

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs**  
**Tuesday, May 25, 2010**  
**2:30 – 4:15**  
**510 Morrill Hall**

Present: Kathryn Hanna (chair), Ben Bornsztein, Arlene Carney, Carol Carrier, Randy Croce, Jayne Fulkerson, Morris Kleiner, Frank Kulacki, Holly Littlefield, Theodor Litman, Karen Miksch, George Sheets, Geoffrey Sirc, Roderick Squires, James Wojtaszek

Absent: Marilyn Bruin, Dann Chapman, Vladimir Cherkassky, Barbara Elliott, Valerie Khominich, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Jason Shaw

Guests: Joe Shultz (Office of the Provost), Nan Wilhelmson (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources)

Other: Jackie Singer (Director, Retirement Benefits)

[In these minutes: (1) congratulations; (2) faculty compensation comparisons; (3) promotion and tenure/P&A continuous appointments data 2009-10; (4) college personnel plans; (5) policy on performance management for academic P&A employees; (6) thanks]

**1. Congratulations**

Professor Hanna convened the meeting at 2:35. Vice President Carrier noted that Mr. Croce had won the President's Outstanding Service Award; Committee members gave him a round of applause.

**2. Faculty Compensation Comparisons**

Professor Hanna turned next to Vice Provost Carney, who introduced Dr. Shultz from the Provost's Office, who prepared the presentation on faculty compensation presented by the Provost to the Board of Regents in May.

The policy question, Dr. Shultz explained, is this: "Is the University of Minnesota competitively positioned to recruit and retain faculty of the quality necessary for the University to reach its strategic positioning goal to become one of the top three public research universities?" This is a question in which the Board of Regents is very interested. One way they try to address it is by looking at faculty compensation.

Dr. Shultz reviewed the AAUP faculty salary survey and who it includes (tenured/tenure-track faculty, full time, non-medical, salaries equated to nine months). The definition is important (there are myriad definitions of "faculty"; the AAUP definition allows comparisons across institutions). The AAUP survey includes both salary as well as compensation; the latter includes Social Security, retirement, medical/dental insurance, life insurance, and so on. Dr. Shultz noted that "average compensation and

---

\* 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.

salary for faculty members across different universities vary primarily due to: "market factors, the mix of disciplines on a campus, the cost of living and local tax burden, state and university initiatives, and variance in fringe benefit packages." The first two are the most important, he told the Committee. An institution with more liberal-arts programs will likely have lower average salaries than an institution that also has law, business, and similar professional programs.

The standard comparison group used as often as possible for the Twin Cities campus is this:

Pennsylvania State University – University Park  
University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign  
The Ohio State University – Columbus  
University of California – Los Angeles  
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor  
University of Wisconsin – Madison  
University of Washington – Seattle  
University of California – Berkeley  
University of Texas – Austin  
University of Florida

The standard comparison group used for the Morris campus is this:

Carleton College  
Macalester College  
Ramapo College – New Jersey  
St. Olaf College  
Saint John's University  
St. Mary's College – Maryland  
University of North Carolina – Asheville  
College of Saint Benedict  
University of Mary-Washington  
Hamline University  
Concordia College – Morehead  
University of Maine – Farmington

Dr. Shultz also provided the comparison groups for the Crookston and Duluth campuses. Dr. Carney noted that the Provost does not choose the comparison groups for coordinate campuses, and they could change, because they are more difficult to come up with.

Dr. Shultz turned next to the salary and compensation rankings for the Twin Cities campus among the 11 comparison institutions.

Total compensation:

Year	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	All Professors (full, assoc., assist.)
------	-------------------	------------------------	------------------------	---

---

---

Fall 2009	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2008	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2007	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2006	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>

Salaries:

Year	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	All Professors (full, assoc., assist.)
Fall 2009	8 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2008	7 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2007	7 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2006	7 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>

The numbers are fairly stable, Dr. Shultz said. In compensation, the Twin Cities tends to be in the top third of the group; in salaries, it falls in the bottom third.

When one looks at total compensation, and at salaries, over the period 2004, and compares the Twin Cities campus with the comparison group, the University lost some ground on salary (with the salary freeze) but remained about the same in total compensation.

The data for Morris are these. Total compensation:

Year	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	All Professors (full, assoc., assist.)
Fall 2009	9 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2008	9 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>

Fall 2007	7 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2006	6 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>

Salaries:

Year	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	All Professors (full, assoc., assist.)
Fall 2009	12 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2008	12 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>	11 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2007	10 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	11 <sup>th</sup>
Fall 2006	11 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	13 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>

Dr. Shultz next reviewed a complicated table comparing fringe benefits for full professors across the Twin Cities comparison group. The average value of the fringe benefits at Minnesota (\$40,512) is less than that only at UC Berkeley and UCLA (\$46,586 and \$47,166), and is markedly greater than that at the other eight institutions (by \$8,000 to over \$15,000).

Professor Kulacki inquired if there is any trend in the data worth noting. There did not appear to be. Professor Kleiner inquired how the calculations could be made when some institutions have a defined-benefit retirement plan while others have a defined-contribution plan. Dr. Carrier said the comparisons are based on employer contribution, and Dr. Shultz has done a replacement ratio for retirement programs irrespective of the way they are funded. Ms. Singer commented that the UC institutions may have retiree medical coverage, which would increase their benefit noticeably.

Professor Kulacki asked if, based on the Pulse survey, faculty put a greater emphasis on benefits or on salary. Dr. Carrier said the results have been pretty consistent: Faculty are happy about their benefits but not so much so about their salaries. Do they know about the benefits, Professor Kulacki asked? If they did, that might be a reason for them not to be quite as agitated about salaries. As well as knowing how they stand vis-à-vis their peers, Professor Kleiner added. Professor Kulacki agreed and said it will be important to get the comparisons for 2012 out to the faculty.

Dr. Shultz next noted the factors affecting recruitment and retention: reputation of university, compensation, family considerations, geographic preference, quality of faculty relationships, quality of students and support for graduate students, quality of libraries, laboratories, and infrastructure, and funding support for new faculty members. The Provost is very interested in retention, Dr. Shultz reported, and has in the past asked the deans to provide data about the number of faculty members who go elsewhere.

Professor Wojtaszek asked how frequently the data are run; is it possible to look back and see if the situation is better or worse than it has been in the past? And how often do campuses revise their peer groups? Dr. Shultz said that Dr. Goldfine in Institutional Research could probably pull the data for prior years; as for peer groups, they communicate each spring with the coordinate campuses about their peer group for the University's accountability report. At that time they confirm or revised the group. The Morris campus, he added, has an "aggressive" peer group.

Professor Kleiner said the two important issues to faculty are compensation and quality. Is there any relationship between compensation and relative rank? The University has a reputational goal (be among the top three public research universities); what is the relationship between compensation and ranking so that the University knows what it has to do? Dr. Shultz suggested the Committee speak with Dr. Goldfine, although he said he did not believe there was a strong relationship between the two variables. One problem is that there is no standardized way to look at rankings, Dr. Carney observed. U.S. News ranking is one metric, Dr. Shultz said; Dr. Carney noted that the National Research Council rankings are another, but they haven't come out. Professor Kleiner said he would like to see what the correlation is with commonly-used ranking systems. Dr. Carney repeated that the Committee should ask Dr. Goldfine.

Professor Hanna suggested that the Committee receive an annual report on compensation and salary rankings. She thanked Dr. Shultz for his report.

### **3. Promotion and Tenure for Faculty/P&A Continuous Appointments 2009-10**

Professor Hanna asked Vice Provost Carney to lead her annual presentation on promotion and tenure. Dr. Carney noted that it is the presentation she and Provost Sullivan make to the Board of Regents each year. The numbers reflect two populations: Those on the tenure track and those who have just been promoted (e.g., Clinical Scholars in the AHC). They in the Provost's office look at all the files and present them to the Board of Regents.

Dr. Carney reviewed the basic principles of tenure, set out in the tenure code (last revised in 2007), which include a set of standards and criteria in each department in addition to University standards, indefinite appointments after a six-year probation, annual reviews before and after tenure is granted, and a rigorous process in the decision year.

File from the non-AHC colleges come to the Provost after department and college review; in the case of the Twin Cities colleges without departments, the college recommendation goes to an all-University committee, and in the case of the AHC colleges, the files go through the Senior Vice President for the Academic Health Center. She also sees the files from the coordinate campuses except Duluth, which go directly to the Board of Regents in accord with the contract with the faculty union.

This year, system-wide, there were 184 total candidates (all campuses, including Duluth), 154 tenure/tenure-track faculty and 30 non-tenure-track candidates. The 184 fell in the following categories:

- 90 assistant to associate professor with tenure (up from 27 last year; it fluctuates)
- 1 assistant professor non-reappointment
- 4 tenure only (typically an untenured associate professors)
- 86 promotion only (associate to full professor plus promotion of Clinical Scholars)

- 1 continuation in rank (associate professor)
- 1 associate to full professor with tenure
- 1 pending (if the Provost cannot decide on a file by May 15, it is pending; this typically means a re-review of the file is planned; there could have been a problem with the procedure or something else; the Provost will not make a decision if he questionable elements in the process)

Dr. Carney also provided data on the breakdown by gender (of the 90 promotions of assistants to associate, 58 were men and 32 were women; of the 85 cases of promotion-only, 51 were men and 35 were women). The University is doing well in the number of decisions it is making about women, Dr. Carney commented, although there was a slightly-lower proportion of women this year (last year it was about 50/50). There is also a good trend in the number of women promoted from associate to full professor.

Overall, 68% of tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University are men and 32% are women; a couple of years ago it was 72% men. Dr. Carney reminded the Committee that half of the faculty are full professors, who are about 80% men; 25% are associate professors, who are about 60% men, so there is a pipeline and women are moving through the system. Of the 2009-10 cohort, 62% were men and 38% women.

With respect to race and ethnicity, of the 111 men in the group, 77 were white, 26 were Asian/Pacific Islander, 3 were African-American, 3 were Hispanic, 1 was American Indian, and the background of 1 was not known. The numbers were parallel for the 73 women in the group: 63 white, 6 Asian, 2 African-American, 2 American Indian. The number of decisions about faculty of color has increased. For the system, 83% of tenured and tenure-track faculty are white and 17% are faculty of color; the 2009-10 cohort is 76% white and 24% faculty of color.

Dr. Carney reported that only 1 of the 91 faculty members who were evaluated for tenure and promotion was denied tenure. Despite this fact, it is incorrect to assume that almost all faculty members achieve tenure at the University. One member of the Board of Regents was unhappy that only 1 of 91 faculty were denied tenure. What many may not realize is that the University has a rigorous annual review process and, thereby, a robust process for counseling people out of the tenure track if it becomes apparent they will not succeed—and people leave before they come up for tenure. They look at the rate of tenure success by examining what happens to an entering cohort of assistant professors in any given year. They follow the cohort over the full probationary cycle of seven years and take a snapshot at different points in time. There are four possible outcomes for those hired in any cohort: received tenure and are still at the University; receive tenure but left the University; left the University without tenure; and are still at the University on the tenure track (e. g., they "stopped" the tenure clock because they became parents). The "Tenure Success Rate" thus includes those who achieved tenure and stayed at the University plus those who achieved tenure but subsequently left. They have looked at the Tenure Success Rate over a three-year period and also look at rolling three-year averages.

Professor Kleiner asked if faculty are leaving to go to peer or better institutions or to different types of jobs because it was not a good fit at this institution or for their career. Dr. Carney said they cannot get a definite answer to that question. Some who leave do not provide information and the University does not always know where they are going. They can look at the years leading up to departure; in over 50% of the cases, things were not going well. It does not appear that those who depart are stellar faculty who go elsewhere. And people do receive consistent messages (rather than being told

everything is fine during the probationary years and then suddenly told they will not receive tenure—she does not like to see that happen because it means something is wrong with the process).

They have data for five cohorts (1998-2002) and three three-year averages. The data (percentages) are these:

	Tenure Success Rate		
	Overall	Men	Women
1998-2000	59.3	60.3	57.9
1999-2001	57.2	63	47.8
2000-2002	55.3	62.7	45

(The data for white faculty and faculty of color were virtually identical.) These data are remarkably similar to those from the University of Michigan, which is the institution that developed the "Tenure Success Rate" measure.

Dr. Carney cautioned that while it may appear that the Tenure Success Rate for women faculty is declining, it is not. The category of "still employed after 7 years and non-tenured) is larger for women and increasing in size [because] more women than men opt to extend their probationary periods for childbirth, adoption, and caregiving." They are following these individuals carefully, and when extension of the probationary period is taken into account, there appears to be no difference in the Tenure Success Rate for men and women—which makes her more comfortable with the idea of extending the probationary period for childbirth/adoption.

Professor Sheets inquired if the rolling three-year averages mollified regental concern about the tenure-success rate. They did, Dr. Carney said, and she defended the University's standards vigorously. She emphasized that the Provost's office does not want to see a process whereby people are lured along for six years and then told they are done. She said that she has been happy to see, as she reads annual reviews, that departments have become more explicit about shortcomings and what probationary faculty must do. She said she also likes to see "treatment plans" if departments identify weaknesses, because they can be cryptic so she may not know if the faculty member received adequate information.

Professor Hanna wondered if a number of assistant professors resigned at the beginning of their decision year if they knew they would probably not receive tenure. A number resigned during their fifth year, Dr. Carney said, but none during the decision year. Once the process of review for tenure starts, she includes them in the data on granted or denied tenure. So if there is not a good fit, they tend to resign earlier, Professor Hanna said. Dr. Carney said that some probationary faculty members resign at the end of the 5th year and the University will allow them to stay through the end of their 7th year—because if they had stayed through their 6th year, they would have had a terminal year anyway. So the University lets them stay (although many leave) because they have decided to err on the side of being as humane and equitable as possible. But the University does lose over 40% of the cohorts along the way, Professor Hanna observed.

Mr. Croce inquired whether it would be problematic if few assistant professors achieved tenure; would that not reflect on the choices made in hiring? It would, Dr. Carney agreed. She said she sees it as good that most assistant professors are granted tenure; if they receive it, typically they stay at the University (although a few leave).

Dr. Carney also reviewed data for P&A staff on continuous appointments (fewer than 4% of P&A staff—112 individuals). Half of them are in the Libraries; the others are attorneys, educational or clinical specialists, academic advisors, physicians, and curators. They go through a six-year probationary process and are reviewed by the unit and by a University committee. She reads all those files as well. This year there were three recommendations for continuous appointments (2 men, 1 woman; 2 whites and 1 individual of color).

Professor Sirc inquired if, once faculty members receive tenure, there is a regular rhythm to eventual promotion to full professor. Dr. Carney said that in 2005 she looked at data for individuals who have spent their careers at the University; at that point it took an average of 8 years to go from promotion to associate professor to promotion to full professor—but there was a large standard deviation in the number. In 2010, the number has dropped. The tenure policy has changed and she has held workshops for associate professors; she reported that she has been pleased at the number of people who attend the workshops who actually then get promoted to full professor. She pointed out that associate professors are not subject to post-tenure review simply because they do not go up for promotion to full professor: The University and departments have goals and expectations about going to full professor as well as standards to retain tenure—and they are not the same. There are differences across colleges in the number of years it takes to go from assistant to full professor; in IT it takes about five years while in CLA the distribution is bimodal. One problem is that there is no regular system to review associate professors, although some 7.12 statements do call for reviews every couple of years. She said she would bring the data in the fall.

Professor Hanna thanked Vice Provost Carney for her report.

#### **4. College Personnel Plans**

Professor Hanna turned to Ms. Wilhelmson to present data on collegiate personnel plans.

Ms. Wilhelmson recalled the existence of the 2001 policy that identifies categories of individuals who have appointments with a teaching function and that requires every college to prepare a personnel plan indicating which categories of appointment it will use to hire. (The categories are regular—tenured or tenure-track—faculty, contract faculty, temporary faculty, visiting faculty, outside adjuncts, P&A instructional staff, and P&A staff with a secondary instructional appointment.) The policy also requires that if the number of (contract faculty plus P&A instructional staff) exceeds 25% of the number of regular faculty, the college must file a supplemental plan to explain the use of contract faculty and P&A instructional staff. The highlights of the college plans are brought to the Committee every year. Ms. Wilhelmson provided copies of a single-page table of data with the number of FTE appointments in each of the seven categories by college; the totals for the system (excluding Crookston and Duluth) are as follows for the three years 2008, 2009, 2010 (fractions dropped/rounded):

Regular faculty:	2685, 2679, 2649
Contract faculty:	501, 547, 568
Temporary faculty:	38, 37, 11
Visiting faculty:	32, 21, 11
Adjunct Outside:	70, 73, 70
P&A Instructional:	539, 528, 495
P&A Secondary Appt:	2, 1, 1

Dr. Littlefield inquired about "outside adjuncts." They are typically retired faculty or someone who has an outside job who are hired to teach, Ms. Wilhelmson responded, and average about 30% time. There are variations in how colleges choose to appoint people, Dr. Carney observed; one might appoint them as P&A instructors while another might appoint them as adjuncts. What if someone is teaching one night class; in what category would he or she fall, Dr. Littlefield asked? That depends on what they are called, Dr. Carney said. Some colleges call them P&A appointees and do not use the "outside adjunct" category at all. It has not been possible to get all the units to agree on use of the same appointments.

Professor Kleiner said that one issue that has come up in the past is the growth in the number of administrators compared to the number of faculty; have they tracked that? Not as part of gathering data required by this policy, Ms. Wilhelmson said. Where do chairs and graduate advisors show up, Professor Kleiner asked? As faculty, Ms. Wilhelmson replied. They are regular faculty members who have an additional without-salary appointment.

Professor Fulkerson recalled that the Committee has talked before about gathering data on the number of contract faculty and how they are being used. The numbers of contract faculty have increased, the opposite of what one would expect. Ms. Wilhelmson said that the answer will be probably be provided by the study of Clinical Scholar appointments in the Academic Health Center; she noted that the vast majority of the contract faculty appointments, and the increase in such appointments, has occurred in the AHC.

Professor Kulacki asked how the numbers are used as a management tool, how they figure into planning for the faculty as a whole across the University, and the uses to which they will be put. They serve multiple purposes, Dr. Carrier said. If there is an excessive number of contract faculty, that is a development that should be discussed. With the hiring "pause," there were still classes that needed to be taught, Dr. Carney added, and when departments could not hire tenured/tenure-track faculty, they may have used contract faculty. It is difficult to know if this is a blip in the data or something about which the Committee should be concerned.

Professor Miksch reported that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure also sees the college personnel plans and is currently reviewing the plan from the School of Dentistry. A college needs permission to exceed the 25% limit. What happens if a college ignores the policy, Professor Hanna asked?

There is a principle underlying the 25% limit, Professor Kulacki said; could it vary with the department? Nothing was tracked before, Dr. Carrier related, and there were a lot of people working at the University for years without benefits. A "temporary" employee could have been here 20 years without benefits.

The bottom line trend is that the number of regular faculty has decreased slightly, contract faculty numbers are up, and P&A instructional staff are down, Professor Hanna concluded. What is not included is a big-picture analysis that includes student numbers. There could be a decrease in the number of graduate students, Dr. Carney commented; Professor Hanna said she believed the number of undergraduates has increased. Professor Miksch inquired if the number of contract faculty increased, and P&A instructional staff decreased, because people were reclassified. That happened in the AHC, Dr. Carney said.

Mr. Croce asked about contract faculty. They are faculty expected to do teaching, research, and service, Ms. Wilhelmson said, and can have a wide variety of the percentage of their time devoted to each. Someone could do research 5% of the time and teach for the rest. But they must carry out all three missions. Professor Sheets inquired if contract faculty are limited in the number of years they can hold such an appointment; they are not, Ms. Wilhelmson said. They usually have annual or 3-5-year appointments, Dr. Carrier said. Dr. Carney reported that the Chronicle of Higher Education has compared a number of institutions; the University's contract and P&A have benefits identical to the faculty, while at many institutions they receive only a salary, no benefits. One must have at least a 50%-time appointment to receive any benefits, Professor Hanna noted.

Dr. Littlefield pointed out that the table of data did not provide information on the number of appointees who held <50%-time appointments. Dr. Carrier said that headcount data can be provided; it was agreed that the Committee wished to see the headcount data by percentage-time of appointment.

## **5. Policy on Performance Management for Academic P&A Employees**

Ms. Wilhelmson reported that there has been an ongoing comprehensive review of all administrative policies; in this case, Performance Management for Academic Professional and Administrative Employees, most of the changes were made to fit the policy to the standard University format. Much of the information originally in the policy is now in appendices and procedures.

One procedure is entitled "Assessing the Performance of Senior Administrators." There is one for deans and one for senior administrators, Ms. Wilhelmson reported, and they are largely the same. At one time the policy called for a comprehensive three-year review and an optional 360-degree review. What happened over time is that they found the three-year review was not very effective, in part because there was a low participation rate, so the procedure now calls for a 360-degree review. There has been considerable work done in Human Resources on organizational effectiveness and on competencies; first the process for deans was improved and this one now provides a procedure for senior administrators (level 1, vice presidents/chancellors, and level 2, others). The competencies are incorporated in this document.

For the reviews, they use about 20 raters and web tool developed by an outside vendor. They use this process because for most senior administrators there is not a large enough population that can be tapped to participate in a review. This tool provides a mechanism for those who interact with the administrator to provide reviews.

Dr. Carrier said the President wished to replicate the model of the review of the deans. At one time there were big reviews that took two or more years (because they could not get responses to requests for participation). This process involves selection of about 20 people to review the individual; the officer selects some of the 20 in consultation with his or her boss, those who report to the individual are included, as is the boss. The process is done electronically and takes about three or three and one-half months from start to finish. Those who are knowledgeable generate a report on what the individual needs to pay attention to. This is a common approach in large organizations, Dr. Carrier said, and gets high response rates. The President is using the system for all senior administrators.

Is there any public announcement of a review so that someone can provide their views, Professor Hanna asked? Or is it strictly the selected pool of reviewers? It is strictly the selected pool, Dr. Carrier said, but anyone can provide information in an annual-review process. The annual reports are taken seriously; this review supplements those reports.

How does one know when deans are being reviewed, Professor Hanna asked? The reviews are announced in Brief, Dr. Carrier said, and to people in the college.

Professor Bornsztejn noted that the procedure calls for a self-assessment. What weight is given to it? One can look at how one rates oneself compared to how one's boss and peers rate one, Dr. Carrier said. If there is a big gap, there is some learning required.

Is there a plan for this kind of review to trickle down to lower levels of P&A staff, Dr. Littlefield asked? They are now working on a procedure for department chairs, Dr. Carrier said. Some units use it for others as well, but that takes awhile because it is difficult to develop the list of competencies required.

Professor Wojtaszek asked if coordinate-campus chancellors are automatically part of the process; they are, Dr. Carrier said. Are the results of the reviews public, Professor Wojtaszek then asked? They are not, Dr. Carrier said, because the results are private data under Minnesota law.

What is the next step, Professor Hanna asked? The policy will be brought to CAPA and then to the Policy Advisory Committee, and then there will be a decision about a 30-day review.

## **6. Thanks**

Professor Hanna noted that this was the last meeting of the 2009-10 academic year and thanked Professors Fulkerson and Kleiner and Dr. Littlefield, all of whom are going off the Committee. Committee members thanked Professor Hanna for her service as chair and gave her a round of applause. She then adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand