faculty would be invited to all the sessions that Dr. Arreola would be facilitating. Professor Miller said she appreciated the need for faculty involvement but that different groups have different decision making processes, and different groups have different needs. Dr. Tzenis expressed her concern that with a large general audience it would be difficult to move forward accordingly. Professor McLoon suggested that a committee spend time with Dr. Arreola, and Dr. Tzenis again stressed that she would review the ideas that the committee established, incorporate them into Dr. Arreola's agenda, and review it with the committee. She thanked the committee for their time.

## **3. Endowed Chairs in CLA**

Professor Kleiner welcomed Dean Rosenstone and Associate Dean Parente to the committee to discuss the topic of Endowed Chairs in CLA and the different ways that evaluations occur. Dean Rosenstone discussed the ways that some chairs rotate: for instance, in one department, a chair is assigned to faculty for a fixed term. The chairholder's performance is then evaluated and a determination is made whether to re-appoint the chair or award it to someone else. In most cases, chairs and professorships are tied to a specific field and some to a specific department. He noted that there were just a few number of chairs in CLA that can be used at the discretion of the college. Moreover, in most case there is no special prescription of what is required of a chair. Dean Rosenstone went on to cite different examples of different requirements for chairs. He added that the one constant is the annual review of all chair holders as part of the faculty merit review process.

Professor Wiedmann asked if it would be valuable for the committee to develop a policy for chairs. Dean Rosenstone said that the highest aspirations of the institution should be embodied in the expectations for chair holders, and while they are reviewed on a regular basis, he felt there was no practical way to apply additional uniform standards to all chairs. Associate Dean Parente added that there were standards for chairs but that a policy might inhibit to some degree negotiating with candidates for chairs. Professor Kleiner expressed concern with the checks and balances in place for chairs, suggesting that a chair might want a faculty member out of their position. He reiterated the committee's concern about faculty input in the process. Dean Rosenstone gave examples of drawing upon endowed chairs to enable the college to compete with comparable major institutions to retain outstanding faculty. He noted the University strives through the merit process to act in a preventive manner. Assessment of who is most deserving to hold an endowed chair is based on information from the merit review process--a process that faculty is involved in. Professor Kleiner asked him if there would be any objection to a statement that faculty input be part of the process. Dean Rosenstone said no, but that that was already part of the process. He said he felt that they were meeting the spirit of the intent already, and if the committee recommends it, that it would be consistent with current practice in CLA. Dean Rosenstone also noted that two things they were trying to avoid was putting valued colleagues in a situation in which they were being turned down for an honor or adding more bureaucracy to the process.

Professor McLoon asked about the process of endowed chairs that reside within specific departments and Dean Rosenstone gave examples of recruiting and appointing faculty to such chairs. Professor McLoon asked if faculty had a say over every appointment and Dean Rosenstone indicated that faculty consultation is indeed part of the process. He gave an example of recruitment, and said that many chairs are restricted in terms of what field they can be in. He stressed that they were walking a fine line of using input from departments without complicating the process. Professor Wiedmann asked that if the committee came up with a policy statement, would he consider it. Dean Rosenstone replied he would be pleased to, but asked that the committee be sensitive to the variety of different types of chairs throughout the University. He urged the committee to consider ways to use precious resources which are crucial in faculty retention, and stressed that they wanted to effectively use those resources. Professor McLoon asked about salary obligations to faculty members. Dean Rosenstone said that in some cases, chair resources are being used to meet the base salary obligation to faculty members and suggested that a paragraph be included in the hiring letter that indicates a statement of expectations. He said that the aspirations of the chair are often outlined in the donor's endowment of the chair, and that he hoped this conveyed a sense of the responsibility that came with the chair. Professor McLoon noted the limited resources available and asked how to remove someone from a chair who was ineffective, and said that how the letter is written should be taken into consideration in the future. Professor Csallany queried as to whether the question should be left alone since it was so complicated. Professor Kleiner said that the question is, should there be a policy that governs the appointments. A discussion followed. Dean Rosenstone suggested that perhaps an affirmation of norms and expectations of good practices might be helpful. Professor Wallace said that he assumed there were no endowed chairs that escaped the merit review process, and Associate Dean Parente confirmed that was correct. Dean Rosenstone reiterated that all faculty are treated the same in the merit review process regardless of fund source, and said that they'd be pleased to give comments on a draft of a statement. Professor Kleiner thanked them for their discussion with the committee.

#### **4. Faculty Cultures**

Professor Kleiner welcomed Dr. Zetterberg, who presented information on faculty cultures. He noted that the strategic plan for the University is dealing with issues of faculty culture and he distributed

materials outlining such cultures. Dr. Zetterberg cited NIH, USDA and NSF cultures and reviewed the differences in cultures. He pointed out that while the University did not establish these cultures, they have just evolved, it is helpful recognize these differences. Dr. Zetterberg stressed that these were observations, not analyses, and noted that these different cultures are why it is so difficult to develop policies or models that work for everyone. Even discussions of "common good" are difficult because of the different "worlds" of the institution. Dr. Zetterberg also cited other major institutions which have parallel cultures and noted that the different cultures are driven by funding source. The committee discussed the various differences in cultures, and Dr. Zetterberg noted that while there might be overlap or some might not fit into any of these cultures, they were just discussing fundamental differences. Vice Provost Carney asked about cultures that are underfunded and don't fit into any of these groups, noting that this is a sizable group. Dr. Zetterberg reiterated that for the purposes of this discussion, he was speaking to fundamental differences in the predominant cultures, as these differences affect how policies are determined and effected across campuses.

Professor Kleiner thanked Dr. Zetterberg for the informative discussion and adjourned the meeting 4:10 pm.

--Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota