

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 17, 2011
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Kate VandenBosch (chair), Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Carpenter, Shawn Curley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Caroline Hayes, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch, Michael Oakes, George Sheets
- Absent: Melissa Anderson, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Fitzakerley, Jeff Kahn
- Guests: Vice President Kathleen O'Brien, Brian Swanson (University Services); Professor Karen Miksch (co-chair, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure); Professor Becky Yust (chair, ad hoc committee on a summer semester), Aaron Carlson, Sarah Waldemar, Jonathan Lund, Steven Pearthree, Bree Dalager (Senate Consultative Committee)
- Other: Jill Christenson (President's Office)

[In these minutes: (1) statement on space management; (2) tenure policy amendments; (3) statement on the Faculty Retirement Plan from Academic Freedom and Tenure; (4) amendment to the syllabus policy; (5) faculty nominees to the Benefits Advisory Committee; (6) report from the faculty legislative liaison; (7) report from the ad hoc committee on a summer semester]

1. Statement on Space Management

Professor VandenBosch convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Vice President O'Brien and Mr. Swanson to discuss the statement on space management that had been adopted by the Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP). The statement read as follows (between the * * *):

* * *

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP):

1. Endorses the principles that space should be:

-- **Sustainable:** The University should not have more space than it can afford to operate, maintain, and support.

-- **Aligned:** The University should provide the correct type, quality, and quantity of space required for programs (academic, administrative, and athletic) to function effectively.

-- **Managed:** The University should provide tools and incentives for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of its space resources.

2. Supports a more disciplined and purposeful decision-making process regarding the University's space inventory by:

* 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.

- a. Establishing a "No Net New Space without Net New Resources" planning goal.
 - b. Prioritizing the renewal of existing buildings over new construction
 - c. Conducting comprehensive cost analyses (capital, operations, program) on all new facility projects.
 - d. Funding new building operating costs, including Repair and Replacement funds.
3. Encourages the inclusion of additional incentives to reduce space-use in the budget process.
 4. Supports the updating and adjustment of the Minnesota Facility Model (MFM) space standards to reflect changes in technology, space sharing, and other best practices applicable in the current academic environment.
 5. Urges the communication of best practices and training of units (departments and RRCs) on space management methods and space charging practices.

* * *

Vice President O'Brien began by recalling that about three years ago, when they understood the financial pressures that the University would face as a result of the state budget situation, the administration started identifying solutions at the macro level and looking at the institution's major cost drivers: space, information technology, personnel, and so on. In University Services, they started working on utility-conservation initiatives and reductions in the costs of space.

The University has about 29,000,000 gross square feet of space, which is more than downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul combined; about 22,000,000 of that footage is on the Twin Cities campus, Ms. O'Brien told the Committee. Many people may think they do not have enough space, but that is because the University in some cases does not have the RIGHT space. If one were building the campuses from the ground up today, the space would look very different from what exists. The questions are how to get the space that exists to be the right space and how to minimize the use of space. Everyone in University Services is working very hard to keep costs down, but every square foot of space costs money no matter what they do.

Professor Oakes said he assumes that some space costs more than other space and they are focusing on those differences. They are, Vice President O'Brien said, and Mr. Swanson provided copies of three pages of information about space on the Twin Cities campus. She said that they have presented information about space to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning several times, and she reported that they will propose to the Board of Regents taking space offline (either through demolition or mothballing).

Mr. Swanson reported that the President charged a staff group to achieve recurring cost savings by reducing the use of space. The group was given a goal of cutting costs by \$10 million, which means reducing space by about 1 million Gross Square Feet (GSF). What does that mean? Of the 22 million GSF on the Twin Cities campus, about 9 million is non-assignable areas such as toilets, custodial closets, public circulation, and mechanical areas, which cannot be eliminated. That leaves about 13 million Assignable Square Feet (ASF). Of that, about 6 million is not supported by tuition/state funds (e.g., housing and residential life, athletics, parking, etc.). So there are about 7 million supported ASF. Given the ratio of ASF to GSF (about 60%), a reduction of 1 million GSF (to achieve the \$10 million in savings)

equals about 600,000 ASF—or about an 8.4% reduction in spaces. In other words, a reduction of 1 million ASF equates to about an 8.4% reduction in usable academic and administrative space. That would be "a massive undertaking," Mr. Swanson observed.

Mr. Swanson next noted data on the use of space by category. While many may talk about unused classroom, they are only a small percent (4.1%) of all space on the Twin Cities campus. The breakdown by use of the 13 million ASF is as follows (both supported and non-supported):

office space	26.9%
laboratories	18.6
special-use facilities	11.8
residential	11.5
support facilities	11.0
general use facilities	7.8
study facilities	5.2
classrooms	4.1
health care	3.1

The big items, obviously, are offices and labs, Mr. Swanson observed. Does everyone need an office? National studies of offices indicate that on average, people are in their office chairs only about 38% of the time, so the University pays a lot of money for empty seats. They have done a pilot program at the HHH Institute to increase the efficiency of space use, and gained 18% (the program did not include walled faculty offices). The reconfiguration has been very well received and demonstrates that there are ways to improve utilization rates without having a negative impact on work performance.

The five factors that drive space costs are construction, operation (i.e., custodial, waste, grounds, maintenance, utilities, repair and replacement), renewal, debt service, and insurance, Mr. Swanson said. In response to Professor Oakes' question earlier in the meeting, he provided examples of cost of operations from the FY09 Building Cost report for a few buildings (per ASF):

Molecular & Cellular Biology	26.72
Heller Hall	19.61
Jones Hall	15.17
Mondale Hall	9.35
Magrath Library	7.35

Facilities Management has been trying to drive operations costs down as low as possible, Mr. Swanson said, but all space must be heated, cooled, and cleaned, so the largest savings come from taking space off line. In making decisions about what to recommend taking off line, they focus on buildings with high operations costs and high deferred renewal. There are a number of buildings on the list but it will be a multi-year process. The buildings that get on this list tend to be obsolete, ones people do not generally want to be in anyway, so there is not usually not much resistance to taking down space—people do want to know, however, where they will go and when.

Vice President O'Brien said that they are looking at support-unit buildings as well as academic buildings and are trying to identify how to use office buildings more efficiently.

After the discussions with SCFP, they were asked to draft a statement that SCFP could consider as lending support to their efforts, Ms. O'Brien said, and the Committee unanimously adopted the statement that was before the Committee today.

Professor Curley asked about the language of section 2(b) and 2(d). For Item 2(b), is this prioritization intended as separate from the other sections in the statement? If analyses and criteria favor new construction, wouldn't that be the choice?

Vice President O'Brien said that at the global level, in the 1960s the University expanded to the West Bank and essentially abandoned the buildings in the historic district of the East Bank (e.g., Nicholson, Jones, Folwell). This was not a good practice. When planning began for the BioMedical Discovery District north of the stadium, and units in the Academic Health Center were being identified for the new space, the administration recognized the need to take responsibility for the vacated space. It is not OK to build new space and leave the old space behind. This does not mean that the University should never build new space—there will be times when programmatic or research needs require new space, but the institution must ask itself if it is putting its buildings to the best use. For example, it made sense to renovate the old Mineral Resources Research Center for the College of Education and Human Development because the building was sound and the ceilings and spaces were usable. By the same measures, it did not make sense to keep Owre-Millard Halls because they could not be renovated for the use needed for the sciences that would occupy the space.

There is a long history of projects in the last ten years that restored buildings, Vice President O'Brien said; she noted Kolthoff, Nicholson, Jones, Folwell, Ford, and Murphy. All of those buildings have been totally restored, she said, and the University has worked to obtain more HEAPR money from the state (which carries no University debt service obligation) and work with academic program funds, and grant funds to invest in building renewal. They continue to look for such opportunities, Ms. O'Brien said, and most of them do not get into the Daily because they are internal.

Regarding Section 2(d), Professor Curley asked what was intended by the language in the section.

Mr. Swanson noted again that the University has added about 3 million GSF in the last ten years, at a time when the dollars available for operation have declined, so the institution is adding space with fewer dollars to operate it. Either there must be more resources available or the amount of space has to be reduced. Vice President O'Brien noted that the facilities-management industry standard is that for every dollar an organization does not spend to keep a building in shape, it will pay three dollars later. So the University can spend now or spend a lot more later. She also pointed out that 70% of the buildings on the Twin Cities campus are over 30 years old; when one thinks about a house of that age, one thinks about the roof, heating, plumbing, and so on. It is those things that they put as a high priority.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the motion. Vice President O'Brien thanked the Committee for its support as they try to figure out how to get the job done for the academic enterprise and also save money.

2. Tenure Policy Amendments

Professor VandenBosch welcomed Professor Miksch to the meeting to explain the last few proposed amendments to the tenure policy that had been approved by the Committee on Academic

Freedom and Tenure. [Note: Technically, the tenure policy is Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; for these minutes, "tenure policy" and "*Faculty Tenure*" refer to the same document, which is at <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>.]

Professor Miksch said that questions raised at the February 3 open forum had been brought to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) on February 11 and had led to a few additional minor clarifications in the language.

-- In section 6.3, the language requiring one vote to promote and grant tenure to a probationary assistant professor does not mean that a department cannot conduct a re-vote.

-- In section 6.21, a little-used provision of the policy, when an Associate Professor or Professor is hired without tenure, the language provides that there may be a three-year probationary period. AF&T had been asked if a two-year or four-year contract might be used; AF&T concluded that the policy should provide for either the three-year (special contract) probationary period or the usual probationary period (typically six years, unless a college has adopted a longer period). An individual holding either a three-year or six-year probationary appointment can always be brought up for tenure early.

-- In section 5.5, which deals with extending the probationary period, there was a question about how to deal with the case when the provost denies an extension for care-giving or medical problems. AF&T considered recommending filing a grievance, but the Office for Conflict Resolution does not deal with matters related to the tenure policy. AF&T also considered allowing an appeal to the Senate Judicial Committee, but the Judicial Committee and its attorney thought that unwise because it would put the Judicial Committee in the position of reviewing a matter on the merits, which it generally does not do. AF&T concluded that there should be no appeal from the denial of the extension of the probationary period but that the policy would be explicit about allowing such a denial to be raised as an issue in the event the probationary faculty member is subsequently denied tenure. The Senate Judicial Committee will also revise its procedures to take care of this possibility.

Professor Miksch also reported that Vice Provost Carney, following a meeting with the Board of Regents policy committee, has asked for a number of changes related to style. Board policies do not permit "his or her," so they will use "the faculty member." They ask that the Interpretations be renumbered so that obsolete ones be eliminated, which will further clean up the policy. They will permit the use of footnotes—Board policies do not have footnotes, but they will permit them for the tenure policy. Finally, they wish to cite the Board of Regents Policy: *Academic Freedom and Responsibility* in the tenure policy, rather than quote from it. (The quotation in the tenure policy must be changed if there is a change in the *Academic Freedom and Responsibility* policy, and the Faculty Senate has already approved two such changes.)

Professor Sheets objected to the last proposal. The *Faculty Tenure* policy is an employment contract, he said, and the tenure policy should retain the language of the AF&R policy so it is part of the employment contract.

There is another aspect of this question that supports Professor Sheets' point (to retain the quote in section 1 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy), Professor Miksch said. The tenure policy talks specifically about FACULTY rights to academic freedom. The Board of Regents AF&R policy does not speak just about faculty or the tenure policy. So while it may be cumbersome, it may be better to retain the AF&R

language in the tenure policy and, if the AF&R policy is changed, require that a parallel change in the tenure policy also be made.

Professor Hancher agreed that if the language of AF&R is important, it should be incorporated in the tenure policy, not simply referred to.

Professor Brothen inquired if the tenure policy is really a contract. Professor Miksch noted that section 2.1 of the tenure policy explicitly declares the policy to be an employment contract.

The changes to the tenure policy were on a fast track to the Board of Regents in March (for information) and May (for action), Professor VandenBosch reported, but the Board of Regents' office suggests that the changes go to the Board in May and June. The schedule for the Faculty Senate would remain the same, but with this discussion, is the Committee able to vote on the changes?

Professor VandenBosch said that she would contact Vice President Brown and Regents' Executive Director Cieslak to indicate that this Committee would not accept the proposal to delete the AF&R language from the tenure policy.

The Committee voted unanimously to accept the additional amendments from AF&T and the style changes related to gendered language, Interpretations, and footnotes and to put the amendments on the docket of the February 24 Faculty Senate meeting. It was noted that a revised version of the changes, with the stylistic changes, will be prepared and distributed two or three days before the February 24 meeting and that paper copies will also be provided at the meeting.

3. Statement on the Faculty Retirement Plan from Academic Freedom and Tenure

Professor VandenBosch next observed that there have been discussions with some members of the faculty leadership and with the Committee on Faculty Affairs about possible changes to the Faculty Retirement Plan in the face of the politics and finances of the state; she turned to Professor Miksch to lead the discussion.

The changes that were discussed at the Committee on Faculty Affairs were brought to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T), Professor Miksch reported, for a discussion about whether or not the tenure policy comes into play, especially section 4. AF&T considered the language of the tenure policy, in consultation with Professor Chomsky, and adopted a statement that is on the docket of the February 24 Faculty Senate meeting for information. The resolution read as follows (between the * * *):

* * *

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has been made aware that the University may consider changes to the contributions to the Faculty Retirement Plan. One question that has arisen is whether such a change would require a vote of the Faculty Senate under the provisions of sections 4 or 11 of the tenure policy.

We conclude that if any proposed change is prospective only, with no changes to the salary and fringe benefits of currently-employed faculty members, then the tenure policy is not implicated and no vote is required. If, however, changes may be made to the contributions to the

Faculty Retirement Plan for currently-employed faculty members, the Committee will revisit the matter.

* * *

Originally the word "salary" was used, and then in other places the word "compensation" is used. Professor Miksch said that as a lawyer who does statutory construction, she assumes that the authors would not use a different word unless they meant something different. So compensation is more than just salary. Sections of the tenure policy speak to salary and others to compensation. Because the position that may be taken by the administration is that any change would be for future employees, they concluded that the tenure policy does not come into play.

Professor Hancher commented that in the Utah case, it is not being proposed that tenure for current faculty members be eliminated, only for new faculty members. That is a direct attack on tenure. That is not exactly like this case, but there are parallels. Professor Miksch said the concern expressed by the Committee on Faculty Affairs was that this would set up two classes of faculty. But when new faculty and staff are hired, they would know what the benefits are and could plan accordingly, just as current faculty and staff planned on the existing Faculty Retirement Plan contributions. There may be two classes of faculty, she said, but the provisions of the tenure policy are not implicated in such a change.

His question, Professor Hancher said, is whether the Faculty Senate should have a say if there is to be a change in the landscape. The tenured faculty at Utah would presumably want to vote on eliminating tenure for their future colleagues. Professor Miksch said that the Committee on Faculty Affairs would continue to work on the issue; AF&T was asked about the tenure policy and responded with the statement.

Professor Luepker said that P&A staff have the same plan as the faculty but are not covered by the tenure policy. Where do they stand? The same place they did with the salary cut, Professor Miksch said; the Faculty Senate had to vote on it but the P&A staff did not.

Professor Curley said he did not agree with the analogy with Utah. There are already a lot of tiers at the University and there are compensation differences all over; compensation is not comparable to tenure. It was a structural analogy, Professor Hancher responded; it suggests that those here are OK and have no stake in new arrivals.

Professor VandenBosch said the Committee could discuss this further; the statement from AF&T responds to a question it was asked.

Professor Sheets noted that there is a tendency to think of health-care as the same as retirement benefits, but they are very different. The retirement benefit is taxed and immediately vested; health-care benefits are not taxed and are not money in one's pocket. If there is a question about compensation, there is a clear difference between health care and retirement benefits.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Professor Miksch for her report.

4. Amendment to the Syllabus Policy

Professor Brothen next introduced a proposed amendment to the syllabus policy that calls for including on syllabi a reference or link to a statement on academic freedom that was developed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and approved, after agreement on modifications to the language, by the Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). The proposal arises from the 2004 report of the Task Force on Academic Freedom. SCEP was also informed about the case of a student demanding that a course go in a direction the instructor did not believe appropriate, and it believed that such incidents should be covered by the statement. The statement read as follows: (between the * * *)

* * *

General Syllabus Statement regarding Academic Freedom and Responsibility:

Academic freedom is a cornerstone of the University. Within the scope and content of the course as defined by the instructor, it includes the freedom to discuss relevant matters in the classroom. Along with this freedom comes responsibility. Students are encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Students are free to take reasoned exception to the views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.*

Reports of concerns about academic freedom are taken seriously, and there are individuals and offices available for help. Contact the instructor, the Department Chair, your adviser, the associate dean of the college, or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs in the Office of the Provost. [Customize with names and contact information as appropriate for the course/college/campus.]* Language adapted from the American Association of University Professors "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students"

Syllabus Statement for Courses Involving Students in Research:

Academic freedom is a cornerstone of the University. Within the scope and content of the course as defined by the instructor, it includes the freedom to discuss relevant matters in the classroom and conduct relevant research. Along with this freedom comes responsibility. Students are encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Students are free to take reasoned exception to the views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.* When conducting research, pertinent institutional approvals must be obtained and the research must be consistent with University policies.

Reports of concerns about academic freedom are taken seriously, and there are individuals and offices available for help. Contact the instructor, the Department Chair, your adviser, the associate dean of the college, or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs in the Office of the Provost. [Customize with names and contact information as appropriate for the course/college/campus.] [* Language adapted from the American Association of University Professors "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students"]

* * *

Professor Miksch concurred with Professor Brothen's summary of the history and noted that they provide two statements, one for a regular class and one for a class that involves a significant research component.

Professor VandenBosch said the proposed amendment would be brought to the Faculty Senate on February 24.

Professor Brothen noted that instructors do not have to include the specific language; they can provide a link to it on their syllabi. Vice Provost McMaster's office will ensure that the language is added to the list of policies provided on the web [which can be found at http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/SYLLABUSREQUIREMENTS_APPA.html].

Professor McCulloch said she believed the statement would help new faculty and instructors who might be unsure about their authority.

Professor Hancher suggested that it may not be widely known that there are other policies that are to be included or linked on syllabi. He said he worries about the number but agreed that they are all well-intended. Professor Gonzales suggested there be a message at the start of every term reminding instructors about the policy.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposed policy change.

5. Faculty Nominees for the Benefits Advisory Committee

Professor VandenBosch noted that one of the responsibilities of the Committee is to nominate faculty members to serve on the Benefits Advisory Committee, which plays a key role in determining the University's employee benefits, particularly health benefits [the charge and membership can be found here: <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/committees/bac.html>].

Committee members agreed on individuals to be asked to serve.

6. Report of the Faculty Legislative Liaison

Professor Hayes reported for the faculty legislative liaisons. It has been a peak year for testimony before state legislative committees, she said; they testified before the House Higher Education Committee last week and before the Senate Higher Education Committee yesterday. With many new members on the committees, they must educate some of them about what the University does.

Because of the press of time, Professor VandenBosch said the Committee would allot more time to this report at an upcoming meeting, and thanked Professor Hayes for the report.

7. Report of the ad hoc Committee on a Summer Semester

Professor VandenBosch now welcomed Professor Yust to report on the work of the ad hoc committee on a summer semester, appointed by the Committee last fall, to explore whether the University

(for the Twin Cities campus only) should investigate in more detail the advisability of adopting a full, regular third semester during the summer. She also welcomed (some of the non-faculty) members of the Senate Consultative Committee, who were invited to join this portion of the meeting to hear Professor Yust's report. Committee members were provided a copy of the report of the ad hoc committee.

Professor Yust reported that the members of the ad hoc committee brought a variety of views to the ad hoc committee, it had visits with a number of administrators of units that would be affected by such a calendar change (Housing and Residential Life, Student Financial Aid, Facilities Management, Office of the Registrar), and they heard from all but three of the deans, so the report represents most of the breadth of the activities of the campus. This Committee presented the ad hoc committee with a set of questions; the ad hoc committee tried to answer them as fully as it could.

The ad hoc committee received information about students on financial aid, student employment, students on fellowships. It heard about potential financial advantages of a summer semester, and concluded that tuition terms and payments schedules would have to be comparable to that of fall and spring semesters. A summer semester could provide more educational opportunities but there could be calendar issues in terms of students transferring from other schools. Many colleges now offer courses in the summer, especially high-demand courses. One purpose of a summer semester would be to increase tuition revenue and improve the four-year graduation rate, and in some cases units could increase the number of students in their program. One question would be the impact on other types of collegiate activities were some to increase enrollment.

In terms of faculty work and appointments, there is nothing that would prohibit nine-month faculty appointments from being a different nine months than at present; the assumption is that nine-month faculty would continue to work for two of the semesters. The bigger issue with the willingness and/or availability of faculty to participate in a summer semester.

