

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, September 11, 2007
2:30 – 4:15
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Geoffrey Sirc (chair), Ben Bornsztejn, Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Vladimir Cherkassky, Tom Clayton, Erin George, Jayne Fulkerson, Kathryn Hanna, Morris Kleiner, Holly Littlefield, Theodor Litman, Anna Masellis, Luis Ramos-Garcia, George Sheets, Roderick Squires, Virginia Zuiker

Absent: Carol Carrier, Larry Wallace

Guests: Jackie Singer (Director of Retirement Benefits)

[In these minutes: (1) welcome and TIAA; (2) Vice Provost Carney's role and responsibilities; (3) retiree issues; (4) issues and agendas for the year]

1. Welcome and TIAA

Professor Sirc convened the meeting at 2:35 and welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the year; he asked everyone to introduce themselves since there were a number of new Committee members.

Professor Kleiner reported that he has received more comments on retirement benefits than any other issue since he has been on the Committee, and especially about the elimination of TIAA as an option. Ms. Singer said she is preparing reports for the Retirement Subcommittee; she suggested she develop those reports and then bring them back to this Committee as well. Professor Kleiner said he would forward to the Subcommittee the questions he has received but added that he would like to see the item on a future agenda.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

Professor Sirc explained that he thought it would help the Committee if Vice President Carrier and Vice Provost Carney each explained their roles and responsibilities. Unfortunately, Vice President Carrier was called to another meeting at the last minute, but Vice Provost Carney could talk with the Committee about her position as Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

Vice Provost Carney briefly reviewed her career (Minnesota Ph.D.) and noted that after serving as a faculty member at several institutions, she came to the faculty here and served as department head for three years and associate dean of CLA for three years before assuming her present position in 2005.

Dr. Carney explained that she has three broad sets of responsibilities. One is for what one might call the "faculty life course": from new faculty orientation to promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. She reads all annual reviews for probationary faculty in colleges that report to the Provost (that

* 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.

is, except for those individuals in the Academic Health Center and on the coordinate campuses) and brings issues of concern to the Provost's attention. For the promotion and tenure process she consults with departments on procedures and process, with faculty about their own reviews, and with senior faculty who have questions about the process. She reads, for the Provost, all promotion and tenure files every year, including those from the Academic Health Center and the coordinate campuses except Duluth. She reports on the outcomes of all votes on all these files to the Provost. She then brings all files with variances in voting to the Provost's attention. The Provost then reads all the files with variances in voting from the department through the collegiate level as well as all files with recommendations for termination. All the files must go through the Provost; by Regents' policy, the Provost is the only one who makes recommendations to the Board on promotion and tenure. The Board of Regents is the body that actually confers tenure and promotion.

There were 176 promotion and tenure files last year, and she will provide a review to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The last two years have had the highest number of promotion and tenure files in the last ten years.

Professor Kleiner recalled that the Provost provided to the Committee a couple of years ago data about the number of individuals who began as assistant professors and ultimately obtained tenure. He said he would like to see those numbers again. It would be helpful to know, given the goal of being in the top three public institutions, whether it has become more or less difficult to obtain tenure in recent years. Dr. Carney said she could provide the data to the Committee and said there are a number of answers to Professor Kleiner's inquiry. The University is now using a method of calculating the tenure rate that is becoming more common in the CIC (the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago and Illinois at Chicago): a report on the outcome after seven years is developed for each cohort of probationary faculty that begins during an academic year. The University of Minnesota had about a 60% tenure success rate for the 1999 cohort. Michigan's rate, over a number of years, fluctuates between 51 and 57%; other CIC institutions have rates in the high 50%s (Penn State was 62% last year).

Another part of the faculty life course for which she is responsible is post-tenure review. The Provost provides an annual report to the Board of Regents on the topic; she can bring that report to this Committee and will also bring it to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. She serves as the University's respondent in promotion and tenure cases that go to the Senate Judicial Committee.

She also serves as an ex officio member of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, which had a very busy year last year reviewing changes to the tenure code and the associated Procedures. She thought it had been a very collaborative process, Professor Clayton (chair of Academic Freedom and Tenure) concurred.

A second major area of responsibility is faculty development, which increased a great deal last year. She oversees the 3-day new-faculty orientation (142 participants this year), which has received very positive reviews. Her office also sponsors four lunches/seminars with new faculty during the year as a way to continue to talk to them. She is responsible for two CIC programs, one for academic leadership (five faculty per year, who are interested in administration, visit three campuses on three different weekend for meetings) and one for academic department chairs. She also runs a new-chair program (which had 25 participants last year and 22 this year) in which the chairs meet with the President and the Provost, other chairs, and people from the General Counsel's office and from Human Resources; it is a full program about the issues they face as department chairs.

Her third area of responsibility is the assessment of student learning. She is responsible for coordination of the Student Learning Outcomes adopted by the Senate last year.

She also works with the Women's Faculty Cabinet; the Center for Teaching and Learning Services has a dotted-line reporting relationship to her as well.

Dr. Carney reported that she is reviewing all the tenure-code-required 7.12 statements and all of them will be returned to departments by the middle of fall semester. She is looking at the full range of the statements and providing feedback to departments. In general the statements are dramatically improved; the faculty should feel good about the revised statements because while it was an onerous task to rework them, a great deal has been clarified.

The new tenure code will be in place this fall, and so will the new procedures and 7.12 statements. Dr. Carney said she was recently at a conference and people were stunned at what the University has done all at once with its tenure code and procedures. She said she hopes to present to Academic Freedom and Tenure and to Faculty Affairs reports on the number of units that talk about public engagement, interdisciplinary work, technology transfer, etc., in their 7.12 statements. She said she cannot report yet whether there are differences by college or field. This will be a unique opportunity to see the values of the University as reflected in the revised statements.

Will the changes in the tenure code affect the tenuring-success rate, Professor Sirc asked? That is hard to tell, Dr. Carney said. She presented the COACHE survey results (of probationary faculty) last year and will do so again in 2008; it will be interesting to see if probationary faculty see the tenure standards as clearer, given the dramatic changes that have been adopted. It will also be interesting to see if there is a change in the number promoted to professor (there were a large number of such promotions last year). Is there any link between these process factors and the University's strategic-positioning goal of the improved quality of the University, Professor Kleiner asked? There is, Dr. Carney said; the statements and code are much clearer about the goal of probationary faculty (to become professors) and what they must focus on.

Professor Bornshtein said he had participated in rewriting two different 7.12 statements in the Medical School; the focus was on stopping the tenure clock. Is that new? It is not, Dr. Carney said; the provision has been in the tenure code for a number of years (section 5.5). The Provost asked that every 7.12 statement address section 5.5. She also stresses section 5.5 at the new faculty orientation. Professor Bornshtein agreed that faculty awareness about this provision of the code has been raised.

Professor Ramos-Garcia said the post-tenure review process was confusing to his department: Is it initiated by the Provost or within the department? Always within the department, Vice Provost Carney said, and the process is outlined in section 7a of the tenure code. It is presumed to be part of the review of faculty; some departments use the annual merit review process. If a person is found to be below standards by both the department chair and a committee of faculty, an improvement plan is to be adopted. There is confusion about this process, she agreed, even though the language in the code is clear. The issue is that departments may not have clear standards of performance for post-tenure review, so the Provost asked that the standards be articulated in the 7.12 statements. Who is supposed to notice if a faculty member is doing no research, Professor Ramos-Garcia asked? The department, Dr. Carney said.

The goal, Dr. Carney said, is that once they are completed, every 7.12 statement will be on the Provost's website so that departments can all see all of the statements.

Professor Ramos-Garcia also asked about the standard to be used when a book has been accepted by a publisher. Dr. Carney said she and Provost will use the department 7.12 statement as the gold standard: when does a department say that a book is published? It helps when a department is clear about this. The Provost will look at the personnel file and compare it to the 7.12 statement; if the department makes a decision different from the 7.12 statement, that is a case when the Provost may make a decision different from the department.

Professor Sheets asked what version of the 7.12 statement is to be used with new assistant professors, since the revised 7.12 statements have not been returned from the Provost. Dr. Carney suggested providing them the current statement and the draft of the new statement (the new 7.12 statement is to be voted on by all tenured and probationary faculty). She affirmed that all new assistant professors will have the right to choose between the old and the new 7.12 statement. All new faculty are bound by the revised section 7.11 of the tenure code (if they started after June 8, 2007); if they select the old 7.12 statement, which will refer to the old section 7.11 of the tenure code, they are still bound by the new section 7.11. Once the revised Procedures are approved, there will be a memorandum of understanding with every assistant professor which indicates which 7.12 statement he or she selected; this memorandum will be signed by the chair/head, the dean, the Provost, and her, Dr. Carney said, so there is a record. The probationary faculty member will have a year to decide. Having the record is important for the protection of the faculty member. The same will be true for associate professors, she added; there will be a lot of memoranda of understanding but that is the cleanest way to make sure everyone knows what choice has been made.

3. Retiree Issues for the Senate

Professor Sirc drew the attention of Committee members to a draft motion and provided background information for those new to the Committee. It was approached last year by two faculty from the University of Minnesota Retirees Association (UMRA) who were concerned that benefits for retirees were not as well administered as they could be and provided a policy they wished brought to the Senate. The Committee agreed with the spirit of the recommendation but not the way it was written, so he and Professor Wiedmann redrafted it for Committee discussion and action.

The redrafted motion read as follows:

** start of draft motion **

The University Senate recommends that the University:

1. Develop a system-wide process to:
 - a) invite all retiring employees to contribute their skills to the University after formal retirement;
 - b) distribute timely information to employees concerning benefits, privileges, and opportunities of retirees;
 - c) oversee the provision of benefits provided by colleges and departments, not only to retired professors, but also to civil service and professional and administrative staff;

- d) amend the Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti and the Regents' Conflict Resolution Policy to include all retired faculty, civil service and professional and administrative employees; and
 - e) always use gender-inclusive language such as "retired faculty" instead of "emeriti faculty." When referring to individuals, of course the traditional "Professor Emeritus" and "Professor Emerita" are appropriate.
2. Coordinate and facilitate the service of retirees in the areas of
 - a) mentoring new or junior University faculty members,
 - b) participating in advisory teams for interdisciplinary centers,
 - c) teaching courses,
 - d) advising and examining undergraduate and graduate students where needed,
 - e) mentoring or tutoring individual undergraduate or graduate students in their specialties, such as in English language acquisition for foreign students, in writing, in developing library skills, or in orientation to the University beyond the students' regular classroom instruction,
 - f) serving on University search committees, development committees, or governance committees, where appropriate and when needed by the University, and serving as advocates for the University in situations where the University's needs and the retirees' abilities and concerns match.
 3. Implement the Regents' Policy concerning "listing in directories" to include retired faculty, civil service and professional and administrative retirees in all directory listings and Web sites at every level.
 4. Ensure that achievements and honors of retirees be noted systematically in college and University publications, such as possibly having a designated retirees section in the Provost's Academic Update and similar materials.
 5. Host an annual reception honoring all retirees (faculty, professional and administrative employees, and civil service staff) of the previous twelve months, with the University president and some members of Board of Regents present.
 6. Consider the establishment of a University-supported Retirement Center.

(Note: There are numerous models around the country for relationships of retirees groups with the universities. Some retirees' associations are arms of the university, some are entirely separate but related in the manner of student organizations or a faculty union, some are members of parallel bodies like alum associations. The University of Minnesota has a volunteer center sponsored by retirees, the University Retirees Volunteer Center, and also the University of Minnesota Retirees Association (UMRA). Looking at the model that is being developed at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, The Senate recommends that SCFA begin discussions with appropriate administrative officers about the possibility of establishing a University-supported Retirement Center along the lines of the Madison proposal. [See Web link www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2006/1204/1958.pdf.] Such a center might consolidate budget, space, activities and authority for its retirees within the University and focus the organization of retired persons who might be helpful to the University when they are needed.)

COMMENT:

The Faculty Retirees' Bill of Rights was adopted by the Senate on April 16, 1998, and the Regents included most of it in their Policy on Faculty Emeriti (July 14, 2000). The UMRA Web site (www.umn.edu/umra) prominently displays these policies.

The 1998 Senate Resolution points out that in addition to pension and health plans, "many emeriti[/ae] wished to retain a connection with the University by volunteering or contracting their services, continuing their research, or working with students, affirmed that such continuing ties brought substantial benefits to retirees and University alike, and urged that policies be developed for dealing with such activity."

The Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti further elaborates that "the University shall provide the following privileges and services to a faculty emeritus[/a] equal to those provided to regular faculty:

- 1) email accounts;
- 2) library privileges;
- 3) listing in the University directory;
- 4) some faculty discounts offered by the University as identified in the administrative procedures; and
- 5) other services of a cost and nature similar to those listed above and as identified in the administrative procedures." (Administrative Procedures document approved by University Senate April 20, 2000)

In addition, a November 2004 report sponsored by President Robert Bruininks and Senior Vice President for Administration Robert Jones and conducted by Professor Carole J. Bland, Director of Research in Family Medicine, concludes that late-career senior faculty desire the following ten institutional relationships and benefits following retirement:

- 1) health care benefits (98%),
- 2) intellectual stimulation,
- 3) emeritus status (80%),
- 4) library privileges (majority),
- 5) office access (majority),
- 6) part-time teaching opportunities (majority),
- 7) parking privileges (majority),
- 8) faculty association (40%),
- 9) institutional volunteer roles (33%), and
- 10) institutional fundraising roles (21%).

Some of these--emeritus/a status, library privileges, office space where available, teaching and office services use possibilities, and parking privileges--are available either by University arrangements, UMRA negotiations, or through the University Retirees Volunteer Center. Although outstanding opportunities have been made available to many retired faculty through their departments and colleges, recent discussions in UMRA have revealed that policies regarding retirees have been unevenly implemented and do not include some important matters. The UMRA goal is to seek to have them available to all. SCFA would like to explore the possibilities, with the support of the Faculty Senate.

** end of draft motion **

One issue that came up, Professor Sirc said, is moving more of the responsibility for retiree benefits to central administration, and out of departments, to help ensure more equal application of the rules. Professor Litman agreed. The problem has been at lower levels, he said; deans and department heads change and retired faculty are left in the lurch. Some decisions are made for financial reasons, which everyone knows. One point of the motion, however, is to encourage units to draw on retirees to assist with achieving the University's mission. It is clear that many retired faculty want to do that, informally and formally, but there is considerable variation in recognition of that work. The future of the professoriate is in danger because universities are relying more on adjunct and temporary faculty and graduate students are saying they do not want to be faculty at research universities; retired faculty are a potential resource for the University in these circumstances. In some cases, of course, a department chair is happy to see someone leave.

Professor Bornshtein asked if the call for the establishment of a retirees center would allow the two existing groups of retirees to collaborate. (UMRA and the University Retirees Volunteer Organization). The Wisconsin model appears to be an efficient one. Professor Litman said the dream is to merge the two organizations in a retiree center. The most extensive operation is at Penn State; at Minnesota, retiree activity is dispersed across the institution. The idea behind the proposal is to provide a presence and an opportunity for greater participation. Not all retirees want to participate but such a center would provide a greater opportunity to do so for those who wish to.

Professor Litman affirmed that retirees are not represented in the University Senate but noted that they do serve on the Benefits Advisory Committee and have representatives at Regents' meetings.

Professor Ramos-Garcia asked if this document refers to department committees. He said that some departments invite retired faculty to participate while others do not. Will the University impose a regulation that all who are interested must be allowed to participate so that participation is not subject to the whim of departments? Professor Litman said the proposal is very general; he attends his division and department meetings and does not mind that he does not have a vote, but he wants to be able to speak. He will not be around the unit as long as those who must vote on and live with the decisions but he can provide advice and history. The point is that a valuable resource is going to waste.

The distinction between departments and the University is important, Professor Sheets said. At the department level, in a small department, if retired faculty members have a vote the result can be to freeze or inhibit department policies. The right to speak and advise should not be limited, but those who must live with the results should be the ones who have a vote. This is not a problem in many cases, but sometimes defining a new position can be contentious because the retiree may have strong feelings about "his" or "her" line. A department can deal respectfully with those views while also acknowledging changes in the discipline. If a University policy required that retired faculty be allowed to vote, that would trump department policies. Professor Ramos-Garcia agreed they should have a voice but not a vote.

Is the Retiree Bill of Rights, now ten years old, still vigorous, Professor Bornshtein asked? It is, Professor Litman said; the problem is the lack of dissemination.

Committee members made a few minor editing suggestions, which Professor Sirc agreed to handle, and that agreed that it would review the revised motion by email.

4. Issues and Agendas

Professor Sirc asked Committee members to look over the proposed meeting agendas and issues pending list that had been distributed. He asked if there were any missing topics.

-- Professor Hanna reported that she is on an ad hoc subcommittee dealing with faculty expertise databases and that there will be a report later in the year. The idea is how to make expertise part of faculty activity reporting; if there were a computerized database, expertise could be part of it.

-- Professor Kleiner suggested an item addressing the role of faculty in selecting those who are to have endowed professorships; Professor Sirc said that issue will be taken up in the revision of the Faculty Compensation Policy.

-- Professor Litman asked about tuition reductions for employee dependents; that will be taken up as a possible "menu of benefits" option.

-- Mr. Chapman recalled a summer email exchange about better communication between this Committee and the Benefits Advisory Committee; he and Professor Litman serve on both, and perhaps a once- or twice-per-year report from one to the other would assist in allocating agenda items.

-- Professor Squires asked if the Committee is sure it is discussing the issues most important to faculty. What of issues that never bubble up to the Committee? Part of the job of Committee members is to identify issues, Professor Sirc replied.

-- Professor Hanna said that some areas of the University are hiring a lot of teaching faculty and contract faculty without consultation with the tenured faculty. The practice is proliferating.

-- CLA faces a shortfall of \$2 million so it must save money; is that true across the University or just in CLA, Professor Ramos-Garcia asked? Faculty have to save on ink and paper.

-- A related issue that is a source of dismay, Professor Sheets said, is the assumption by CLA in this year's department budgets that operating expenses can be subsidized by donated funds in a department's private endowment accounts. It had been thought that private donations would be used for extra things, not operating expenses. That is a legal issue, Professor Litman said. In the past, it was common to use donor funds as a department wished; now the Foundation takes into account donor intent. Some places have had big disputes over donor intent. Professor Sirc suggested this issue be referred to the Committee on Finance and Planning and said he would contact Professor Martin, chair of that committee.

Professor Sirc thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand