



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

AGENDA
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, August 26, 1982

1:00 - 4:00

B-12 Morrill Hall

Approx. time

- | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1:00 | 1. Fix agenda. |
| | 2. Minutes of July 29 (enclosed). |
| | 3. Report of the Chair (enclosed). |
| | 4. Report of the Student Chair. |
| 1:30 | 5. Committee Reports - Senate Finance Committee. |
| 2:00 | 6. Follow-up questions to the 1978 SCEP report (enclosed). |
| 2:30 | 7. Discussion of implementation of the Senate
maternity/paternity leave policy. (SCFA rep. present) |
| 3:00 | 8. Update on curriculum task forces. |
| 3:15 | 9. Update on searches. |



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 9/16/82

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

August 26, 1982
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
B-12 Morrill

Members present: Phyllis Freier, Barry Hogen, John Howe, Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dave Lenander, Marv Mattson, Doug Pratt, Donald Spring, Burt Sundquist, Pat Swan (Chair), John Turner, Kathy Watson.

Guests present for all or part of meeting: Julie Bates, Ellen Berscheid, Don Jacobson, Jerry Kline, Maureen Smith, Bruce Thorpe.

1. Agenda. Julie Iverson requested adding a question to Vice President Keller about the safety of Northrop Auditorium. The item will be held for the September 16 conversation with President Magrath. Ms. Iverson will write her concern to Vice President Bohlen in the meanwhile.
2. Minutes of July 29. Professor Turner submitted two corrections.
 - (a) Page 3, item 8, line 3: figures should be 950 and 1000 (not 100).
 - (b) Page 5, par. 6: Strike first sentence and replace with following: Professor Turner expressed his concern that, with the faculty already having heavier demands placed upon them because of increased enrollments and a diminishing number of teaching assistants, another task force to study undergraduate education might be a duplication of what has already been done and hence a needless diversion of valuable faculty resources.

The minutes were approved as amended.

Professor Swan urged everyone to submit corrections to the minutes at any time, even after approval, if they notice something which gives a false impression. Having an accurate record is important and can even be significant in a legal issue.

3. Report of the Chair. Professor Swan referred to parts of her written report.

A. SCC must appoint a coordinate campus faculty member to the Senate Planning Committee to replace Larry Christiansen (UMC). While the Crookston campus is somewhat underrepresented on Senate committees, the replacement might also come from Morris or the medical faculty at Duluth.

B. Scheduling a joint SCC/Civil Service Committee meeting. Could the SCC join the CSC, as invited, for a part of their September 28 meeting? Most members indicated they could attend, and Professor Swan will so inform Mr. Larson. The SCC will indicate to CSC that the first week of classes in any quarter, and particularly the fall quarter, is awkward for faculty and student

members. Mr. Lenander inquired about progress in CSC's request for civil service representation on more Senate and Assembly committees. If Mr. Larson agrees, Professor Swan will invite representation at that joint meeting from the Committee on Committees.

C. Other special meetings.

i. On the agenda for the FCC's September 16 conversation with President Magrath will be Honors Committee business. Professor Swan announced that she will probably ask the committee at the beginning of that meeting to vote on closing the meeting at least for the Honors item since it will include discussion of individuals.

ii. On Wednesday, September 22, a faculty team from Stout State University will be on the Twin Cities campus to talk about this University's budgeting process. They have requested meeting part of the time with a faculty group. Professors Swan and Sundquist will take part, and Professor Swan asks for at least three more faculty members from the SCC and the Finance Committee.

D. University-industry relations. Vice President Keller is assembling a committee of administrators and faculty for the purpose of drafting a policy paper. The project is part of a continuing conversation between the central administration and the Regents. Professor Pratt will be a faculty participant and will, with the committee's advice, name about three more faculty. Vice President Keller has recommended including a member of the faculty not personally involved in chemical/biological research. He has also recommended a representative from SCFA and one from the Research Committee.

Professor Turner stressed the seriousness of university-industry collaboration, including the possible consequence of a suit, following the hypothetical adverse development of a chemical discovery, which could result in attachment of the University endowment. He urged the University to proceed with great thoroughness and caution and to make use of studies other institutions, further along in the process, have already made. Professor Swan reported that the vice president is accumulating a file on developments elsewhere.

Professors Howe and Freier recommended a participant from the Graduate School. The committee members should be individuals keenly alert to the implications and possibilities of this new direction.

Further consideration was postponed until the discussion with the vice president later in the meeting (see p. 7).

E. Faculty workload study group. The idea of studying faculty workload was stimulated by the program prioritizing and budgeting exercises of the past year. The group will include faculty members, and Professor Swan asked the SCC to make nominations soon. The group will ask qualitative questions, on the order of "What kinds of data need to be gathered?" and "What is legitimate use of such data?"

4. Report of the Student SCC. There was not report of the chair. Kathy Watson reported that as Speaker of the MSA Forum she has written the chairpersons of all Senate and Assembly committees requesting copies of their agenda and minutes. One committee has responded affirmatively; she expects responses to increase as faculty return to the campus.

5. Committee reports.

A. Senate Finance. A draft of minutes from the August 16 SCC/SFC meeting was distributed at the beginning of the 8/26 meeting. Professor Sundquist summarized the joint committees' discussion and conclusions on the drafts of the biennial budget request and capital request they studied on the 16th. He stated that while there was some concern shown about the size (\$52 million) of the critical capital request, no one recommended eliminating either of the major items (Music, Smith Hall).

Clarification of 8/16 minutes. The SFC's request for accounting of library expenditures on acquisitions (which Vice President Keller has agreed to obtain) is limited to the purchases of funds raised through the tuition surcharge of 1981-82. made with

Faculty salary component. Professor Swan reported that the comparative data on salaries outside the University will not be available to central administration until after September 1. The administration will develop its salary recommendation to the Regents between then and the September 9-10 Regents meetings. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs appears not to have made any specific recommendation since its May report to the Senate to make the '83-'85 request consistent with implementation of the long-range salary improvement plan. (The schedule SCFA proposed and the Senate accepted is in terms of catching up to the 1972 salary levels in real dollars, from 80.1% of that value in the fall of 1982 to 100% in 1990.)

Professor Freier warned of hazards in the marketplace comparison the administration is presently stressing and of the lengths to which the legislature might carry such an approach. Professors Turner and Howe suggested that careful presentations of the concept could preclude dire consequences. There were more favorable than unfavorable statements in the August 16 SCC/SFC meeting on the proposed request approach which would include outside comparisons and the establishment of special funds. The SCC on August 26 favored alerting the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to the urgency of working with central administration between now and September 10. At a later point in the meeting, Professor Swan asked guest Professor Berscheid if SCFA had made a recommendation on the faculty portion of the 1983-85 biennial budget request. Professor Berscheid replied that SCFA had not. Professor Swan conveyed the SCC's sense of urgency and concern that SCFA has not participated in conversations to develop the request. Professor Berscheid expressed her hope the SCC would contact Professor Sell, SCFA chair, in the coming week when he returns to the campus.

6. Quality of instruction: Follow-up questions to the 1978 SCEP report.

Guest: Professor Gerald Kline, Chair, SCEP. Discussion continued from the July 29 meeting. The draft of questions can serve as a guide for those areas in which SCC and SCEP need to gather data to discover what has been accomplished toward the goals stated in the 1978 SCEP report.

Professor Turner asked the members to keep in mind the principle that when the Senate adopts an educational policy, it is the job of the University administration to assure that the policy is implemented. The University has made many gains in the area of instructional quality, including some aspects not in the 1978 list. SCC members said the academic vice president, deans, and individual faculty members

all have responsibility for carrying out the policy. Professor Turner noted that some of the recommendations require specific directives from central administration to have any effect. Someone has to take responsibility for initiating certain practical steps for improvements, such as the establishment of seminars on teaching for T.A.'s.

Professor Swan said the SCC will ask the SCEP subcommittee to work with Academic Affairs and learn what has happened so far.

Professor Kline reported he had received an offer from Mr. Darwin Hendel for support in data gathering. Professor Kline sees the subcommittee as needing to take into account the student perspective and cross-college issues, among other considerations. He will want membership from SCEP and elsewhere. He is also interested in structural questions bearing upon implementation of the 1978 recommendations as well as the earlier 1973 policy requiring that each faculty member be evaluated for at least one course a year. He has learned, for instance, that there was a 35% drop-off in use of evaluation services when the fee for service was introduced.

Questions. From the draft list, questions I.A., II.A., II.A. and IV.A. seemed to demand first attention. Steps toward developing evaluation instruments (instead of an instrument) and the accessibility of these instruments are to be added to I.A.

Professors Turner and Howe emphasized that the goal of II.A., concerning peer review and peer assistance, is improved teaching, rather than improved evaluation and judgement. Professor Spring observed that while the University appears to succeed in enforcing the SCEP recommendations regarding promotion and tenure decisions, large numbers of faculty are untouched by that review. Professor Swan asked Professor Kline to add to the questions the kind of review undertaken regarding merit increases. Professor Kline said the subcommittee would look pretty carefully at the incentive structure question (IV.A.-- University recognition of teaching quality). Mr. Thorpe emphasized that the key question is how good teaching is being rewarded and how that has changed, if it has, in recent years.

Ms. Iverson asked that the subcommittee consider the direct impact of instruction on students, with an eye to determining an acceptable level of instruction. Professor Swan recommended expanding question V.A. regarding instructional evaluation as an aid to student choices, to include the relation of advising to instruction. Vice President Keller added that the collegiate deans are also presently trying to determine the most beneficial way to carry out advising.

7. Implementation of the Senate-approved policy on maternity and parental leaves.
Guests: General Counsel Mr. Stephen Dunham, Professor Ellen Berscheid, of SCFA.

Mr. Dunham distributed copies of a policy statement he has drafted on "Sick Leave and Disability Leave Policy," based upon the "Sick Leave" portion of the Senate policy. Mr. Dunham said he had changed some of the language; his draft covers "all full-time academic employees during the term of their regular employment." Vice President Keller said this was a draft of the policy the administration would forward to the Regents. The critical change from the SCFA/Senate policy is that, while natural maternity leave is included, there is no

provision for other parental leave. Central administration, considering the Senate-adopted policy, saw both legal questions and policy questions which the governance structure hadn't fully covered.

Maternity leave legally fits into the category of sick and disability leave, said V. P. Keller and Mr. Dunham. A presumption of six-week disability for maternity leave is permissible. Vice President Keller said the administration's draft omits provision for paternity leave and adoptive parental leave because they do not constitute sickness or disability.

V. P. Keller said the administration did not know how it was meant to implement the several parts of the Senate leave policy regarding employees other than full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty supported wholly or largely on state funds. Since the University could not commit non-state resources to cover leaves, he asked, did the governance structure intend to commit University funds for persons in all other categories? Keller said central administration could not take a policy to the Regents until these questions were resolved.

Professor Berscheid stated that SCFA's intentions were to provide for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty. SCFA did not discuss the implications for faculty not on state funds.

Vice President Keller said the administration is estimating the cost for implementation and will incorporate a proposal for retrenchment to cover costs. He said the administration would not distinguish professional/academic staff employees from faculty in writing the policy.

Why were paternity and adoptive parental leaves dropped in the administration's draft, Professor Berscheid asked. Mr. Dunham explained that only a policy and monetary question was involved, not a legal one. Professor Berscheid said it was SCFA's wish to give institutional recognition of the value of parenting and the paternal role. The cost would be no more than the cost of anyone calling in for two weeks of informal sick leave, which is presently permitted. A new parent determined to stay home could presently take that kind of "sick leave."

Responsibility to the students. Vice President Keller asked if the faculty would be comfortable with building in a provision that faculty would make every effort to make up missed classes, since considerable numbers of students would be affected. Mr. Dunham pointed out that "reasonable effort to make up" missed classes is new language in the University's sick leave policy. Faculty said it is not uncommon for departmental faculty to substitute for the sick faculty member, obviating the need for make-ups. Mr. Dunham said the draft could incorporate wording like "...shall make reasonable effort to make up or have covered the classes..."

Professor Berscheid said SCFA heard testimony from people who had sought parental leave in their departments and been pressured by department chairs to make up missed work. SCFA wanted to alleviate such pressure.

The Vice President said if the University goes on record as supporting a two-week parental leave, it must also take responsibility for seeing that classes meet.

Regarding costs, the Vice President said that in the past there has been an assumption that classes of a sick or disabled faculty member will be covered voluntarily in the first three months (before insurance payments begin). Under

the Senate's formalization of policy there is no such assumption of voluntarism. The administration is trying to determine what the consequent costs will be.

Professor Spring asked for a clarification of which of two assumptions we are working under: (a) that Senate policy will be implemented whatever the cost, or (b) that central administration will determine the cost, recommend modifications, and send the policy back to the Senate. Professor Swan said that since the Senate did not discuss the financial aspect of the policy proposal, the SCC cannot make any assumptions about Senate intentions regarding costs. Professor Spring offered the conclusion that when the costs are determined, the plan will have to go back to the Senate for further consideration.

Vice President Keller said the rough guess is for an annual cost of between \$100,000 and \$200,000, depending on how many categories of employees are included. The question becomes more difficult if the University wishes to cover people not on 0100 funds. Mr. Dunham said Tony Potami, Director of Research Administration, is looking at the language and provisions of various kinds of grants.

Mr. Dunham then noted, in response to a request, the points in his draft at which he had changed language from the SCFA proposal.

Professor Swan said as soon as central administration has more definite information on costs, the SCC will arrange to address this question again and will invite SCFA to join the discussion.

8. Update on curriculum task forces. Vice President Keller.

A. Human Services. The task force reported about August 19. After studying the report, Vice President Keller will request a meeting with the task force regarding their intentions. The recommendations were made almost unanimously, but will not be without controversy.

B. Composition. The report draft is out to task force members for a vote.

C. Biochemistry. The departments have recommended names of people to serve and Academic Affairs is drafting the charge.

D. Remedial Work. Task force to be established in the fall.

E. Advising Special Students. Task force to be established in the fall.

F. Information Services. The administration is gathering names for the task force. Many persons outside the University have expressed a desire to serve. Vice President Keller's view is that the task force should be comprised of University employees, but should be enjoined to hold open meetings to which it will invite the interested parties from outside to make presentations.

Professor Swan reminded Vice President Keller of SCC's request that the reports of the Human Services and the Composition task forces be routed to SCEP. Dr. Keller agreed, but stressed that he wanted the task force to result in action. He repeated that he would meet with each task force when it has completed its job to be sure to catch the spirit of what they are suggesting.

9. Update on major searches. Vice President Keller.

A. Dean of the Graduate School. The search is closed; process is going well. Central administration expects a report from the committee in early fall.

B. Dean of the College of Agriculture. The search committee is considering its charge. They have not yet sent out ads because they are still considering the administrative and organizational complexity of this position. Moreover, William Hueg has announced that he will resign next year as Deputy Vice President and Dean of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics. The College of Agriculture, said Dr. Keller, will have a full dean. There is a question of whether it should also have a director of instruction. The responsibilities of the dean of the Institute, as contrasted with that of the College, are primarily external. Dr. Keller said the existing system has had good results for the colleges in the Institute.

C. Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. Vice President Keller met with the search committee and conveyed the SCC's concern about the adequacy of the pool. The search committee feels it has a very creditable pool of candidates, reported Professor Spring, but feels it may not have been fair to everyone by opening and closing the search in the summer. Hence a new closing date for applications has been set for October 29, and a letter to that effect has gone to the deans.

Vice President Keller stated he wants a person with academically strong credentials and with creative ideas about delivering education. The University's delivery should be adjusted to reflect what it has to offer and to whom. While the job will entail a lot of work, he believes the interaction of the aspects of delivery to undergraduates on campus and to other recipients is good. Professor Sundquist affirmed his support of the integration of these two aspects. He noted that his department of Agricultural and Applied Economics several years ago restructured its undergraduate teaching program on the basis of what the faculty were learning from their outreach instruction.

D. Associate Vice President for Finance and Operations. It is a national search and proceeding slowly.

E. Director of Hospitals. Final candidates are now being interviewed. The decision will be announced in about a month.

F. Patent Administrator. Finalists have been interviewed. New person will be announced in about a month. Dr. Keller said the new person will strengthen the energy level of that office.

3.D. University-industry relationship policy. (continued from p. 2) Quest for names.

Professor Pratt reported to Vice President Keller that the SCC had begun to discuss names. There is favor for including an interested citizen not personally involved in research in the affected areas. Vice President Keller said the group will need people who are sensitive to the issues of technology and information transfer, and who are positive about the University's moving in this direction, but are cold enough to seek ways the University can protect itself. The aim is to produce an enabling document which will gain advantages

for the University while protecting it against possible adverse consequences.

Professor Swan said the SCC was somewhat concerned as to whether an adequate policy could be developed before the December deadline the administration has agreed upon with the Regents. Vice President Keller said he thinks the University needs an evolving policy. He would prefer for now an unrefined statement, which could be labeled "Interim Policy" and could be worked out as the University gains experience in this new realm.

He described the portion of the committee designated by the administration. It will include two deans/directors who have community as well as academic involvement, a faculty member with long industry experience, and a representative from research administration. SCC and Dr. Keller agreed there might be representation from the Graduate School. The SCC suggested two faculty members who fit the category of supportive yet disinterested good citizens.

Vice President Keller raised the question of whether the policy at some point should be brought to the Senate.

Professor Turner expressed his concern that even an interim policy could get the University into difficulties. Professor Pratt said this University would be plowing new ground for public institutions. Professor Turner said there are elements of commonality in the relationships between industry and education whether public or private, and that the experience of all universities which have been developing relationships and policies in the past several years should be studied. He also supported University retention of patents with a policy of issuing to a company a time-limited license for development.

Vice President Keller agreed that there are a few negative aspects to giving away a patent--especially that the patent may be blocked. However, he said, there are sometimes conditions for giving away patents in which the giver can still protect itself. There can be value in the arm's length situation which exists when the University has surrendered the patent.

Professor Swan spoke for the educational opportunities for graduate students and the value to other researchers of accessibility to research. Dr. Keller said certain absolute requirements will be in the policy, as, for example, a prohibition against secret research. Moreover, he said, in many cases the patent is not the interesting thing. Companies are not always looking for what is patentable.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant,
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

Report of the Chair for meeting of 8/26/82.

1. It is a pleasure to be able to announce the following appointments as the FCC had hoped:

All University Honors Committee: Lewis Wannamaker for 1982-85;

Student Legal Services Board: Warren Gore and Gary Wynia for 1982-84.

Unhappily, UMC's Larry Christiansen, who was going to join Planning this year, has accepted a position in Phoenix. The FCC will choose a replacement for Planning at its September 16 meeting.

2. The SCC and the Civil Service Committee have a mutual desire for an occasional joint meeting. The last (perhaps only) such was in the spring of 1981 when the CSC met with us for a portion of one of our regular meetings. When Jerry Larson, CSC chair, and I discussed a joint session this fall, he asked if it would be possible for the Consultative Committee to join them at one of their regular meetings, so that all of their members, including their coordinate campus representatives, could be present. They have proposed time at their first meeting of the quarter, Tuesday, September 28 (1:15-2:00 in 300 Morrill). On August 26th I'll ask how many of our members could participate at that time.

3. The report of the Senate Finance Committee will be based upon the draft of minutes from the special August 16 SFC/SCC meeting at which the biennial request and capital request were discussed with Vice President Keller.

4. Instructional quality. Enclosed is John Turner's set of questions drawn from the 1978 SCEP report, organized into four categories and augmented by two questions raised by the students. We need to select from among these questions those we believe are the most important so that we can begin to systematically collect data on them.

Enclosed with the questions is the memo to the SCC from Julie Bates and Julie Iverson specifically regarding academic advising for undergraduates.

5. Also enclosed is a document entitled "Proposed Resolution on University-Industry Relationships" together with Vice President Keller's July 8 letters to the Regents. I'm not yet sure whether we will begin to address this question on the 26th or at a later meeting. I'm happy to report that Doug Pratt has agreed to be SCC's agent on this policy development issue.

Pat Swan
8/17/82



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

*How do the
agencies...*

August 9, 1982

Professor Patricia B. Swan, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
St. Paul Campus

Dear Pat:

As you will remember, the University Senate adopted a sick leave and maternity leave policy at one of its meetings last Spring. The policy has been discussed extensively in the central administration and there appear to us to be a number of flaws in it which would prevent us from bringing it to the Board of Regents with a positive recommendation. At the moment, the Attorney's Office and the Office of Research Administration are working on proposed changes in the recommended policy that would meet much of the intent of the University Senate's proposal, but would deal with our concerns.

Of course, we would like to discuss our concerns and our recommendations with the appropriate committees of the Senate before bringing them to the Board. Since the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is not planning to meet this Summer, I would suggest that we bring the matter up at the Senate Consultative Committee, perhaps inviting members of the SCFA who may be available to attend. I would appreciate your arranging to have this item on the agenda of the SCC in the latter part of August. Please let me know if this will be possible.

Sincerely,

Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

KHK:jhh

cc: Nils Hasselmo, Vice President for Administration and Planning
Stephen S. Dunham, General Counsel
Betty W. Robinett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

August 11, 1982

Dr. Kenneth Keller
Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

In response to your letter of August 9 which states that the Senate-adopted sick leave and maternity leave policy contains flaws preventing central administration's approval of it, I will put the item on the Consultative Committee's agenda for August 26 and will invite members of the Faculty Affairs Committee to join us.

Before that meeting I hope to have again the opportunity for a conversation with you, and would appreciate at that time learning the specific difficulties which the Senate policy proposal raises.

Sincerely,

Patricia D. Swan, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

August 18, 1982

Dr. Kenneth Keller
Vice President, Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall

Dear Ken:

Here are some aspects of the SCC's August 26 agenda items which I will want to discuss with you prior to that meeting. I have made an appointment for the morning of the 25th.

1. Data-gathering for assessing the University's response to the SCEP teaching policy. (If SCC focuses on certain questions how might we proceed to collect data?)
2. Maternity/paternity leave policy: what problems have arisen?
3. Plans for Regents' review of the Faculty Senate's long-range salary improvement plan;
4. Committee on University-industry relationships;
5. Faculty members to work with Al Linck on the faculty work-load study.

The Consultative Committee will take up its own internal business first on the 26th. We will hope that the Regents won't require you for the entire afternoon so that you may join us to talk about item 2 above, to tell us about the progress of your task forces and to bring us up-to-date on the status of key personnel searches.

Sincerely,

Patricia B. Swan, Chair,
Senate Consultative Committee

SICK AND DISABILITY LEAVE POLICY

This policy applies to all full-time academic employees during the term of their regular appointment.

A faculty member who is sick or otherwise disabled may be absent with pay for up to two weeks by informally notifying his or her department head. If the faculty member is sick or disabled beyond this two-week period, the faculty member should submit a doctor's certificate to the department head, the Dean of the College, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the faculty member adequately documents inability to work, he or she shall be entitled to leave with pay for the period of the disability as follows: 1) Full salary for three months for a faculty member with less than two years' service; 2) full salary for six months and 2/3 salary for an additional six months for a faculty member with over two years' service but less than ten years service; 3) full salary for 12 months and 2/3 salary for an additional 12 months for a faculty member with over ten years service. These periods include the two-week informal leave.

Disabilities associated with pregnancy and childbirth will be treated like any other disability under this policy, except that a faculty member is entitled upon request to six weeks maternity leave with pay following the birth of her child and need not

prove actual disability during this six week period. A faculty member who is disabled during pregnancy or following the expiration of the six week maternity leave is entitled to the informal two-week leave without documentation as well as additional paid leave with proof of disability as provided in this policy. The six week maternity leave and the two-week informal leave are part of the time limits described in the above paragraph.

The time limits in this policy are maximums for each separate disability. A faculty member will be entitled to more than one period of paid leave only upon proof that the sickness or disability which requires a subsequent leave is separate from and not a continuation of an earlier sickness or disability for which the faculty member took a paid leave. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may determine in the interests of fairness that a faculty member who suffers a recurring disability after returning to work should be allowed a subsequent paid leave.

Faculty members with long-term disabilities must apply as soon as they are eligible for benefits under the faculty Group Income Disability Insurance Plan, under Social Security, and under other specified disability programs whose benefits are deducted under the Disability Insurance Plan. Salary paid under this policy will be reduced by the amount of the benefits paid under those programs. If the faculty member fails to apply for these other disability benefits, payments under this policy will be reduced by the benefits that would have been received with proper application.

A faculty member who takes an informal leave of two weeks or less shall make reasonable efforts to make up cancelled classes. In cases of longer disabilities the department is responsible for making other arrangements to make up classes.

Central Administration will pay half the cost of that portion of the continued salary not covered by insurance disability or other benefits of faculty who are on sick or disability leave for more than three months.

FAMILY AND PERSONAL LEAVE WITHOUT PAY

A faculty member is entitled upon request to a leave of absence without pay for up to 12 months following birth or adoption of a child or if the faculty member has a child or spouse with a serious health problem. A faculty member is entitled under the same circumstances to an additional unpaid leave of up to 12 months unless the Vice President for Academic Affairs determines after consultation with the department head and dean that the leave will create substantial hardships for students or other faculty. With the exception of unforeseen situations, a faculty member requesting leave under this policy should file the request with the department head, the Dean of the College and the Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than four months prior to the expected beginning date of the leave. This leave may start immediately following a disability leave related to childbirth. If a family or personal leave ends during an academic term, the faculty member should adjust the leave to end at the beginning or the end of the term. The department head and the faculty member may agree at any time to shorten or lengthen an unpaid leave under this policy or to make such a leave part-time.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS TO SCEP TASK FORCE REPORT - MAY, 1978

I. Course/Instruction Evaluation by Students

A. What steps has the University community taken to develop an evaluation instrument^s which (1) will ^{provide a} be valid ^{part of} in assessing teaching effectiveness and which (2) will give the teacher clues as to why he/she is not doing well and how teaching performance might be improved?

B. What steps has the University community taken to evaluate teachers by surveying graduates who have been holding jobs for about five years?

II. Course/Instruction Evaluation by Peers

A. What steps has the University community taken to encourage peer review and peer assistance ^{of} ~~to~~ beginning teachers?

B. What steps has the University community taken to secure the evaluation of institutions on their teaching capabilities, along with their scholarly capacities? ^{research} of higher education

III. Improvement of Instruction

A. What steps has the University community taken to insure the dissemination among the faculty of superior teaching ideas, ~~syllabi~~ ^{syllabi of} courses, training programs for assistants, and the like? etc., and the development of

B. What steps has the University community taken to encourage the development of self-improvement programs, or to encourage teachers to take advantage of existing programs?

C. What steps has the University community taken to encourage departments to establish orientation programs and special teaching seminars for graduate assistants who are to be given teaching responsibilities?

D. What steps has the University community taken to make the hardware in audio-visual centers more available to teachers?

IV. University Recognition of Teaching Quality

A. What steps has the University community taken to insure that the people who make decisions on tenure, promotion, and salary will, in accordance with University policy, place the teaching factor on a level of equality with the research factor in the decision process?

B. What steps has the University community taken to insure that departments, when interviewing potential staff members, inform these people that good teaching is an important part of their professional responsibilities, and that their teaching will be evaluated and the assessment will become one of the criteria upon which rewards are distributed?

V. Instructional Evaluation as an Aid to Student Choices

B. A. What steps has the University community taken to help students and teachers understand the student's own educational and ~~psychological~~ ^{psychological} profile (student's learning style)?

B. What steps has the University community taken to advise students on the effective choice of courses, ~~(curricula and careers)?~~ ^{curricula,}

Suggest deletion, since it does not fit congenially into the focus of the task force, as requested by the students. Also it is a bit out of the mainstream of the other questions on the list. (Perhaps I am wrong; perhaps it can be redrafted. ??)

It may be a good idea for someone else to ~~go~~ go over the Task Force report to see if there is any important recommendation that I may have missed. (I did my analysis very quickly.)

Regards -
John

A. What steps has the University community taken to assure that there is ^{appropriate} communication ~~of ideas~~ ^{the processes of} between advising, teaching and ~~and~~ instructional ^{evaluation} such that ~~each~~ ^{each} process appropriately informs the others?

Copy to SC
8/26

Minnesota Student Association
240 Coffman Memorial Union
Educational Affairs Committee
Student Services Committee

July 29, 1982

TO: The Senate Consultative Committee
FROM: Julie Bates and Julie Iverson
RE: Discussion of Undergraduate Education

During the upcoming discussions about the current and future state of affairs of undergraduate education at the University of Minnesota, we would like to have the Committee to be aware of the special and focal role that academic advising plays in the "undergraduate experience." The significance of academic advising cannot be more emphasized, especially now when student support services suffer from stringent and severe budget cuts in their programs and personnel.

The future of academic advising for undergraduates does not look optimistic.

We believe, however, that there is a potential for positive returns to students and the University, if the University is committed to a study of the academic advising system for undergraduate students on the Minneapolis campus. We are committed to such an undertaking, in cooperation with the various academic unit's support services, and urge decision-makers to concur and participate in such a study.

This study, in its formative stages, will benefit from further discussions of where undergraduate education is going at the University and the path it will take. We urge you to consider the validity of an advising proposal and timeliness of such a study.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Copy to *See - August Agenda*

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

July 8, 1982

The Honorable Charles H. Casey
The Honorable William B. Dosland
The Honorable Willis K. Drake
The Honorable Erwin L. Goldfine
The Honorable Lauris Krenik
The Honorable David M. Lebedoff
The Honorable Verne Long
The Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan
The Honorable Wenda W. Moore
The Honorable David K. Roe
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler
The Honorable Michael W. Unger

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

The docket for the July meeting of the Educational Policy and Long-Range Planning Committee contains an informational item on a contract we have recently signed with Genetics, International of Boston, Massachusetts to support research in biotechnology at the Gray Freshwater Biological Institute. We have been negotiating this contract for several months, involving both internal and external legal counsel, our patent office and our Office of Research Administration, since we are charting new territory for the University.

You will remember that we first alerted the Board to these negotiations last October (my letter to the Board of October 28, 1981) and discussed the matter at the February meeting of the Educational Policy and Long-Range Planning Committee. Because of the sensitivity of this issue, we have held extensive discussions within the University on the arrangements. I have met with the Freshwater Biological Institute faculty on several occasions, with the College of Biological Sciences faculty, and with the Senate Committee on Research. The discussions have been constructive and supportive.

I have attached a copy of my letter to you of October 28, 1981. Its first two paragraphs summarize the importance to the University of closer ties with the industrial sector. Essentially every major research university is moving in this direction, each recognizing, as we do, both the advantages and the pitfalls in such relationships. We have requested information from several of them on the policies they have adopted and we will share those with you when they arrive.

The Genetics, International contract has focused our attention on a number of the important issues which must be considered in developing a sound University policy on University-industry relationships. Therefore, it seems appropriate at this time to identify these issues specifically and to initiate action to develop a policy that the Board could adopt to govern future contracts. I have attached a proposed resolution for the Board's consideration which would provide a framework within

Board of Regents
July 8, 1982
Page Two

which a policy proposal could be developed. While the discussions within the University thus far have laid the groundwork for such a policy, I believe it would be advisable to discuss the proposal with appropriate University Senate committees before bringing it back to the Board in the Fall.

I have placed the resolution on the agenda for information only. I hope that this will provide you with sufficient time to ask any questions you may have prior to the September meeting when the matter will be up for action.

Sincerely,



Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

KHK:lme
Attachment

cc: Dr. C. Peter Magrath
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Duane A. Wilson, Secretary to the Board of Regents

6. Financial interests of individual investigators where income to the University is in the form of royalties, the proportionate share allocated to faculty inventors is defined by the Patent Policy. The proposed policy should set guidelines for sharing other forms of income or equity in a manner consistent with the intent of the Patent Policy. In addition, before the University enters an agreement with a company the faculty member to be involved should be required to report all other financial interests in and arrangements with the company and guidelines should be established on the maximum allowable extent of such interests and arrangements.

:lme

July 8, 1982

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRIAL RELATIONSHIPS

WHEREAS, the shifting patterns of federal support for education and research increase the need for the University to turn to the private sector for research funding, for help in the acquisition of scientific equipment, and for direct support of educational programs, and

WHEREAS, collaboration with industry increases the likelihood that educational and research activities at the University will reflect current societal needs, and

WHEREAS, closer cooperation between the University and the industrial sector can lead to more effective application of new knowledge and new technology for the benefit of society, and

WHEREAS, the transfer and development of new knowledge and new inventions through licensing and other agreements can generate income which can preserve and enhance the quality of education at the University, and

WHEREAS, the independence of the University and its mission as a land-grant institution devoted to teaching, research and service must never be impaired by agreements or activities which blur its purpose or introduce elements of conflict of interest,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents directs the administration to develop and bring back to the Board by December, 1982 for discussion and action, a policy for governing University-industry contractual relationships. This policy should deal with at least the following issues:

1. Appropriate research activities. In this regard, the policy should insure that research activities are consistent in quality, breadth, and importance with the aim of the institution to be at the forefront of research in each of its fields and that the research is integrated with and the supportive of the educational mission of the University
2. Openness of research. Any of the contractual relationships allowed should conform to the provisions of the University Senate Policy limiting secrecy in research.
3. Commitment of University resources, space, and personnel. The policy should insure that no single arrangement or project involve the commitment of so large a fraction of any unit's space, equipment, or faculty that an appropriate balance of other activities within the unit cannot be maintained.
4. Assignment of patent rights and licences and other approaches to technology transfer. While the policy may well provide for a variety of different mechanisms by which the inventions, discoveries, and developments of the faculty may be assigned to companies in the private sector, each of these should meet the criterion that it optimizes the likelihood that the citizens of the State and nation will benefit from the advance in knowledge involved.
5. Financial involvement of the University with any company. Where the agreement between a company and the University involves the transfer of stock or other equity to the University, the policy should set limits to the relationship that are consistent with those established for the University's investment funds. If it is impractical or inadvisable to adhere to these limits, the policy should provide for alternative "arm's-length" arrangements.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October 28, 1981

The Honorable Charles H. Casey
The Honorable William B. Dosland
The Honorable Willis K. Drake
The Honorable Erwin L. Goldfine
The Honorable Lauris Krenik
The Honorable David M. Lebedoff
The Honorable Verne Long
The Honorable Charles F. McGuiggan
The Honorable Wenda W. Moore
The Honorable David K. Roe
The Honorable Mary T. Schertler
The Honorable Michael W. Unger

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

As I am sure you know, the shifting patterns of federal support for research and the increasing need for the University to find other sources of income are leading us in the direction of closer and closer cooperation with the private sector in a number of ways. First we must turn to the private sector more and more to fund research proposals for which there are no longer adequate sources of federal support. Second, we must look for ways to profit from technology developed at the University to an extent greater than that possible through the licensing of inventions and the collection of royalties.

In many respects, these trends offer important new opportunities to the University and its faculty. Collaboration with industry increases the likelihood that fundamental research undertaken by our faculty will be in areas at the forefront of societal needs. Furthermore, the collaboration can lead to a much more effective transfer of technology and, consequently, the earlier implementation of the advances that come about through University research. Finally, the interaction provides us with opportunities to make clear to the private sector and to the State at large how important the basic research carried on at the University can be to the health and economy of the State and region. On the other hand, as universities across the country are discovering, there are pitfalls in these new activities. We must be very careful to maintain our commitment to our basic teaching, research, and service mission, to avoid conflicts of interests, and to ensure that we do not allow our activities to be skewed by purely financial considerations. I believe that this suggests that we must take some care in approaching these new relationships even as we encourage them.

My reason for raising this issue with you at this point is to bring you up-to-date on a negotiation now in progress between the University and a new company called Genetics International, or G.I. The company is interested in the research work being carried out at the Gray Freshwater Biological Institute in the area of recombinant DNA technology applied to the production of chemicals. They would like the opportunity to support research in that area at the University and, obviously, to develop any products that might result from that research.

Board of Regents
October 28, 1981
Page Two

The proposal that they have made to us can be summarized briefly. They would like to be given "a right of first refusal" to fund, at full cost, any research proposed by our faculty at the Gray Freshwater Biological Institute that may have application in the well-defined areas of their interests. If they do fund such research, they would want royalty-free licenses on any resulting patents. If they choose not to fund the research, our faculty would be free to submit the research projects to any other funding agency. They would place no restriction on the publication of results of any research conducted with their funding nor would they restrict in any way the research activities of the investigators involved either in the areas which they have funded or in other areas.

In return for our agreement to enter into an arrangement of this sort with them, they propose to give the University a 4% equity in their company and to give each of the investigators who chooses to participate a smaller, but substantial amount of equity. Of course, no faculty member would be required to participate.

The proposed arrangements are consistent with all-University policies, but we are charting new territory and I wanted you to know that we are proceeding cautiously. We are holding discussions with the company, with the investigators involved, and with a number of faculty groups. We would like to ensure that there are guidelines in place that will avoid the pitfalls inherent in this kind of arrangement. Among the guidelines we are considering are the following:

- 1) a limitation on the fraction of research activity at the Freshwater Biological Institute which can be supported by this one company;
- 2) a limitation on the maximum financial benefit that can accrue to any individual at the Freshwater Biological Institute;
- 3) the formation of an external committee of scientific peers who would review the program of the Institute on an annual or biennial basis to ensure that it is scientifically sound and balanced; and,
- 4) a proscription on the direct financial involvement of any graduate students with the company.

This proposed arrangement with Genetics International offers a number of exciting possibilities for conducting research at the forefront of an important new field, including the opportunity to work with investigators at other universities in healthy scientific collaborations. Therefore, I share the enthusiasm of our Institute faculty members for the concept. However, since such arrangements are bound to attract public attention, I wanted you to be aware of the negotiations in progress and to assure you

Board of Regents
October 28, 1981
Page Three

that we were taking every care to protect the interests and integrity of the University in the agreement.

If you would like further details on any of these matters, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,



Kenneth H. Keller
Vice President

KHK:cac

cc: Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Duane A. Wilson, Secretary to the Board of Regents