

Notes*

**Tenure Committee
Monday, April 21, 2003
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: William Garrard (chair), Ron Akehurst, Kent Bales, Tom Clayton, Amos Deinard, Robert Jones, Cleon Melsa, Bernard Selzler, Jennifer Westendorf

Absent: Carol Carrier, Dale Carpenter, Nancy Ehlke, Carston Wagner

Guests: none

1. Evolving 7.12 Statements

Committee members discussed the requirement (proposed but apparently not yet approved by the Provost) in one department's 7.12 statement that a faculty member must raise part of his/her salary in outside funds.

- Is it a University expectation that faculty bring in outside funds to pay part of their salary? No.
- Is this department out of line in its 7.12 statement and must it be adjusted to be in line with the rest of the University? Is one not a tenured faculty member if one must generate one's own salary?
- The controlling standards should be the 7.12 statement in existence when one is granted tenure OR the one that was first adopted by the department.
- It would be difficult to write legislation for very divergent departments across the University. There can also be a conflict between what the department and University needs and academic freedom.
- Post-tenure review can be used to get rid of people, although it is a very inefficient way to do so because it could take up to five years. It could also be used as a tool to harass a faculty member, in order to get him/her to leave. It can be used to get rid of unproductive faculty but it should not be used when a department changes its 7.12 statement and then says "we changed the rules."
- Standards can be changed for probationary faculty, who can then choose between the ones under which they were hired or the new ones. The same rule should apply to faculty later in their careers who might be up for post-tenure review. But: "I voted in favor of all the 7.12 statements in my department. Does that negate using earlier standards, when I voted to change the rules?"

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

- Do 7.12 statements deal with nothing except teaching, research, and service? In the Medical School, part of the evaluation criteria is that research should lead to getting grants from peer-reviewed proposals.
- All of the 7.12 statements were reviewed by Vice President Carrier and the then-chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, Professor Mary Dempsey; they are not solely for post-tenure review.
- Faculty should be immune from dismissal for cause if they teach, do research, and provide service. Is not bringing in funds a cause for dismissal? Some units push on faculty if they do not bring in money to help fund the department and pay for staffing needs. If a faculty member is doing a good job of teaching courses, and doing research (even if the research is not in vogue), it would very difficult to remove the individual. But it would require a lot of energy on the part of the individual to defend him/herself and puts both the individual and the unit under duress. The administration has foot soldiers willing to try to remove someone.
- Disciplines change over time; one cannot evaluate faculty on criteria set 25 years ago. The 7.12 statements are drafted by and voted on by the faculty and recommended to the chair, the dean, and the provost. If there is a change in the statement, faculty have a choice on the one they will be evaluated by.

2. Teaching Evaluations

The question has arisen: If a course in one college is cross-listed in another, which teaching evaluation instrument should be used?

- The instrument used in the individual's tenure home should be used.
- The cross-listed unit should be interested in the evaluations and ask for the results, but if it does not ask the information should not be provided.

It was agreed that the Committee on Educational Policy should be asked to address the issue in the teaching evaluation policy.

3. Applause

Committee members gave Professor Garrard a round of applause for his service as chair of the Committee this year.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota