

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1998

11:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m.

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus

The Senate Constitution provides that any student eligible to vote for senators may be admitted to Student Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Student Senate. Only elected student members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (26) must be present. Amendments to motions in the printed agenda must be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow for appropriate distribution. Consideration of amendments not received at least 48 hours in advance requires suspension of the rules by a majority of those members present and voting.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA Action (2 minutes)

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS (2 minutes)

III. ELECTION OF STUDENT SENATE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR (20 minutes)

IV. STANDING RULES OF THE STUDENT SENATE Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To adopt the following as a standing rule of the Student Senate:

If all but two of the Student Senate coordinate campus "voting members" (as defined in Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised) vote against a motion at a meeting of the Student Senate, the motion will be postponed until the next regular meeting of Student Senate, at which time an amended version may be presented to the Student Senate.

COMMENT:

The rationale behind this amendment is that even if all the coordinate campus senators vote against a motion in the Student Senate, the number of votes on the Twin Cities outweighs the votes from the coordinate campuses. If the Student Senate is going to represent the views of all students, then the voices from the coordinate campuses should be able to make a difference in voting.

This amendment does not attempt to veto a motion on the floor. As it reads, it simply asks that the motion be postponed for one meeting so that revisions, proposed by the coordinate campuses, can be considered.

HEATHER AAGESEN, Vice Chair
STUDENT SENATE AND
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

V. STUDENT SENATE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS Action (20 minutes)

MOTION:

To endorse the following amendment to the University Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 4b, as follows: (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; new language is underlined.)

b. The elected representatives of the students to the University Senate shall be chosen by secret ballot by the student constituency enrolled in the several institutes, colleges, or schools as specified in the bylaws. There shall be one student member for each initial 1,000 full-time students or fraction thereof in each student constituency plus one additional student senator for each additional 1,000 full-time students or major fraction thereof in such constituency. At Morris and Crookston there shall be two student senators for each initial 1,000 full-time students or fraction thereof in each student constituency plus one additional student senator for each additional 1,000 full-time students or major fraction thereof in such constituency.

To be eligible for election to the University Senate, a student must have earned the required number of credits in residence at the University, as described below, within the past year.

- Undergraduate students shall be eligible for election if they have previously earned and are who has twenty-four credits in residence at the University and at the time

~~of voting is carrying at least nine eight credits in his or her institute, college, or school at the time of voting, shall be eligible for election as a student representative to the University Senate.~~

- ~~Graduate School students shall be eligible for election if they have nine credits in residence at the University and are full-time students have previously earned and are carrying at least seven credits or one credit ABD (all but dissertation) at the time of voting or are certified as the equivalent of full-time students by the Graduate School.~~
- ~~Professional students shall be eligible for election if they have previously earned and are carrying at least twelve credits at the time of voting.~~

~~Continuing Education and Extension University College students shall be eligible for election if they have earned at least twelve credits in residence during the previous five years and are carrying at least three credits at the time of voting.~~

~~Full-time students in each institute, college, or school shall be eligible to vote. Each institute, college, or school shall establish its own procedures to determine qualification as a full-time student.~~

COMMENTS:

The Student Senate Consultative Committee feels that distinct credit limits should be established for each group represented in the University Senate. Furthermore, by reducing the total number of credits required to begin serving in the University Senate, it allows students in their second term at the University to be elected as a senator from their respective collegiate unit.

KEVIN NICHOLSON, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

VI. DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSOR FRED MORRISON REGARDING CONSTITUTIONAL AND BYLAW AMENDING PROCEDURES Discussion (15 minutes)

[See Item XI. on the Twin Cities Campus Assembly agenda and
Item I. on the University Senate Agenda]

VII. TUITION DISCUSSION WITH VICE PROVOST CRAIG SWAN Discussion (15 minutes)

VIII. CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE UPDATE (5 minutes)

IX. STUDENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION REPORT (5 minutes)

X. CAMPUS REPORTS (10 minutes)

XI. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT (5 minutes)

XII. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (5 minutes)

XIII. OLD BUSINESS

XIV. NEW BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1998

(immediately following the Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting—approximately 3:00 p.m.)

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 204, including the President, 152 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 51 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (103) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 136 affirmative votes at one meeting or 103 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 103 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. Amendments to motions in the printed agenda must be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow for appropriate distribution. Consideration of amendments not received at least 48 hours in advance requires suspension of the rules by a majority of those members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any academic professional and student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members or alternates, the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Senate Office prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign in. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

MBM
Miche

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

[Item I. will be considered at the same time as Item XI. on the Twin Cities Campus Assembly agenda.]

I. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE Amending Procedures Action (10 minutes)

PREAMBLE

Over the years the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly have experienced considerable difficulty in securing the required attendance at its meetings to adopt constitutional and bylaw amendments. Important legislation that oftentimes receives overwhelming support from those senators present and voting has been left unapproved due to the stringent voting requirements. The proposal to establish a Twin Cities Undergraduate Curriculum Committee last year serves as an example of this problem. It received overwhelming support at each of several meetings at which it was presented, but failed to receive the required number of votes for passage at any one meeting.

In view of this ongoing problem, the Business and Rules Subcommittee was asked by the Senate Consultative Committee to examine the voting practices of other institutions as well as *Robert's Rules of Order*, the parliamentary authority for the Senate and Assembly. The Subcommittee learned that the requirements for amending the Senate and Assembly constitutions and bylaws are not only inconsistent with other institutions but are strongly discouraged by *Robert's Rules of Order*. The above amendments reflect the more commonly used practice of other institutions and conform to the recommendations in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

The Senate Consultative Committee/Assembly Steering Committee endorses the recommendations of the Business and Rules Subcommittee, as outlined in the motion, and encourages the Senate and Assembly to adopt the proposed changes. Parallel amendments to the Assembly constitution appear on the Assembly agenda.

As a constitutional amendment, 136 affirmative votes are required at one meeting for approval, or 103 affirmative votes at each of two consecutive meetings.

MOTION:

To amend Articles VIII. and IX. of the Senate Constitution as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are ~~struck-out~~]

ARTICLE VIII. AMENDING PROCEDURE

An amendment to this Constitution shall be approved either by a two-thirds majority of ~~all voting members of the University Senate~~ vote of the senators present and voting at a regular or special meeting of the University Senate, or by a majority of ~~all voting members of the Senate~~ those senators present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting; and provided the proposed amendment has been distributed, in writing, to the persons and in the manner provided in Article III, Section 7, for distribution of the Senate agenda, at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed amendment. An amendment shall be effective following approval by the University Senate and by the Board of Regents.

ARTICLE IX. BYLAWS

The University Senate may enact or amend its Bylaws by ~~majority vote of the total membership of the Senate~~ a two-thirds vote of the senators present and voting at a regular or special meeting of the University Senate, or by a majority of those senators present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting, and provided the proposed change has been submitted, in writing, to each member of the Senate at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed change.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
RUSSELL HOBBIE, Chair
BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE

II. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1998-99 Action (5 minutes)

CONSENT AGENDA 1 Action (5 minutes)

Agenda Items III. through VI. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "Consent Agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As bylaw amendments, 103 votes are required for approval.

III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Student Senate Consultative Committee Membership

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article III., Section 3, Senate Consultative Committee, as follows: (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~)

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

3. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

Student Consultative Committee

Membership

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of:

- one student from the Crookston campus
- one student from the Duluth campus
- one student from the Morris campus
- five students from the Twin Cities campus, as follows:
 - 1993-94 4 ~~undergraduates~~, 1 ~~graduate/professional~~
 - 1994-95 3 ~~undergraduates~~, 2 ~~graduate/professionals~~
 - 1995-96 4 ~~undergraduates~~, 1 ~~graduate/professional~~
 - 1996-97 3 ~~undergraduates~~, 2 ~~graduate/professionals~~
 - 1997-98 4 ~~undergraduates~~, 1 ~~graduate/professional~~
 - 1998-99 3 ~~undergraduates~~, 2 ~~graduate/professionals~~
 - 1999-00 4 ~~undergraduates~~, 1 ~~graduate/professional~~
 - 2000-01 3 ~~undergraduates~~, 2 ~~graduate/professionals~~

-the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate

COMMENT:

The amendment extends the present pattern of Twin Cities representation on the Student Senate Consultative Committee through 2001.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Disabilities Issues Committee

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Blaws, Article III, Section 4, Committee on Committees, as follows: (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~)

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

4. DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE

The Disabilities Issues Committee ~~oversees~~ recommends University policies, procedures, and services concerning disabled faculty/academic professionals, students, and staff.

Membership

The Disabilities Issues Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students (at least one graduate and one undergraduate), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Faculty, academic professional, and student members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the president in consultation with the Civil Service Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. ~~To advise the president and administrative offices, on University-wide issues relating to physical access, access to academic programs, and the structure of and provision for student services for the disabled.~~
- a. To advise the president and administrative offices, including the Disability Services Office and the University ADA Coordinator, on policies, programs, and services for students and employees.
- b. To promote compliance with laws relating to students and staff with disabilities.
- b c. ~~To review policies and practices in light of legal compliance aspects, deployment of resources, and effectiveness in meeting student needs the needs of the University community, and to recommend changes.~~
- e d. To educate inform the University community to the special concerns of its disabled members with disabilities and of the available resources.
- d. ~~To consult with the administrative committees providing coordination of programs, and services.~~
- e. To bring concerns to the Senate, as appropriate.
- f. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- g. To submit an annual report to the Senate.

COMMENT:

In consultation with the Disability Issues Committee and appropriate administrative officers, the Committee on Committees proposes the above amendments to clarify the duties and responsibilities of the Disabilities Issues Committee and its relationship with the Disability Services Office and University ADA Coordinator.

EMILY HOOVER, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Restructuring the Committee on Committees

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 2, Committee on Committees, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~]

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Senate Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Senate and advises the Senate Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Senate. The faculty/academic professional representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate Committee on committees and the student representatives shall serve as the Student Senate Committee on Committees.

Membership

The Senate Committee on Committees shall be composed of 9 elected faculty/academic professional members, 6 elected undergraduate students, and one elected Twin Cities graduate/professional student.

Of the faculty/academic professional members, 6 shall be from the Twin Cities campus, and one member each from the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses, all elected for three-year terms by the faculty/academic professional members of the Senate from these respective campuses. Faculty/academic professional members must have served as senators within the last five ten years.

Of the undergraduate student members, 3 shall be elected from the Twin Cities campus, and one each from the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses, all elected by the undergraduate Student Senate members from these campuses the respective campuses from among their number. The Twin Cities graduate/professional student shall be elected by the graduate and professional Student Senate members from among their number of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Elections shall be held during the spring quarter. Terms of membership shall be for one-year terms. Any undergraduate student committee position that cannot be filled by October 31 will become a Student Senate at-large positions and can be filled by an undergraduate student from any campus may be filled by the Student Senate Consultative Committee on an interim basis until the next general election. Any graduate/professional student committee positions that cannot be filled by October 31 will become at-large positions and can be filled by any graduate or professional student.

The chair shall be elected by committee members from among their number for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position. The chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To forward annually to the Senate for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, undergraduate students, graduate/professional students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Senate specified in the Bylaws of the Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional, undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty, academic professionals, undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Senate and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.

- b. To review annually the committees of the Senate and recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.
- c. To submit an annual report to the Senate.

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Faculty Senate Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position. The chair shall also serve as the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. Faculty/academic professional members shall To furnish the full committee a slate of faculty/academic professional committee nominees, and student members shall furnish the full committee a slate of student nominees, for review and recommendations.
- b. To solicit annually from each newly elected faculty/academic professional member of the Senate a list of Senate committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.
- c. To conduct a survey, at least every three years, of faculty/academic professional interest in serving on committees of the Senate and make a summary of this study available to the Senate.
- d. To request annually from deans, directors, and department heads a list of faculty/academic professional members who they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- e. To select an additional voting representative from a non-eligible constituency of the University for placement on the appropriate committee for a term of one year, if the Senate Consultative Committee determines that a committee of the Senate will benefit from such representation.
- g. To recommend to the Student Senate Committee on Committees and the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

STUDENT SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Student Senate Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair shall be eligible for re-election to that position.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To furnish the full committee a slate of student committee nominees for review and recommendations. Consideration shall be given to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members, and the presidents of the respective student associations; and 4) expressions of interest in committee service offered by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select student senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Student Senate and the committees and shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, gender, and class rank in constituting committees.
- b. To solicit annually from each newly elected member of the Student Senate a list of Senate committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.
- c. To request annually from student association presidents a list of students whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- d. To recommend to the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees and the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- e. To submit to the Clerk of the Senate an annual budget request for the Student Committee on Committees.

COMMENT:

The above amendments reflect revisions requested by the Student Committee on Committees to more clearly identify the duties and responsibilities of the Student Committee on Committees and to clarify the selection process for the student members.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EMILY HOOVER, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

VI. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article III., Section 14, Student Affairs Committee, as follows: [new language is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~]

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

14. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To formulate and recommend to the Senate policies pertaining to all student affairs and all University-registered student organizations that are not within the control or supervision of any other committee of the Senate.
- b. To provide supervision over the financial affairs and regular publications of all University-registered student organizations, and to require all registered student organizations to provide an annual report and, upon request, a report within 30 days of notice.
- b. To provide a comprehensive link between the University and all University student organizations in accordance with the defined relationship between the student organization and the University as described in the Policy on Registration and Classification of Student Groups for the Twin Cities campus and as defined by coordinate campuses.
- c. To be concerned with the general welfare of international students and the services and affairs that pertain to them.
- d. To provide a link between Health Service staffs and the University community and to address problems in providing effective and efficient health care.
- e. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- f. To submit an annual report to the Senate.

COMMENT:

The Student Affairs Committee charged an ad hoc committee to review the defined relationship between student organizations on the Twin Cities campus and the University. The ad hoc committee developed a student organization relationship proposal that was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Student Affairs on June 11, 1996.

The relationship as described in the Senate Bylaws, Article III, 14.b., is no longer consistent with the relationship descriptions passed by the Student Affairs Committee in 1996. The proposed change still fosters a link between the Committee and student organizations but remains flexible enough to respond to the different relationships that might exist on each campus and/or category for registration on the Twin Cities campus.

EMILY HOOVER, chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
KATHLEEN PETERSON, Chair
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

[End of Consent Agenda 1]

CONSENT AGENDA 2
Action (5 minutes)

Agenda Items VII. and VIII. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "Consent Agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As amendments to the Senate Rules, a majority of members present and voting is required for approval.

VII. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Disabilities Issues Committee

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Rules, Article III, Section 2, Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees, as follows: (new language is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~)

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

Ex officio members shall be appointed from each of the offices listed below and are non-voting positions unless otherwise noted.

-
DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE—Office of the Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs (one from the Disability Services Office and the University ADA Coordinator); Office of the Senior Vice President, Finance and Operations

EMILY HOOVER, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Ex Officio Representation

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Rules, Article III., Section 2, Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees, as follows: (new language is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~)

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate committees

Ex officio members shall be appointed from each of the offices listed below and are non-voting positions unless otherwise noted.

-
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE—Vice chair of the Faculty Senate (voting), Chairs of the Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Finance and Planning, and Research Committee (if a non-faculty member is appointed as chair as one of the ~~three~~ four committees, then the faculty members of that committee shall elect from among themselves a representative); elected representatives from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections.
- FINANCE AND PLANNING—Office of the Senior Vice President, Finance and Operations (two representatives); Office of the Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs (two representatives, including one from the Office of Planning and Analysis); chair (or his/her designee) of the Research Committee

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) invited the chair of the Senate Research Committee to join its meetings during 1997-98, on an informal basis, and has found that having that person at its meetings was useful for coordination of governance activities as well as informative for FCC members. Inasmuch as this is a research university, FCC believes it would be wise to have the Research Committee chair made an ex officio nonvoting member of FCC on a permanent basis, and recommends to the Senate that this change in the rules be approved.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

[End of Consent Agenda 2]

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Conflict of Interest Policy
Discussion and Action (30 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Conflict of Interest Policy, as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are ~~struck out~~]

Due to the length of the policy, the proposed amendments have been mailed to senators and are available in the Senate agenda on the Web at the following URL: http://www.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/senagenda.html

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
KENT BALES, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

X. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Degrees with Distinction and Degrees with Honors Policy
Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following policy:

DEGREES WITH DISTINCTION AND DEGREES
WITH HONORS POLICY

PREAMBLE

The overall performance of degree candidates in each undergraduate collegiate unit shall be judged in relationship to the performance of their peers, and not in relationship to other University students. While many students may be outstanding when they are admitted to a program, the recognition of achievement shall be reserved to those who have excelled in the program itself, relative to their peers.

I. Degrees with Distinction

- a) The initiative in establishing degrees with distinction shall lie with the colleges and campuses concerned and must be approved by the chief academic officer on the campus.
- b) To graduate "with distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.75 or higher at the time the student graduates. To graduate "with high distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.90 or higher.
2. The grade point average alone shall be used in determining the granting of degrees "with distinction" or "with high distinction." Colleges or campuses may choose to offer only degrees "with distinction" or only degrees "with high distinction," but in either case they would be subject to section I(1)(b) of this policy.

II. Degrees with Honors

- a) The initiative for establishing degrees with honors (that is, cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude) shall lie with the departments, colleges, or campuses and must be approved by the appropriate dean and the senior academic officer on the campus. Qualifications for degrees with honors must meet the requirements of sections II(2), II(3), and II(4) of this policy.
- b) Descriptions of existing honors programs, as of the date this policy is adopted by the Senate, shall be provided to the Committee on Educational Policy. Establishment of new honors programs, or major modifications to existing honors programs, shall be reported for information to the Committee on Educational Policy.
2. The requirements for a degree with honors shall not consist of only the accomplishment of a designated amount of course work or achievement of a stipulated grade point average, but shall also include a definite standard of excellence in scholarship with specific evidence of ability to accomplish independent or original work. This requires that the student participate in a fully developed honors program in a unit.
3. A unit desiring to grant degrees with honors must propose an honors program, specifying how honors students are to be selected, the nature, depth, and breadth of the honors requirements, and the general requirements for obtaining a degree cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude.
4. The minimum grade point average required for achievement of a degree "cum laude" shall be 3.5, that for a degree "magna cum laude" shall be 3.66, and that for a degree "summa cum laude" shall be 3.75.
5. Colleges shall attempt to ensure that there is reasonable consistency across departments in the amount of work required of its students to obtain degrees with honors.

III. General Provisions

1. Any college or campus may offer both degrees with honors and degrees with distinction, only one, or neither.
2. A student may obtain both a degree with honors and a degree with distinction.
3. To qualify for either a degree with distinction or a degree with honors, a student must have completed 60 or more semester credits at the University. For the purposes of meeting the grade point average standards set forth in this policy, only University course work shall be counted.
4. It is the expectation of the Senate that in general, a college will not award degrees with honors and with distinction, in total, to more than approximately 10 - 15% of any graduating class.
5. The University transcript will contain a brief explanation of the difference between a degree with distinction and a degree with honors.
6. The Office of the Registrar shall annually report to the Committee on Educational Policy data on the number and percentage of students in each college and campus who receive degrees with distinction and degrees with honors.
7. From time to time, the Committee on Educational Policy may review honors programs and criteria for degrees with distinction in the various colleges, and may make recommendations to the Senate concerning them.

Implementation Notes (to be approved by the Senate, but not officially part of the policy):

Students who have achieved the required grade point average shall be permitted to graduate (with distinction) or (with high distinction) as soon as it is practicable to implement this policy. If a student is already in a program offering a degree (with distinction) or using similar language, the student shall be bound by those rules. All students entering the University after this policy has been adopted by the Senate shall meet the requirements of this policy.

Students enrolled in an existing honors program shall be bound by those rules. The provisions of this policy covering honors degrees will apply only to students entering honors programs Fall Semester, 1999, and after.

COMMENT:

This policy, for all campuses of the University, is essentially adapted from three earlier policies adopted by the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly. This proposal differentiates between degrees with distinction and degrees with honors. It requires campuses, colleges, and departments to conform to general guidelines in awarding these degrees.

One new element of this policy is the specific grade point average standards, which are set as part of the larger effort to bring consistency to University policies. In the case of degrees with honors, departments and colleges are expected to set additional requirements (e.g., an honors thesis, completion of honors seminars, etc.). A degree is awarded by the University, not by a college or department or campus, so it seems to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) appropriate that there be University-wide standards with respect to degrees with honors and with distinction.

SCEP does NOT propose a fixed percentage limit of students who may obtain a degree with distinction or with honors. To set a percentage would mean that students would not know, at the time of graduation, whether or what level of honors or distinction they had received, because those calculations could not be made until after all grades were turned in. Use of a percentage would also mean that there would be a floating target for students seeking to obtain a degree with honors or with distinction. For these reasons, SCEP concluded after considerable debate that stipulation of grade point averages was the most reasonable course. degrees.

SCEP considered the proposal that qualification for degrees with distinction or with honors should be based only on upper division credits, or the last 60 semester/90

quarter credits. Some believe that a student who gets off to a bad start as an undergraduate should nonetheless be able to qualify for these degrees if they mature as a student and significantly improve their academic performance during the junior and senior years. Others believe that the degrees with honors and with distinction should reflect performance that is of uniformly high quality throughout the student's undergraduate career. SCEP came down on the side of the latter view, believing that the degrees with honors and distinction should reflect uniformly excellent academic performance by students beginning with nearly their first enrollment at the University. A student who has achieved a 2.0 or only slightly better during the first year or so of college may in fact turn behavior and performance around, and later achieve at a much higher level, but SCEP does not believe that such change, while commendable, warrants being awarded a degree signifying outstanding academic performance. SCEP also concurs with the view expressed by some students that those who improve their performance should not be placed in the same category as those who consistently perform well academically throughout their undergraduate years.

SCEP may periodically review all existing honors programs for appropriate consistency throughout the University, and will report the results of those reviews to the Senate. If it were to find, for example, that 10% of the graduates in one college but 25% of the graduates in another college were receiving degrees with honors or with distinction, SCEP might be prepared to consider further revisions to this policy.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

XI. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Resolution Regarding Future Investments in Burma (Myanmar)
Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the University of Minnesota has established a strong tradition of concern for social issues in its investment policies, and

WHEREAS the most controversial country for U.S. investors concerned about human rights at present is Burma, and

WHEREAS the military government of Burma has systematically abused human rights, tortured and imprisoned citizens who dissent from its policies, and has failed to yield control to the legally elected party in the national elections of 1990, and

WHEREAS Total Oil Company's (Total S.A.) investment in the construction and operation of the Yadana offshore oil pipeline represents about one-third of the current foreign investments in Burma, and

WHEREAS Total Oil Company has been complicit with the Burmese government in the use of forced labor for the building of this pipeline and its supporting infrastructure,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The University of Minnesota should not invest in Total Oil Company (Total S.A.) stock until the reestablishment of a democratic government and redress of human rights abuses in that nation, or until Total Oil Company suspends its operations in Burma, and;

The University carefully consider the social impact of future investments in companies which operate in Burma, until the reestablishment of a democratic government and redress of human rights abuses in that nation.

COMMENT:

A military government, Slorc, was established in 1988 amidst violent suppression of a wide-spread democratic movement. The pro-democracy party (National League for Democracy) won the election of 1990 by a large margin, but the Slorc ignored the results, and instead continued to quash dissent. Slorc imprisoned Aung San Suu Kyi (Nobel Peace Prize winner) for six years, during which time her party won the national elections. After her release in 1995, she remains confined to her home. In 1996, student protests and arrests escalated. In response, the Slorc closed Burma's 30-odd colleges and universities; they remain closed to this day. International agencies and human rights groups continue to criticize the SPDC (name for the all-military government since 1997) for using forced labor on infrastructure projects and for military purposes.

Total Oil Company (Total, S.A.), Burma's largest investor bringing in about one-third of foreign capital, has been charged with using forced labor in building its oil pipeline and in construction of the Ye-Tavoy railroad which supports the pipeline project. Forced labor is used by the SPDC as well, under particularly onerous conditions, for military portering.

In May 1997, the Clinton administration determined that the conditions under which the United States can impose economic sanctions on Burma had been met, and declared a ban on new U.S. investment in Burma. Eighteen cities, Alameda Co. (California), and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have passed selective purchasing legislation, targeting companies that do business in Burma. Companies that have ceased operations in Burma include Amoco, Apple Computer, Eastman Kodak, Hewlett-Packard, IBM, J.C. Penney, Kmart, Liz Claiborne, PepsiCo, and Walt Disney. The University of Wisconsin divested its portfolio of Texaco stock in April 1997, and Texaco sold its stake in Burma's Yetagun oil fields in December 1997.

The University of Minnesota divested its Total Oil shares valued at \$1.2 million in March 1998.

ERIC BAUER, Chair
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

XII. LIBRARY COMMITTEE REPORT
Information

As we conclude the academic year 1997-98, the Senate Library Committee is pleased to report several positive developments, but also needs to inform the members of the Senate of a number of critical issues facing the University of Minnesota Libraries. On the positive side, users of Wilson Library can be assured that the lengthy and bothersome internal construction (asbestos removal and sprinkler installation) was completed on April 1 of this year, making all parts of the collection accessible again. Full funding for the renovation of Walter Library to become a Digital Technology Center has been obtained, and the construction of the Minnesota Library Access/Archives Center is progressing on schedule. We view with concern, however, the steady erosion of the Library's purchasing power, which has reached a crisis point in the acquisition of serials. In this area, costs have increased more than 147% during the last ten years. Some journal subscriptions now cost the library over \$15,000 per title! Even with recent slight increases in the library budget, these expenditures have caused a reduction in title acquisitions by about 7%. At the same time, new journals appear on the market and need to be acquired to meet research needs of our faculty. While the library has cancelled some subscriptions to less urgently needed journals (after consultation with appropriate faculty), this double-digit inflation has led to a serious reduction in the ability to purchase non-serial titles. In 1985, approximately one-half of the acquisitions budget was used to purchase books. At present, this sum has fallen to less than 25%.

In addition to its acquisitions problems, the library also needs more qualified staff to properly serve rapidly expanding new areas of knowledge.

The Senate Library Committee believes that the University Community should be aware of these issues confronting our Library. We must preserve and strengthen this central resource of our University, and for this we need everybody's support.

GERHARD WEISS, Chair
LIBRARY COMMITTEE

XIII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)

XIV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(5 minutes)

XV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)

XVI. OLD BUSINESS

XVII. NEW BUSINESS

**XVIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY**

FACULTY

Catherine R. Brown
1950-1998

James O. Hanson
1920-1998

XIX. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1998

2:00 P.M.

25 LAW BUILDING

The voting membership of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly totals 180, including the President, 139 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Steering Committee), and 40 students (including the Student Steering Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (91) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 120 affirmative votes at one meeting or 91 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 91 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. Amendments to motions in the printed agenda must be submitted to the Clerk of the Assembly at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow for appropriate distribution. Consideration of amendments not received at least 48 hours in advance requires suspension of the rules by a majority of those members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any academic professional and student eligible to vote for members of the Assembly shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Assembly. Only elected members or alternates, the Steering Committee, and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, and student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Senate Office prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Assembly.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign in. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1998-99

Action (5 minutes)

II. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic

Policies and Practices

Action (30 minutes)

MOTION 1:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approve the following policies to standardize policies and practices for Twin Cities undergraduate students:

[Due to the length of the recommendations, a copy of Motion 1 has been mailed to senators and appears in the Assembly agenda on the Web at the following URL: <http://www.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/tccaagenda1.html>]

MOTION 2:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approve the following delegation of authority:

The Assembly delegates to the Committee on Educational Policy authority to make changes in these policies, subject to the following provisions. First, all such changes shall be reported to the Assembly at its next meeting. Second, no such changes will be effective until after the changes have been reported to the Assembly.

COMMENT:

There is concern about how readily these policies can be amended, and that requiring approval by the Assembly is a laborious and time-consuming process. The Council of Undergraduate Deans has recommended proposing this language.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

III. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Proposed Schedule for the Twin Cities Campus

Action (15 minutes)

PREAMBLE

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy (ACEP) and the Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering appointed a subcommittee last year (Winter 1997) to consider complaints that arose from students taking courses on both the Minneapolis campus and the St. Paul Campus. The complaints related to the students' inability to move between the two campuses and take courses in a timely manner; a number of faculty reported that it was disruptive to have students enter classes late or leave early in order to get to or from a class on the other campus. Prior to fall 1996, the class schedules on the two campuses were staggered; that staggering ended at the request of a number of faculty, staff and administrators on the St. Paul campus, primarily because the St. Paul campus was losing a class hour during the day. The request was granted by ACEP.

The "staggered class" subcommittee considered numerous options regarding the scheduling of classes as well as transportation issues and issues related to semesters, and actually walked the campuses and rode the buses in order to judge the amount of time it takes to get different places.

ACEP has concluded that there are two options the Assembly might consider for the Twin Cities staggered class schedule, but wishes first to confirm that staggered class starting times are desired. As a result, three motions are offered.

Motion 1 affirms that staggered class starting times should be implemented. If Motion 1 is defeated, Motions 2 and 3 are moot.

Motions 2 and 3 are the two different options that ACEP has identified as reasonable alternatives. A majority vote in favor of Motion 2 will render Motion 3 moot. If Motion 2 does not receive a majority, then the Assembly may proceed to vote on Motion 3. If neither Motion 2 or 3 receives a majority, but Motion 1 is adopted, ACEP will need further advice from the Assembly on how to proceed.

MOTION 1:

To adopt a staggered class schedule for the Twin Cities Campus.

MOTION 2:

To approve Option I, as follows:

OPTION I

Period	East Bank/West Bank	Saint Paul
I	7:45-8:35	8:15-9:05
II	8:50-9:40	9:20-10:10
III	9:55-10:45	10:25-11:15
IV	11:00-11:50	11:30-12:20
V	12:05-12:55	12:35-13:25
VI	13:10-14:00	13:40-14:30
VII	14:15-15:05	14:45-15:35
VIII	15:20-16:10	15:50-16:40
IX	16:25-17:15	16:55-17:45

MOTION 3:

To approve Option II, as follows:

OPTION II

0 (optional)		7:25-8:15
I	8:00-8:50	8:30-9:20
II	9:05-9:55	9:35-10:25
III	10:10-11:00	10:40-11:30
IV	11:15-12:05	11:45-12:35
V	12:20-13:10	12:50-13:40
VI	13:25-14:15	13:55-14:45
VII	14:30-15:20	15:00-15:50
VIII	15:35-16:25	16:05-16:55
IX	16:40-17:30	17:10-18:00

COMMENT:

1. These schedules allow 15 minutes passing time within each campus
2. Cross-passing time is 45 minutes from Minneapolis to St. Paul, and 50 minutes from St. Paul to Minneapolis. To manipulate the schedules so the time between classes is less leads to the situation that the period is acceptable for students going one way, but becomes unacceptable the other.
3. The East Bank/West Bank start time is earlier as that is a transit hub for students coming commuting to the University. Many students leave from the East Bank for St. Paul.
4. This allows both campuses the full allotment of class periods during the day, although the St. Paul classes would run until 6:00 p.m. if Option II were adopted. The option of a zero-hour is also provided for St. Paul with Option II.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

CONSENT AGENDA

Action (5 minutes)

Agenda Items IV. and V. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "Consent Agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As bylaw amendments, 91 votes are required for approval.

IV. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE

Assembly Steering Committee Membership

MOTION:

To amend the Assembly Bylaws, Article III., Section 7, Steering Committees, as following: (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~)

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

7. STEERING COMMITTEES

.....

Assembly Steering Committee

Membership

The Assembly Steering Committee shall be composed of 7 (or possibly 8) elected members of the faculty, 5 elected undergraduate and graduate/professional students, and the vice chair of the Assembly. The numbers of undergraduate and graduate/professional students on the Student Steering Committee shall be as follows:

1993-94	4-undergraduates, 1-graduate/professional
1994-95	3-undergraduates, 2-graduate/professionals
1995-96	4-undergraduates, 1-graduate/professional
1996-97	3-undergraduates, 2-graduate/professionals
1997-98	4-undergraduates, 1-graduate/professional
1998-99	3-undergraduates, 2-graduate/professionals
1999-00	4-undergraduates, 1-graduate/professional
2000-01	3-undergraduates, 2-graduate/professionals

COMMENT:

The amendment extends the present pattern of Twin Cities student representation on the Assembly Steering Committee through 2001.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE

V. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Restructuring the Assembly Committee on Committees

MOTION:

To amend the Assembly Bylaws, Article III, Section 1, Committee on Committees, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~]

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

1. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Assembly Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Assembly and advises the Assembly Steering Committee on the committee structure of the Assembly. The faculty/academic professional representatives shall serve as the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees and the student representatives shall serve as the Student Assembly Committee on Committees.

Membership

The Assembly Committee on Committees shall be composed of the elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional and student representatives from of the Twin Cities campus to the Senate Committee on Committees. It shall be composed of 6 elected faculty/academic professional members and those students of the Senate Committee on Committees elected from the Twin Cities campus, but not exceeding four. Faculty/academic professional members must have served as members of the Assembly within the last five ten years.

A special faculty/academic professional nominating committee, appointed by the Faculty Steering Committee and approved by the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, shall nominate twice as many faculty/academic professional candidates for the committee as are to be elected each year. These candidates shall be announced in the Assembly docket for the last regular meeting of the academic year. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by the petition of 12 faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting. At the last regular Assembly meeting of the year, the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly shall elect by secret ballot two members of the committee for three-year terms. No faculty/academic professional member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full terms. In the case of a tie, the chair of the Assembly shall cast the deciding vote.

Student members shall be elected in accordance with the rules outlined in Article III, Section 2, of the University Senate Bylaws.

~~The elected representatives of the undergraduate students shall be elected by the Minnesota Student Association, according to procedures determined by the Minnesota Student Association. The elected representatives of the professional/graduate students shall be elected by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, according to procedures determined by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Students shall serve a one-year term and are eligible for re-election.~~

The chair of the Senate Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Assembly Committee on Committees. In the event the chair is from another campus, the Assembly Committee on Committees shall elect a chair from among its members.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To forward annually to the Assembly for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Assembly specified in the Bylaws of the Assembly. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional or student member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, and student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty, academic professionals, and students. In addition, the committee shall select members of the Assembly for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Assembly and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.
- e. b. To review annually the committees of the Assembly and recommend to the Assembly Steering Committee any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.
- g. c. To recommend to the Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- h. d. To submit an annual report to the Assembly.

Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees

The chair of the Assembly Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. ~~Faculty/academic professional members shall~~ To furnish the full committee a slate of faculty/academic professional committee nominees, ~~and student members shall furnish the full committee a slate of student nominees for review and recommendations.~~
- b. To solicit annually from each newly elected faculty/academic professional member of the Assembly a list of Assembly committees on which the member of the Assembly is serving or has an interest in serving.
- c. To conduct a survey, at least every three years, of faculty/academic professional interest in serving on committees of the Assembly and make a summary of this study available to the Assembly.
- d. To request annually from deans, directors, and department heads a list of faculty/academic professional members who they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- f. To select an additional voting representative from a non-eligible constituency of the University for placement on the appropriate committee for a term of one year, if the Assembly Steering Committee determines that a committee of the Assembly will benefit from such representation.
- g. To recommend to the Student Assembly Committee on Committees and the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

Student Assembly Committee on Committees

The chair of the Student Senate Committee on Committees shall also serve as chair of the Student Assembly Committee on Committees unless that individual is from an outstate campus. In that event, the Student Assembly Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members. The term of office shall be for one year and the chair shall be eligible for re-election to that position.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To furnish the full committee a slate of student committee nominees for review and recommendations. Consideration shall be given to 1) representation from the various colleges and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members, and the presidents of the respective Twin Cities student associations; and 4) expressions of interest in committee

service offered by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select Twin Cities student senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Student Senate and the committees and shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, gender, and class rank in constituting committees.

- b. To solicit annually from each newly elected Twin Cities member of the Student Senate a list of Assembly committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.
- c. To request annually from the Twin Cities student association presidents a list of students whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- d. To recommend to the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees and the Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

COMMENT:

The above amendments reflect revisions requested by the Student Committee on Committees to more clearly identify the duties and responsibilities of the Student Committee on Committees and to clarify the selection process for the student members. Parallel amendments to the Senate bylaws appear on the University Senate agenda.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
EMILY HOOVER, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

[End of Consent Agenda]

VI. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION

Action by Faculty and Academic Professional Members (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill one 1998-99 vacancy and two 1998-2001 Twin Cities faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Committee on Committees:

ONE-YEAR TERM

NANCY HERTHER, Associate Librarian, Reference and Consultation Services, University Libraries. University Senate member: 1995-98.

MARY JO KANE, Associate Professor, Kinesiology & Leisure Studies, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1994-97. Committee participation: Professional Studies Provostal Consultative Committee, 1996-98 (Chair 1996-98).

THREE-YEAR TERM

JOHN ANDERSON, Professor, Biochemistry, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: 1992-95. Committee participation: Library Committee, 1994-97.

GAIL PETERSON, Associate Professor, Psychology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1994-97. Committee participation: Facilities Management Subcommittee, 1995-99; FCC-Nominating Committee, 1997 and 1998.

NAOMI SCHEMAN, Professor, Philosophy, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1982-85, 1991-93. Committee participation: Educational Policy Committee, 1986-88; Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee, 1994-97 (Chair 1995-97).

BILLIE WAHLSTROM, Professor, Rhetoric, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member, 1995-98. Committee participation: Council on Liberal Education, 1991-97; Judicial Committee, 1993-96, 1997-2000.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot at its spring quarter meeting faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by a special nominating committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted.

The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 1998-99 are:

Emily Hoover, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Karen Karni, Medical School
Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Institute of Technology

W. ANDREW COLLINS, Chair
CATHERINE FRENCH
M. JANICE HOGAN
TONI McNARON
THEODORE OEGEMA

VII. FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE 1998 Classroom Management Recommendations Information

[Due to the length of the report, a copy has been mailed to senators and appears in the Assembly agenda at the following URL: <http://www.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/tccaagenda1.html>]

JANE PHILLIPS, Chair
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
FRED MORRISON, Chair
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. RECESS

[Item XI. will be considered at the same time as Item I. on the University Senate agenda.]

**XI. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE
Amending Procedures
Action (15 minutes)**

PREAMBLE

Over the years the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly have experienced considerable difficulty in securing the required attendance at its meetings to adopt constitutional and bylaw amendments. Important legislation that oftentimes receives overwhelming support from those senators present and voting has been left unapproved due to the stringent voting requirements. The proposal to establish a Twin Cities Undergraduate Curriculum Committee last year serves as an example of this problem. It received overwhelming support at each of several meetings at which it was presented, but failed to receive the required number of votes for passage at any one meeting.

In view of this ongoing problem, the Business and Rules Subcommittee was asked by the Senate Consultative Committee to examine the voting practices of other institutions as well as *Robert's Rules of Order*, the parliamentary authority for the Senate and Assembly. The Subcommittee learned that the requirements for amending the Senate and Assembly constitutions and bylaws are not only inconsistent with other institutions but are strongly discouraged by *Robert's Rules of Order*. The above amendments reflect the more commonly used practice of other institutions and conform to the recommendations in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

The Senate Consultative Committee/Assembly Steering Committee endorses the recommendations of the Business and Rules Subcommittee, as outlined in the motion, and encourages the Senate and Assembly to adopt the proposed changes. Parallel amendments to the Senate constitution appear on the Senate agenda.

As a constitutional amendment, 120 affirmative votes are required at one meeting for approval, or 91 affirmative votes at each of two consecutive meetings.

MOTION:

To amend Articles VI. and VII. of the Assembly Constitution as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are struck-out]

ARTICLE VI. AMENDING PROCEDURE

An amendment to this Constitution shall be approved ~~either~~ by a two-thirds majority ~~of all voting members of the Assembly~~ vote of the senators present and voting at a regular or special meeting of the Assembly, or by a majority of ~~all voting members of the Assembly~~ those senators present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting; and provided the proposed amendment has been distributed, in writing, to the persons and in the manner provided in Article II, Section 5, for distribution of the Assembly agenda, at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed amendment. An amendment shall be effective following approval by the Assembly and by the regents.

ARTICLE VI. BYLAWS

The Assembly may enact or amend its Bylaws by ~~majority vote of the total membership of the Assembly~~ a two-thirds vote of the senators present and voting at a regular or special meeting of the Assembly, or by a majority of ~~those senators present and voting at each of two meetings~~, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting, and provided the proposed change has been submitted, in writing, to each member of the Assembly at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed change.

**VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
RUSSELL HOBBIE, Chair
BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE**

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Role of Executive Committee

- To represent the Libraries staff on issues relevant to academic governance and to participation in decision-making.
- To prepare and approve agenda for quarterly meetings of the Library Assembly in consultation with the University Librarian.
- To review and recommend amendments to the Libraries' Constitution, and to the Bylaws.
- To call special meetings of the Library Assembly.
- To serve as an advisory body to the University Librarian.
- To serve as the collective representative of the personnel groups and staff at large to which it is responsible.
- To make recommendations to the University Librarian and Assembly on matters of Library policy and to serve as the executive body of the Assembly.
- To appoint ad hoc committees as needed.

Approved by Executive Committee 4/6/1998

From: Karen Roloson <Karen.L.Roloson-1@tc.umn.edu>
was eminent and we could not change all of
To: all-staff@hamlet.lib.umn.edu
Subject: Library Assembly Agenda/Reports

* The ALL-STAFF Mailing List *

LIBRARY ASSEMBLY
MAY 21, 1998
3:00 P.M.
20 LAW BUILDING

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Report on Compact-Tom Shaughnessy
3. Report of Staff Communication Task Force -Richard Rohrer
4. Report on A Team and A Team goals-Linda DeBeau Melting
5. Report from Executive Committee-Deborah Burke
6. Approval of minutes of February 10, 1998
7. Reports from Standing Committees
 - Administrative Personnel Committee
 - Civil Service Committee
 - Faculty Personnel Committee
 - Librarian Personnel Committee
 - Nominations, Elections, and Appointments--the slate of candidates for offices will be presented and opened for nominations from the floor at this time
 - Research & Publications Committee
8. Report from Libraries' senior senator-Nancy Herther
9. Questions from the University Librarian
10. Adjourn

LIBRARY ASSEMBLY, MINUTES, FEBRUARY 10, 1998. Law Building Room 25; 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order. Tom Shaughnessy, University Librarian, presided.
2. Report on Compact meeting with University Administration. Tom Shaughnessy --There is no new information from University Administration regarding our Compact.

--University Administration has delayed meetings with other Deans regarding their Compacts due to the priority the administration must give to the University's request to the State Legislature. Until all the meetings with the Deans have been completed there will be no further discussion of our Compact.

--Initial reaction to our Compact: Ann Hill Duin, Vice provost for Instructional Technology and University Partnerships, is pleased to see that our Compact anticipates the development of the Virtual University. Our Compact states what we need in order to achieve our goals, but it does not spell out specific outcomes that can be measured to see if our goals have been reached. U Libraries were asked about doing user surveys. Tom responded that we did a major user survey a number of years ago. Such surveys are expensive. Question: Do we need to do another survey and expand the questions? Lalee Kerr asked if University Libraries would work with other libraries in the State. Tom noted that he has put together a package with other libraries in the State. Part of this would be to measure the impact University Libraries have on outstate libraries, especially the impact of our lending to them.

3. Response to Audit Report. Tom Shaughnessy and Charlene Mason

The University's Department of Audits is part of the Office for the Sr VP for Finance and Operations. The Audits Dept. is charged by the Regents to review all units. Past audits have focused on financial records only. The Regents asked the Dept. of Audits to broaden their review this time. Team Leaders and members of the Executive Committee have copies of the report which asks University Libraries to address the following:

- a. Develop a Disaster Plan for our Online Systems [LUMINA] and Collections. There have been initial discussions with Shih-Pau Yen, Director of Academic and Distributed Computing Services, about a disaster plan for the online systems. This could be quite expensive.
 - b. Develop a General Disaster Plan. Don Kelsey is working on this. The deadline is the end of 1998.
 - c. Improve Communication. A taskforce is working on this. Bill DeJohn and Dick Rohrer are co-chairs. Auditors noted confusion on who sets priorities.
 - d. Too Many Uncataloged Collections. Auditors noted that these important materials were unavailable to our users. Tom acknowledged to them that this is a problem facing all research libraries. It is estimated that to catalog our uncataloged collections would cost 25 million dollars.
4. Report from the Executive Committee. Deborah Burke [This is the complete text.]

--Summary of meetings held in November and December of 1997, and January of 1998. Meetings have been scheduled for the first Monday morning of each month and are so scheduled through June of 1998.

--The major substance of each meeting so far has consisted of reports from the University Librarian on matters of general interest such as the Compact agreement, the audit report and the libraries' response to the audit report.

--The formation of ad hoc groups or committees have been noted.---Ad hoc committee to improve academic/administrative staff performance review process;

--- Communications committee to look at communication issues in the libraries raised by the audit report

-At this point, there is feeling among committee members that we need to clarify our role, "fleshing out the role of this committee, making sure we are clear as to our constitutional limits and obligations, and establishing a working body which has a clear and well communicated mission. "

To begin this, we have a draft document. (below) The first item is language suggested by the University Librarian. The following responsibilities are extracted from the Constitution and Bylaws. We were hoping to have some discussion of this document at this meeting, but you may not have had an opportunity to see this before. [There was no discussion of this draft at the Feb. 10th Library Assembly.]

I suggest that comments and input be directed to Executive Committee members. [Deborah Burke, Betsy Friesen, ~~Bernie Karon~~, Barbara Walden, ~~Don Kelsey~~, Cherie Weston, and Wendy Treadwell.] Subsequent drafts could be published prior to the next Library Assembly meeting, at which discussion could take place.

DRAFT
Role of Executive Committee

to represent the Libraries staff on issues relevant to academic governance and to participation in decision-making.

~o prepare and approve agenda for quarterly meetings of the Library Assembly in consultation with the University Librarian.

~o review and recommend amendments to the Libraries' Constitution, and the Bylaws.

~o call special meetings of the Library Assembly.

~o serve as an advisory body to the University Librarian.

~o serve as the collective representative of the personnel groups and staff at large to which it is responsible.

~o make recommendations to the University Librarian and Assembly on matters of Library policy and to serve as the executive body of the Assembly.

~o appoint ad hoc committees as needed.

5. Approval of Minutes of the September 24, 1997 meeting. The minutes were approved.

6. Reports of the Standing Committees

a. Librarian Personnel Committee. Richard Isaacson. Quarterly report approved. Question regarding the schedule for the Curriculum Vita Workshop. Linda DeBeau-Melting responded that it will be given regularly. This summer there will be a Dossier workshop.

b. Faculty Personnel Committee. Penny Krosch. Quarterly report approved.

c. Civil Service Committee. Tina Hamilton. Quarterly report approved. Cherie Weston, a member of the committee, drew our attention to item 2 in the report which deals with important salary range issues. Anomalies have been documented and the committee is working to address them. In addition Cherie noted that MINITEX staff are excluded from the Library Assembly, but that UHR says they are considered University Library staff and have bumping rights. The Civil Service Committee is looking into this.

d. Administrative Personnel Committee. Wendy Treadwell. Quarterly report approved. Wendy noted that during winter quarter the 8 people on this committee will be looking at the appropriate use of administrative appointments including how they were used in the past and how to use them in the future. In addition they will look at the relationship of the classifications used in this personnel category to those in the other personnel categories.

e. Research and Publications Committee. Janice Jaguszewski reported that the first meeting of this committee is being arranged.

7. Report of Ad Hoc Committee to Improve Academic/Administrative Staff Performance Review Procedures. Linda DeBeau-Melting.

--The committee includes Stephen Hearn for Academic Professional appointments, Penny Krosch for Faculty, and Linda for Administrative.

--Goal of the Academic committee was to simplify the review process by making it easier and more effective for the evaluatee and the evaluator. The committee was NOT charged with reviewing the criteria for evaluation or the promotion and tenure review process.

--Improvements Recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee

--Bring the calendar for the process together with the activities to be accomplished by the evaluatee and the evaluator so the timetable and the process is easier to understand.

--Incorporate the University Libraries goals, i.e. 3 to 5 goals, directly into the review process. The goals would appear at the top of the annual review form. Individuals being reviewed would be asked to develop individual goals for each of the library goals each year. The Library Leadership Council liked this because it will allow the staff to focus on the goals of the library and also communicate those goals to the staff.

--Updated position description and vita to be appended to the review each year.

--Review takes the form of bullets rather than a narrative.

--Numeric evaluation be placed on the review sheet and any differences in judgement recorded at the next level.

Questions.

-Laurie Probst. Where do team goals fit into the process? Linda. This needs to be worked out within each team. Reference to team goals can be made in the sections for "How have you met your goals and other accomplishments and activities." Penny. It was not possible this year to incorporate team goals, since not all teams have them. Next year these can be added especially in relation to the Compact. Linda. Team goals should relate to University Library goals. We can continue to fine tune.

-Charles Spetland. Please clarify the use of pluses and minuses in the numeric reviews. Linda. We have not looked at this. The LLC asked the committee to clarify the rating categories. They will look at the issue of pluses and minuses then.

-Lalee Kerr. Information on the new form is needed early since it can take weeks to pull together the information. Linda. They are looking into distribution of the forms electronically, but whether the form can be turned in electronically has not been decided. Forms will be available on the web, as a word document, and on paper.

-Lalee Kerr. Anyone who changes a rating needs to communicate the decision to the candidate. Linda. We will look into this.

-Someone asked a question regarding the process when an individual is on multiple teams. Someone responded that team leaders would need to confer in order to do the review. Penny. We are trying to simplify a complex process.

-Karen Nelson Hoyle. The dossier session was good. Can you also have a session on the new forms and the process? Getting the information now in written form will be helpful since April is so busy. Linda. Yes, it has also been suggested to attach a form for the curriculum vita so all are done in the same style. Peggy. An approved job description sample would be useful also. Some of the annual reviews only include the letter of appointment with no job description. Job descriptions are a public document so sharing them is ok.

Tom. After the next LLC meeting the drafts of the new forms will be distributed as part of the LCC minutes, but remember they are drafts

8. Report from Libraries' Senior Senator. Dick Kelly

[Dick was not at the meeting. Penny Krosch gave the report.]

Penny reported on a meeting with Yudof. Last years review of the tenure code made for a tense situation in the senate. Now there is an aura of change, confidence, and even happiness! There is nothing specific that concerns the library. Library faculty are waiting for the post tenure review/draft that was received yesterday according to Linda.

9. Questions for the University Librarian. Tom reported on the following:

-Common Bonds Pictorial History of the University. Tom reported that this history of the University has been published. Andrea Hinding is the author. Ten thousand regular copies have been printed as well as some leather bound copies which Andrea has autographed. The printing was underwritten by the University Foundation. This project was begun many years ago by John Howe and Andrea, but John had to withdraw. This large project was a lot of work, but was completed with the help of Penny Krosch. All the photographs are from the University Archives. The price is \$35.

-Walter Library Renovation. Yudof is optimistic about getting 53 million from the legislature for the renovation. Lalee Kerr expressed thanks for moving up the timetable for upgrading the teaching learning facilities on the St. Paul Campus. Tom reported that Walter 113 is still in need of an upgrade. Wilson S30 facilities are done. The cost is approximately \$100,000 for each facility.

-Trip to Poland. Tom is soon to leave for Poland and will return April 5. He will be teaching in the Polish Library School and staying in student housing with no phone. He will give two lectures a week for 5 weeks. He will have an e-mail address provided by the library school. He plans to communicate with us during his leave.

-Curator for Special Collections. Timothy Johnson has accepted the position and will arrive July 1, earlier if possible.

-Distant Education Instruction Librarian and Faculty Liaison search has found too very good candidates, but we have only one position in the Bush Grant. Ann Hill Duin has been approached about getting additional funding, but the decision process is very slow. The position is in the Compact and she is aware of this.

-Access Center Update. Tom reports space limitations may result in leaving the rare books in the vault in Wilson and having the Curator for the Bell Collection responsible for them. Mariann Tiblin acknowledged the space issues, but does not want the rare books to fall through the cracks. One of the caverns in the Access Center is for archives and special collections; the other is for the lesser used materials from the general collections.

-Sprinklers in U Project is going well. An early morning coffee party is planned for the sprinkler installation crew in the construction area. The ending date for this long project is March 6th!!!!

-Receptions for Residents. Reminder: This is February 24th.

-LLC is looking at vacancies. A number of retirements are coming up and Merry Schellinger is leaving. There may be as many as 5 open positions. Rather than say they belong to any one team, we could seek a list of the skills and talents need by University Libraries. The LLC will finish their review a week from Thursday. The skills and talents identified will need to be group into positions. This approach may not work, but we will give it a try.

10. Adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Dianne C. Legg, Secretary, Library Assembly

Administrative Personnel Committee Report, May, 1998

The Administrative Personnel Committee is in the process of developing comprehensive guidelines regarding the appropriate use of Administrative class appointments in the University Libraries. As preparation for drafting these guidelines, the APC identified the benefits to the University Libraries in using Administrative appointments, the current and potential issues or problems in the use of these classes, and the information needed

prior to drafting the guidelines. We are currently collecting the needed information and plan to complete the guidelines during the next quarter.

Submitted by,
Wendy Treadwell
Chair, Administrative Personnel Committee

Civil Service Committee
No report submitted.

Faculty Personnel Committee
Report, May, 1998

Penelope Krosch, Chair of FPC, worked with LPC representative Stephen Hearn and Linda DeBeau-Melting on an assignment to simplify the yearly performance review document used to evaluate faculty and academic librarians. We simplified the document as much as possible, given that the yearly review period was eminent and we could not change all of the reporting structure at such a late date. It is FPC's recommendation that the document could be further streamlined to better reflect team goals and participation in team efforts.

As a result of the new calendar for the yearly review, FPC was required to complete its evaluations early in the review period. The new form is not structured for clear identification of faculty activities. FPC will devise a form which will request listing of activities relating to faculty activities in teaching, research, and service and outreach. The form will be e-mailed to faculty early in the summer of 1998.

Penelope Krosch, Chair

Librarian Personnel Committee Quarterly Report
May, 1998

In October, a ballot seeking approval of the document "Guidelines of the Librarian Personnel Committee" was sent to all Librarian Series staff. The document was formally adopted and incorporated as Appendix F of the 1989 document "Librarian Series Personnel Policies and Procedures." In November, recommendations for standing members of the 1997 Librarian Review Committee were forwarded to the University Librarian. The committee was subsequently appointed and the review process begun. Members of the 1997 Librarian Review Committee are Kathy Robbins (Chair), Gregg Richardson, Charles Spetland, and Julia Wallace. In December, LPC met with Linda DeBeau-Melting and began planning for a February 1998 curriculum vita workshop for academic staff, their supervisors and team leaders.

Respectfully Submitted,
Librarian Personnel Committee
(Kathy Fouty, Chair, Richard Isaacson, Kathy Robbins)

Research & Publications Committee Report

The Committee had its first meeting on February 13th, 1998. At that meeting Stephen Hearn was elected chair, taking over from the initial convener, Brent Allison. The committee decided to query University Librarian Tom Shaughnessy whether he had any specific concerns for the committee to address, and decided to begin compiling a list of library staff publications. In the former case, no tasks were assigned to the committee. In the latter, committee members agreed to begin working on several tasks preparatory to surveying library staff about recent publications.

--Submitted by Stephen Hearn, 5/19/98--

Karen L. Roloson

University Librarian's Office
University Libraries
499 Wilson Library
612-624-1807
612-626-9353 (fax)
k-rol@tc.umn.edu

* The ALL-STAFF Mailing List *

Administrative Services Team

MEMBERSHIP

University Librarian's Office

Tom Shaughnessy
Charlene Mason
Ellen Nagle
Peggy Johnson
Linda DeBeau-Melting
Judith Hedin
Bill DeJohn

Administrative Support Services

Karen Roloson
Lori Cramer
Carol Clark (.50)
Sherri Fincham (.25)

Library Business Office

Ellory Christianson
Jane Blees
Khanh Tran
Ed Ruotsinoja
Judy Novak
Tiffany Persson
Laura Fisher
Stephanie Kukowski

Human Resources Office

Berdine Gavle
Carol Clark (.50)
Juanita Meza
Sherri Fincham (.25)

COORDINATING GROUP

Membership

- A-Team Leader, appointed by University Librarian; after first year, A-Team will recommend appointment of Team Leader. Team Leader role is one of communication and coordination and does not include supervisory responsibility for A-Team members except for those already established in the units. (one-year term)
- One representative selected from each unit by unit members (one-year term)
- Fiscal Officer, HR Officer, and Associate University Librarian (standing members)

1998/99 Coordinating Group: Ellory Christianson, Lori Cramer, Linda DeBeau-Melting, Team Leader, Charlene Mason, Juanita Meza, and Ed Ruotsinoja.

GOAL 1: ENHANCE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR ALL LIBRARIES STAFF

WHAT IS NEEDED:

1. All staff members must be supported by the Administrative Services Team in the areas of human resources, business office, and general administrative support.
2. All staff members must have a *basic* level of self-sufficiency in performing tasks which support their assignments and responsibilities in the Libraries. This includes an operational knowledge of University and University Libraries human resources and business office rules and policy guidelines, ability to use software for reports and other communication media on their computers.

WHEN NEEDED: This is a current need

WHAT METHODS USED AND WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE:

1. Web Site
 - A-Team will develop a series of Web Pages to provide easy access to basic information needed by all staff about human resources, the business office, and other administrative support areas
 - A-Team will publicize the contents of the Web Pages
2. Training Program
 - A-Team will develop an ongoing training program (in partnership with Staff Development & Training Team) which will provide an operating knowledge of University and University Libraries human resources and business office rules and policy guidelines for staff members who must have knowledge in these areas to perform their responsibilities in the Libraries. Comprehensive skill sets will be developed for Libraries staff members whose responsibilities require knowledge of human resources and business operations.
 - Staff Development & Training Team will be encouraged to provide training in all basic library software to support staff members' ability to carry out their responsibilities with self-sufficiency
 - Team Leaders will be encouraged to require that staff participate in A-Team and SDT Team training associated with their work responsibilities
 - As support to training program, Team Leaders will be encouraged to assure that each staff member has access to assistance from designated expert users for general and specialized assistance with learning and using standard software

3. Equitable Levels of Support

- Team Leaders, A-Team, and staff members who provide administrative support across the Libraries will develop a plan for providing equitable levels of support for all Teams and staff

4. Electronic Mailbox

- A-Team will create an electronic mail box for Libraries staff to ask questions of A-Team. Members of A-Team would be scheduled to monitor the mailbox, answer or refer the question to another member of the team within a certain time parameter, e.g. within 24 hours. Suggestion that 1-2 members of each functional area (administrative support, business office, human resources), rotate this responsibility. Advertisement to staff would have to include the caveat that this does not replace asking questions directly to specific A-Team members nor does it apply to questions which include confidential information.

TIME LINE:

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

1. Libraries staff will perform their responsibilities with less delay because they will have the knowledge of, or have access to, information about human resources and business office rules and policy guidelines necessary to support their work.
2. A-Team staff will devote the time that is now spent responding to staff members who have immediate needs for basic information to activities which will result in a more effective delivery of service to the Libraries.
3. Boost in morale for Libraries staff.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION:

1. Questions received in the electronic mailbox could be tracked to the A-Team understand patterns of user needs and to evaluate the effectiveness of A-Team proactive (training, Web page, mailbox with time parameters) support role.
2. Pre and post test possible for training sessions and record of training attended.
3. Evaluations of training sessions will be used.
4. Focus groups can be used to determine needs for more information or training at any given time.

GOAL 2: CREATE WEB PAGE TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO CURRENT INFORMATION FOR LIBRARIES STAFF

WHAT IS NEEDED: Administrative Services Web Page on University Libraries Staff Resources Listing (internal to Libraries staff only)

WHEN NEEDED: This is a current need

WHAT METHODS:

1. Create online links to University Human Resources, University Central Accounting Services, Executive Vice President and Provost Office, and other appropriate administrative units.
2. Break into three sections: Accounting, Human Resources, Administrative Support

WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE:

1. One representative from each area submits information for links to online documents/reports and layout (format) for his/her section.
2. Responsible person (L. Cramer) translates to HTML code and uploads to the appropriate Web site.

TIME LINE: One month estimated completion time for prototype.

EXPECTED OUTCOME:

1. Once explained to staff how this will work for them, it should eliminate some of the questions on documents and reports (or at least the need to talk with A-Team staff about each document).
2. If there are still questions, the person will be directed, on the Web page, to the appropriate person to contact for more information.
3. The electronic mailbox can also be given as a contact point.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: How many times a Web site has been visited vs. follow-up calls that need further explanation.

GOAL 3: FISCAL INFORMATION NEEDS TO BE UNDERSTANDABLE

REPORTS

WHAT IS NEEDED: Libraries staff need training for a better understanding of reports. (Some have suggested that more user friendly reports are needed. This cannot be done as most reports are from the University business office via the CUFS system and cannot be changed). We are investigating the capability of accessing better reports online through CLARITY.

WHEN NEEDED: This is a current need.

WHAT METHODS: University Training Services offers training for reports once a month. Chart of Accounts (COA) is a prerequisite to the reports training. Training and manuals have already been provided to the Library Leadership Council. A CLARITY demo will be scheduled for LLC review.

WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE:

1. Training will be provided by the Fiscal Officer in partnership with University Training Services.
2. Team Leaders will be encouraged to require Libraries staff who use the reports to attend training.

TIME LINE: Training Services provides a training schedule. Special training sessions can be arranged for on-site training as needed.

EXPECTED OUTCOME:

1. Once trained, a staff member is given enough information to help himself or herself.
2. Training should replace the need for "shadow systems".
3. Understanding fiscal reports.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION:

DOCUMENTS

WHAT IS NEEDED: Accounting staff need to be available to assist Libraries staff in understanding documents.

WHEN NEEDED: This is a current need

WHAT METHODS AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE:

1. Since files cannot be removed from Libraries Business Office, the LBO staff will provide information requested. Libraries staff must follow established procedures.
2. Individuals responsible for incurring and/or authorizing expenses will answer the questions who, what when, where and why for every transaction.
3. CLARITY provides the capability to view document information from reports.

TIMELINE: There will be a 24-hour turnaround time for simple requests. Requests requiring analysis or pulling information from storage will take longer. LBO staff will attempt to meet deadlines, if sufficient time is given to do so.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

1. More efficient use of all staff's time since most requests could be answered by LBO staff and save Libraries staff from visiting the LBO.
2. Quicker turnaround for requests when procedures are followed.
3. Staff can view majority of information needed online without LBO intervention.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION:

A-Team Meeting
December 8, 1997
Revised, May 20, 1998

GOAL 4: ACHIEVE EQUITABLE AND EFFECTIVE USE OF STAFF RESOURCES

WHAT IS NEEDED: Equitable and effective use of staff resources in the Libraries

WHEN NEEDED: This is a current need

WHAT METHODS:

1. Analysis of employee position classifications (generic position descriptions) fit with current work in Libraries
2. Analysis of academic, civil service, technical and clerical responsibilities
3. Analysis of distribution of classifications with distribution of work in Libraries
4. Analysis of augmentations

WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE:

1. Libraries Human Resources
2. University Human Resources (HR consultant, Employee Relations, Compensation Officer)
3. Consultants:
 - University and Libraries Civil Service Committees
 - University Libraries Labor/Management Committee
 - Faculty Personnel Committee
 - Librarian Personnel Committee
 - Academic Administrative Personnel Group
 - Executive Committee
 - Library Leadership Council

TIMELINE: To be determined at initial planning meeting with University Human Resources

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

1. Establish ongoing process to measure and evaluate equitable and effective use of staff resources.
2. Relevant generic employee position descriptions (#1 in METHODS)
3. Clearer understanding of appropriate responsibilities among and between employee classifications (#2 in METHODS)
4. Correspondence of work with employee classification (#3 in METHODS)

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION: Consult with Libraries Measurement and Evaluation subgroup

A-Team Meeting
December 8, 1997
Revised, May 20, 1998

May 14, 1998

INTERIM REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
14 May 1998

THE CHARGES. The Joint Committee on Faculty Appointments was formed by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) in the fall of 1997 and charged with gathering information on faculty and faculty-like appointments. It was also charged with proposing whatever revisions are necessary in the current classifications, policies, and practices so that these may be regularized and published as a single policy. In addition, the committee was charged with devising ways to ensure that hires within the various categories are made according to the needs identified by the bodies responsible for establishing educational policy (the Senate and SCEP) and that, within departments, members of each academic classification participate in forming and implementing whatever educational policy affects the conduct of their professional duties. Finally, after its formation, the joint committee was asked by the FCC to join the Senate Committee on Finance and planning in recommending possible policies concerning the budgetary preconditions for making tenure-track hires.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN POLICY AND PRACTICE, together with the data justifying them, will be sent to the Senate in fall 1988 or winter 1999. At this stage the joint committee is still collecting data, interviewing deans, department heads, and other concerned parties, and weighing alternatives. The committee will recommend policy for limiting and regularizing the use of non-tenure track and part-time faculty yet accommodating the needs of units that employ professional practitioners to augment and complement the work of the regular faculty.

P&A: WHERE MOST FACULTY-LIKE APPOINTMENTS ARE TO BE FOUND. The joint committee quickly learned that the number of P&A appointments recently has increased in something like inverse proportion to a reduction in regular faculty and civil service personnel. When we tried to gather data on this change, we encountered something like chaos. The few categories within P&A are multiplied by the large number of classifications within each category. While relatively few of these have been designated as teaching classifications, it became apparent that some of those appointed outside the teaching classifications nevertheless are teaching and that some appointed within them are not. Some units assign teaching personnel to a classification that in another unit is closed to teachers. These inconsistencies and the drift towards increased teaching by Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) have convinced the joint committee that the P&A system needs to be scrutinized carefully and possibly reformed. Aware that recommendations of this sort ought to be made in as well informed a manner as possible, the committee invited participation by members of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee (ASAC) and sought as well representation from the number of part-time teachers.

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY have long served the University of Minnesota, usually well. Indeed, it is impossible to imagine the University without the services of some such faculty, whether they be called adjunct or clinical or temporary, whether they be appointed under the Tenure Code as Term faculty or as P&A Academic Staff members. In particular, some professional schools find it to be essential that practitioners be affiliated with the regular faculty of the unit and lend their practical expertise to fulfilling the missions of the unit. In other instances a similar need for professional research justifies the addition of faculty-like members who do relatively little but valuable teaching. Although lacking the protection of tenure, most of these NTTF have been treated well.

ABUSES EXIST, however, and the increasing number of part-time NTTF, usually with P&A appointments, are especially vulnerable to them. The AAUP warns against three that may apply to all NTTF: the absence of job security, a lack of benefits, and the lack of opportunity to advance. All of these problems are present at Minnesota, and the committee will recommend ways to remove or ameliorate them. For different and good reasons, the AAUP also makes two recommendations concerning the use of NTTF: that they be limited to no more than 15% within the institution as a whole and to 25% in any department. The committee will consider whether such limitations are appropriate to the University and identify what units, if any, truly need to hire beyond the limit set for most units.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ELSEWHERE. As the joint committee was being formed, a conference of eight scholarly discipline associations (the American Historical Association, the American Mathematical Society, the American Philosophical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Association, the Modern Language Association, The National Council for Teachers of English, and the Organization of American Historians), together with the AAUP and the Community College Humanities Association, issued a report on the "Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty" that stressed how to avoid the abuses earlier identifies by the AAUP. That group's recommendations are far-reaching and its findings far-ranging, but most to the point here are their recommendations on ways of including NTT and part-time faculty within the planning and governance of departments--of regularizing their presence and treating them with professional respect--and their finding that the greatest number of abuses occur in staffing basic courses in the humanities. (Nationally, well more than half of such introductory courses are taught by part-time NTTF--this *not* counting courses taught by graduate assistants!)

SINCE A SIMILAR PATTERN IS EMERGING AT MINNESOTA, now is the time to change it so as to maintain a measure of flexibility but to remove the abuses that make teaching resemble assembly-line labor.

LESS PRESSING PROBLEMS also exist in the employment of NTTF. Some are simply accounting matters--how to identify who are teaching and how much they teach within the myriad categories of appointment and the irregular use of titles that prevails. These easily metamorphose into professional problems when academic rank itself is affected, so that what makes one a professor is not common among units. It seems that we have too few basic categories (tenure, term, P&A) and too many ways of describing role and rank within those categories. One can be a "professor" of whatever and appointed within any of these three categories

TENURE-TRACK HIRES. These problems (and possible solutions of them) interrelate with a problem long troublesome during hard times, namely, what kind of budgetary basis there should be for making tenure-track appointments. The full-time NTTF appointments in the Health Sciences, for example, are one solution to the problem, since they avoid it--at some times more happily than at others, it must be admitted. Fear of overcommitting hard money and the perceived lack of a sufficient base of it conspire in making so many part-time NTTF hires in the humanities. Thus units rich in research money and units poor in it face similar problems in making appointments but "solve" them in different ways. While the joint committee cannot find more money for such units, it plans to recommend better ways of solutions to some problems created by the general lack of money that underlies the increasing use of NTTF--hired largely as some kind of P&A.

WE SOLICIT THE HELP OF COLLEAGUES in the Senate and throughout the University in understanding and solving this matrix of related problems. Address your replies to the Senate office (senate@mailbox.mail.umn.edu), which can redirect them to members of the joint committee, if you wish.

Kent Bales (FCC, SCFA), Chair for the committee
Karen Alaniz (ASAC)
Carole Bland (FCC)
Cleon Melsa (SCFA; Crookston)
Eville Gorham (SCFA)
Gordon Hirsch (SCEP)
Russell Hobbie (FCC)
Michael Korth (FCC; Morris)
Kathleen Newell (SCEP)
Palmer Roger (SCEP)
Richard Purple (SCFA)
Kyla Wahlstrom (ASAC)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MBM
M66

University Senate

427 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110
612-625-9369
Fax: 612-626-1609
E-mail: senate@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

May 5, 1998

To: Senate and Assembly Members
From: Martha Kvanbeck, Clerk
Re: May 14 Meetings

Enclosed for consideration at the May 14 University Senate meeting (Item IX.) is the revised Conflict of Interest Policy.

Also enclosed for Twin Cities senators for consideration at the Assembly meeting is the proposed packet of policies to standardize undergraduate academic policies and procedures (Item II.) and the report concerning 1998 Classroom Management Recommendations (Item VII.).

The complete agendas, including these items, are available on the Web at the following URLs:

University Senate: http://www.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/senagenda.html
Student Senate: http://www.umn.edu/usenate/student_senate/stuagenda1.html
TC Campus Assembly: <http://www.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/tccaagenda1.html>

The agendas will also appear in the May 7 edition of the *Minnesota Daily* and paper copies will be available in the Senate Office, Chancellor's Office at UMC and UMM, and the School of Medicine Dean's Office at UMD.

enclosures

ADDENDUM

The Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity has voted to change part of its report, as follows:

In Part II, page 4, the report should now read:

We also recommend that as a reminder and reaffirmation students sign and date the following statement to be printed on blue books and other examination forms:

I have not cheated while taking this examination.

(signature) _____ (date)

Anyone who sees cheating during an exam is encouraged to tell the instructor or the Office of Academic Integrity.