Professor Yust said she was very impressed by the representatives of the support units; they all said that they could accommodate a change to a full third semester if the faculty wished to do so. In the case of the Office of Classroom Management and Housing and Residential Life, it would provide an opportunity to even out their workloads over the year. The Registrar, Ms. VanVoorhis, told the ad hoc committee that her office could handle the change but she was not sure the college offices could do the additional processing of procedures that would be required. Moving to a full semester would require using standard class meeting times during the summer.

Vice Provost McMaster told the ad hoc committee he would oppose increasing the size of the freshman class because if the campus did so, the AAR scores would go down. He saw no constraints on increasing the number of transfer students, however.

Some of the staff indicated they use the summer to do more complex work and analyses that they cannot do during the regular academic year. Summer is also the only time the staff can take vacations in some areas (e.g., student labs).

There would be pluses and minuses for each college, Professor Yust said. For some students, there could be gains in opportunity costs; they might borrow more but they might also be able to enter the workforce earlier.

The ad hoc committee could not determine that any other institution comparable to the University had adopted a full third semester.

More analysis would need to occur in a number of areas. First, the Registrar brought in different calendar scenarios on how a full summer semester might be implemented. There is one that works, but it would mean starting spring semester the week before the Martin Luther King holiday. Second, the actual benefit and cost needs to be assessed at the college level. Third, it is not known how many students would desire and participate in a year-round semester schedule. Fourth, the general impact related to the cycle of the work year (governance, advising, etc.). And, fifth, attitudes toward a change—opinions varied and the ad hoc committee identified barriers and advantages to a change. The major question is whether the University could offer a full semester if only some units wanted to do so and others did not. It seems unlikely a full semester would be a success unless all of the undergraduate colleges offered a reasonably full slate of classes.

Professor Hayes inquired about increasing enrollment: If one assumes there is only a certain number of students available and qualified, and it is fixed, is there a steady state? Or would a change simply make school faster for the current cohort? Both, Professor Yust said, but it would facilitate transfer students.

Professor McCulloch asked if the ad hoc committee had a sense about individual units that could or could not offer a summer semester and those that could benefit. They did, Professor Yust said. In her own department, for example, they could add another cohort in one major if students would take a full load in the summer; the question is whether they could sustain it the number of students over a number of years.

One reason for the adoption of a full summer semester is the under-utilization of the physical plant during the summer, Professor Luepker commented. It appears the concerns relate to undergraduate education and faculty appointments; in his unit, where all the faculty have 11-month appointments and all the students are graduate students, they want to go to school all year and get done and students ask why they cannot take courses in the summer. But there is enormous heterogeneity across the campus, and in some cases a summer semester might better meet student needs. Professor Yust agreed and observed that there would be a need to coordinate with central administration on calendars and appointments.

Ms. Dalager commented that she would like to take more summer classes.

Mr. Lundberg said that he is from a coordinate campus, but is in a program that takes five years, and he would prefer to get his classes over sooner and get out the door. He said he was sure there are similar programs on the Twin Cities campus and said it would be beneficial to have a third semester. It would also allow graduate students to switch their research around and do it in a different way.

Mr. Carlson said the idea needs more quantitative study but it would be a good thing to look at. The possibility of increasing the number of online courses by 25% is also intriguing.

The Provost is very interested in the possibility of a summer semester, Professor VandenBosch reported, and said it should be explored if the report from this Committee suggested it. How can the work of the ad hoc committee be distilled and what additional work should be suggested?

Their report is just a scan, Professor Yust said. There needs to be more discussion with undergraduate and graduate students and within the colleges. A number of the deans said they would be willing to discuss the possibility, but many of the questions revolve around curriculum and academic plans. Other Big 10 institutions are not offering a full summer semester, so Minnesota would be an outlier, and there would have to be a careful study of the calendar.

Mr. Carlson asked if a summer semester has been implemented in any smaller colleges. He said it could be hard to change the norms of a large institution. Professor Yust said she did not know about smaller colleges.

Professor VandenBosch said the report of the ad hoc committee should be brought back for consideration of next steps. She thanked Professor Yust and the ad hoc committee for the effort they put into the report.

Professor VandenBosch adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota