

CONSECUTIVE MEETINGS OF:

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
THE FACULTY SENATE**

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2005

2:30 - 5:00 P.M.

**25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
308 Selvig Hall--Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room--Duluth Campus
Humanities Conference Room--Morris Campus**

This is a concurrent meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate. There are 258 voting members of the University Senate and 161 voting members of the Faculty Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

**1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS
Information**

Faculty Senate

Interpretation of the Undergraduate Residency and Credit Requirements Policy (Effective date fall 2005)

Presented to the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Delete conflicting footnote on I converting to an F)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Freezing transcript at graduation)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Performance level for S)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Regents Policy on Openness in Research

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices (Academic Probation)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Homa Amir-Fazli
Professor
Design, Housing & Apparel
1931 – 2005

Rutherford Aris
Professor
Chemical Engineering/Material Science
1929 – 2005

John Dolan
Professor
Philosophy
1937 – 2005

Lucille Hoiland
Professor
Anatomy
1914 – 2005

Alton H. Hollenbeck
Professor
Public Health
1920 – 2005

Rodney C. Loehr
Professor
History
1905 – 2005

David Noetzel
Professor
Entomology
1929 – 2005

Eldred Smith
Professor
University Libraries
1931 – 2004

Martin L. Snoke
Professor
Educational Psychology
1914 – 2005

John E. Turner
Regents Professor

Political Science
1917 – 2005

Chengxing Wang
Professor
Dentistry
1966 – 2005

Harry C. Walker
Associate Professor
Radiology
1924 – 2005

Walter Weyhmann
Professor
Physics
1935 – 2005

STUDENTS

Richard T. Rose
University of Minnesota – Morris

Wade Sibson
College of Liberal Arts - Duluth

Jill M. Tuttle
Graduate School

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Statement on Courses with a High Percentage of A's Information for the Faculty Senate

Statement on Courses with a High Percentage of A's

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has reviewed material provided by Vice Provost Swan with regard to courses with a high percentage of A's. There are clearly some situations where a high proportion of A's would not be unusual, e.g., smaller classes with a large proportion of high ability students. While there are no simple numeric limits that the Committee would want to impose, a high proportions of A's in large classes for which there is little reason to expect that enrollment would be selective does raise questions about the appropriateness of the use of the A-F grading scale.

In particular, SCEP believes that there are a group of courses for which S-N grades would be more appropriate. These include courses where there are not specific differential expectations of performance linked to grades; grades appear to be heavily based on attendance rather than an evaluation of learning .

The Committee asks the Provost's Office to share this statement with colleges, to have follow up conversations with colleges on specific courses, and to report back to SCEP by the end of the spring semester.

Adopted October 26, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**4. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Criteria for Noting Teaching Awards in the Class Schedule
Information for the Faculty Senate**

**Twin Cities: Identification of Award Winning Teachers for
Inclusion on the Class Schedule and Course Guide**

Recognition of teaching awards should include

- All-University or all-campus awards for excellence in teaching
- College awards for excellence in teaching
- Disciplinary awards for excellence in teaching, e.g. national recognition by professional society.

Other awards that recognize outstanding contributions to the education of students are eligible to be considered for inclusion. For awards to be considered for inclusion, individuals should send a brief description of the award to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This material will be vetted with an appropriate group of faculty for review.

To be considered, materials must include information about the following

- The history of the award (i.e., how long has the award been in existence)
- A listing of past University of Minnesota recipients
- An indication of how frequently the award is granted and how individuals are recognized
- A description of the process that solicits nominations
- A description of the material that is reviewed
- A description of what body reviews nominations/submissions

Approved September 28, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**5. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Revised Rules for the Morse-Alumni and Graduate-Professional Awards
Information for the Faculty Senate**

[Guidelines for both awards are available as a PDF on the web at:
<http://academic.umn.edu/provost/awards/aoce.html>]

**HORACE T. MORSE-UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNDERGRADUATE
EDUCATION**

Purpose

Each year since 1965, the University of Minnesota has recognized a select group of faculty members for their outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. This honor is awarded to exceptional candidates nominated by colleges in their quest to identify excellence in undergraduate education. In addition to honoring individual faculty members, the award contributes to the improvement of undergraduate education at the University by publicizing their work to serve as a resource for the whole faculty.

The award, named for a former dean of General College, is made possible through generous support of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Eligibility

Regular faculty (tenure-track and tenured) and term faculty (non-regular) salaried through the University and holding a 66 2/3% time or greater appointment, who have been at the University of Minnesota for at least five years, including the current year, may be nominated for the Morse-Alumni Award. Previous nominees who did not receive the award may be renominated; previous winners are ineligible.

For the purposes of this award, undergraduates are defined as students who are pursuing a baccalaureate or an associate degree program. Professional and graduate programs, if they offer education to undergraduates, are encouraged to nominate candidates.

Awards

During the 2005-06 academic year, up to eight University of Minnesota faculty members will be selected to receive the Morse-Alumni Award with the announcement of award recipients to be made mid-March. Recipients will receive a \$3,000 continuous augmentation to their annual salary during their lifetime as a University of Minnesota faculty member. In addition, each recipient's department will be given \$1,500 annually for five years to be used by the recipient for professional development or research.

Criteria

Nominees will be evaluated on the basis of a dossier documenting outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. The dossier should provide specific evidence of outstanding performance in one or more--not necessarily all--of the five categories listed below:

1. Teaching: direct contact with students in undergraduate courses and programs and in co-curricular activities. Teaching activities include instructing groups of students in classes, seminars, and laboratories; and supervising individual activities, such as practicums, internships, field-learning experiences, tutorials, performances, exhibitions, and independent study, including supervision of UROP projects. The activities listed above are representative, not exhaustive.
2. Advising: activities that aid individual students with course and major selection, career plans, and personal development, especially in ways that go beyond formal curricular advising; and those that provide guidance to student organizations or groups. Documentation should include information about accessibility to students, which ordinarily includes but is not limited to office availability.¹

¹ Where advising is the exclusive or primary contribution, a candidate should be nominated instead, or perhaps in addition, for the John Tate Award for Undergraduate Academic Advising; "Two awards will be given to

3. **Research and Artistic Activities:** such activities should be documented and discussed in terms of the relationship between these activities and the nominee's contributions to undergraduate education.

4. **Academic Program Development:** such activities that contribute to the planning, design, or development of improvements in undergraduate education. Contributions in this area include, for example, new courses or a cluster of courses, general-education options in the undergraduate curriculum, and valuable programmatic innovations of any kind.

5. **Educational Leadership:** extra-programmatic activities of any kind and at any level that constitute leadership and contribute substantially to undergraduate education; for example, presenting papers, holding a position such as national or regional officer or program chair in a professional association, or being a member of a college or all-University committee.

This list should not be considered exhaustive or restrictive. The selection committee will consider any and all outstanding contributions to undergraduate education described by the materials provided. The magnitude of an outstanding contribution in one area may compensate for little or no contribution in other areas. For example, not all distinguished classroom teachers have the opportunity to contribute to "academic program development" that persons in administrative offices do, but they may, nevertheless, make outstanding contributions to undergraduate education.

Selection committees will consider outstanding contributions ranging from broadly distinguished performance over many years to a single extraordinary contribution without favoring one kind over another. Persons receiving awards will be those whose contributions to undergraduate education the selection committee considers the most outstanding in a given year and also genuinely outstanding regardless of the year or the competition. The University of Minnesota is a research university, so the dossiers of all nominees should include evidence of their intellectual distinction.

Selection of College Nominees

Each college engaged in pre-baccalaureate education may submit, **on or before Thursday, January 26, 2006**, up to three nominations. Because of its size, the College of Liberal Arts may submit up to six nominations. Colleges may nominate faculty members of other colleges as well as their own.

Suggestions for nominees may be made to the college nominating committee² by individual students and faculty members, by departments and other administrative units of the college, and by student organizations and associations. College nominating committees should inform the faculty, student, and staff of that college of its nominating procedures well in advance of beginning its selection process.

Nomination Procedure

those whose primary responsibilities include advising, and two awards will be given to those for whom advising is not a primary responsibility, but who meet the criteria for excellence in advising."

² All colleges (small as well as large) are encouraged to have nominating committees.

After selecting its nominees, the college, in consultation with the nominee, should prepare the nominee's dossier for review by the Morse-Alumni Award Selection Committee. This selection committee, which reports to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), is composed of seven faculty, one or more student members of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and a representative of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association. Of the seven faculty members:

- at least one must be a current member of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy,
- two must come from coordinate campuses (not from the same campus) and serve two-year terms, with these two positions rotating among the coordinate campuses so that no campus is unrepresented for more than two consecutive years,
- at least two must be former award winners.

Organization and Presentation of Dossiers¹

The college should submit *an original plus nine copies* of each candidate's dossier to the **Morse-Alumni Selection Committee, 234 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455** by no later than **4:00 p.m., Thursday, January 26, 2006**. *In addition to including the nomination form in each candidate's dossier, the designated college contact will submit the nomination form online, using a previously provided password and web site address for the online form submission. If this information has not been obtained, contact Karen Zentner Bacig, kbacig@umn.edu, 612.624.5082.* Decisions will be based on the content of the dossier, not on the dossier appearance. In order to maintain a similar appearance and reduce the burden to the college and nominees, each copy should be submitted in a plain report cover with index tabs (no three-ring binders, please). Photographs, videos, and other types of visual materials not central to the dossier are discouraged. Brevity is encouraged in assembling the following materials. Items should be presented in the order listed below. Successful dossiers will be made available for public review and various University of Minnesota editors may publish information from these dossiers in materials regarding the Morse-Alumni Award. Dossier contents will be publicly available except for information covered by the MN Data Privacy Act. Private or personal materials should not be included as part of the dossier.

- A. The nomination form and the release form. The nomination form must also be submitted online.
- B. A statement of no more than five pages (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins), presenting the full case for the nomination as well as summarizing the dossier, with specific reference to the criteria listed in these guidelines.

This statement forms the basis of the recommendation and is extremely important for the review process. The author should describe the nominee's qualifications and other relevant criteria, focusing on specific details. The aim of this statement is to set out a convincing and detailed case for the nominee's outstanding contributions to undergraduate education.

- C. Personal statement by the candidate of no more than 1200 words (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins)* addressing the criteria for the award and the impact on student learning.

¹ The dossiers from the 2004-2005 award recipients may be reviewed at the following libraries:

Twin Cities: Walter Library, Circulation/Reserve Desk (Perry Dean)
UMD: UMD Library, Reserve Desk (Bill Sozansky)
UMC: UMC Library (Owen Williams)
UMM: Rodney Briggs Library, Reserve Section (Shaheen Haji)

- D. The candidate's curriculum vitae of no more than four pages (using 12-point font and one-inch margins) organized according to the following rubric: Education; Courses Taught at the University of Minnesota; Program and Curricular Development; Service; Outreach and Other Activities Related to Teaching/Learning; Publications (a summary list of the candidate's most important published works).
- E. A list of undergraduate courses taught at the University of Minnesota over the previous five years of active teaching, along with a numerical overview compiled from student evaluations, arranged according to the form supplied. For upper division courses please specify the percentage of undergraduates enrolled. Up to one additional page of assessment of student learning can be included.
- F. Up to ten supporting letters, three of which must be from individual undergraduate students, past or present. The remaining letters may be from students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, or non-University of Minnesota references. In all cases letter writers are encouraged to cite specific examples in support of the case.

***EXCESS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

NOTE: Please retain a copy of the dossier at the collegiate or departmental level as dossiers will NOT be returned or retained centrally.

**AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO
POSTBACCALAUREATE, GRADUATE, AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION**

Purpose

Commencing in 1998-1999, the University of Minnesota recognized a select group of faculty members for their outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education. This honor is awarded annually to exceptional candidates nominated by their colleges in their quest to identify excellence in postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education. In addition to honoring individual faculty members, the award will contribute to the improvement of postbaccalaureate, graduate, and professional education at the University by publicizing their work to serve as resources to the whole faculty.

The award is made possible through generous support of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Eligibility

Regular faculty (tenure-track and tenured) and term faculty (non-regular) salaried through the University and holding a 66 2/3% time or greater appointment, who have been at the University of Minnesota for at least five years, including the current year, may be nominated for the award. Previous nominees who did not receive the award may be renominated; previous winners will be ineligible.

Self-nomination is not allowed.

For the purposes of this award, graduate and professional students are defined as students who are pursuing a postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional program.

Awards

During the 2005-2006 academic year, up to eight University of Minnesota faculty members will be selected to receive the award with the announcement of award recipients to be made mid-March. Recipients will receive a \$3,000 continuous augmentation to their annual salary during their lifetime as a University of Minnesota faculty member. In addition, each recipient's department will be given \$1,500 annually for five years to be used by the recipient for professional development or research.

Criteria

Nominees will be evaluated on the basis of a dossier documenting outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional education. The dossier should provide specific evidence of outstanding performance in one or more--not necessarily all--of the categories listed below:

1. Excellence in instruction.
2. Involvement of students in research, scholarship, and professional development.
3. Development of postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional instructional programs.
4. Advising and mentoring of students.

This list should not be considered exhaustive or restrictive. The selection committee will consider any and all outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education described by the materials provided. The magnitude of an outstanding contribution in one area may compensate for little or no contribution in other areas.

The selection committee will consider outstanding contributions ranging from broadly distinguished performance over many years to a single extraordinary contribution. Persons receiving awards will be those whose contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education the selection committee considers the most outstanding in a given year and also genuinely outstanding regardless of the year or the competition. The University of Minnesota is a research university, so the dossiers of all nominees should include evidence of their intellectual distinction.

Selection of College Nominees

Each college engaged in postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education may submit, on or before Thursday, January 26, 2006 the following number of nominations:

- 1) College of Liberal Arts, Institute of Technology, College of Agricultural, Food & Environmental Sciences, Medical School, Duluth campus - **up to 5 nominations**
- 2) Carlson School of Management, College of Education & Human Development, College of Biological Sciences, School of Public Health, College of Human Ecology, School of Dentistry - **up to 2 nominations**
- 3) All other units - **1 nomination**

Colleges may nominate faculty members of other colleges as well as their own.

Suggestions for nominees may be made to the college nominating committee¹ by individual students and faculty members, by departments and other administrative units of the college, and by student organizations and associations. Colleges nominating committees should inform the

¹ All colleges (small as well as large) are encouraged to have nominating committees.

faculty, students, and staff of that college of its nominating procedures well in advance of beginning the selection process.

Nomination Procedure

After selecting its nominees, the college, in consultation with the nominee, should prepare the nominee's dossier for review by the Graduate-Professional Award Selection Committee. This selection committee, which is appointed by and reports to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), is composed of five faculty members and one graduate or professional student, and a representative of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association.

Organization and Presentation of Dossiers²

The college should submit *an original plus seven copies* of each candidate's dossier to the **Graduate-Professional Award Selection Committee, 234 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 by no later than 4:00 p.m., Thursday, January 26, 2006.** *In addition to including the nomination form in each candidate's dossier, the designated college contact will submit the nomination form online, using a previously provided password and web site address for the online form submission. If this information has not been obtained, contact Karen Zentner Bacig, kbacig@umn.edu, 612.624.5082.* Decisions will be based on the content of the dossier, not on the dossier appearance. In order to maintain a similar appearance and reduce the burden to the college and nominees, each copy should be submitted in a plain report cover with index tabs (no three-ring binders, please). Photographs, videos, and other types of visual materials not central to the dossier are discouraged. Brevity is encouraged in assembling the following materials. Items should be presented in the order listed below.

Successful dossiers will be made available for public review and various University of Minnesota editors may publish information from these dossiers in materials regarding the Graduate-Professional Award. Dossier contents will be publicly available, except for information covered by the Minnesota Data Privacy Act. Private or personal materials should not be included as part of the dossier.

- a. **The nomination form and release form.** The nomination form must also be submitted online.
- b. **A statement of no more than five pages (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins)*** presenting the full case for the nomination and summarizing the dossier, with specific reference to the criteria listed in these guidelines.

This statement forms the basis of the recommendation and is extremely important for the review process. The author should describe the nominee's qualifications and other relevant criteria, focusing on specific details. The aim of this statement is to set out a convincing and detailed case for the nominee's outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional education.

² The dossiers from the 2004-2005 award recipients may be reviewed at the following libraries:

Twin Cities: Walter Library, Circulation/Reserve Desk (Perry Dean)
UMD: UMD Library, Reserve Desk (Bill Sozansky)
UMC: UMC Library (Owen Williams)
UMM: Rodney Briggs Library, Reserve Section (Shaheen Haji)

- c. Personal statement by the candidate of no more than 1,200 words (using a 12-point font type and one-inch margins)*, addressing the criteria for the award and the impact on student learning.
- d. The candidate's curriculum vitae of no more than four pages (using 12-point font and one-inch margins) organized according to the following rubric: Education; Courses Taught at the University of Minnesota; Program and Curricular Development; Service; Outreach and Other Activities Related to Teaching/Learning; Publications (a summary list of the candidate's most important published works).
- e. A list of graduate/professional courses taught at the University of Minnesota over the previous five years of active teaching, along with a numerical overview compiled from student evaluations, arranged according to the form supplied. For courses with both undergraduates and graduate/professional students, please specify the percentage of graduate/professional students enrolled. Up to one additional page of assessment of student learning can be included.
- f. Up to ten supporting letters, three of which must be from individual graduate/professional students, past or present. The remaining letters may be from students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, or non-University of Minnesota references. In all cases letter writers are encouraged to cite specific examples in support of the case.

***EXCESS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

NOTE: Please retain a copy of the dossier at the collegiate or departmental level as dossiers will NOT be returned or retained centrally.

Approved September 28, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**6. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Statement on Faculty Salary Goal for Strategic Positioning
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Statement on Faculty Salaries

If the University aspires to be among the top three public research universities in the world, the aspiration must include salaries commensurate with that aspiration.

COMMENT:

The Provost asked the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to identify, in the context of the University's strategic positioning process, an appropriate goal for faculty salaries.

The Committee recognizes that many factors go into making the University competitive, and that one can look at either salaries or total compensation as a measure of financial competitiveness for faculty. In the past, the Committee was told, compensation comparison made the University more competitive than a study of salaries alone, because the University had a benefits package that was superior to that offered at peer institutions. More recently, however, the differences in benefits packages has lessened, and so, therefore, has the comparative advantage the University held.

At present (fall, 2004) the University ranks 5th among Big Ten public institutions in average salary for faculty at all ranks. Among the top 20 public institutions by academic rank (AAU), it ranks 17th. The AAU has 59 members, which include the top 30 research universities (public and private); in that group, Minnesota ranks 39th. The Committee doubts that any small comparative advantage in total compensation can begin to offset the significant differences in salary levels offered at Minnesota and at its aspirational peers.

The Committee intends to return to the Senate with a more detailed statement in the future, but wished to set the stage for its efforts with this simple declaration.

**FRED MORRISON, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**7. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning
Information for the University Senate**

CAPA recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

CAPA also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

CAPA believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and CAPA believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

CAPA also believes that current severance policies can cost the University money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, CAPA recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job, to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, CAPA recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current university employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections.
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

CAPA believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

Approved October 21, 2005

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

8. INTRODUCTIONS

**Interim Dean, Carlson School of Management; Dean, Minnesota Extension Service;
Chancellor, University of Minnesota, Crookston
(10 minutes)**

**9. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**10. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 29, 2005
Action by the University Senate
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate and Faculty Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/050929sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**11. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning
Action by the University Senate
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

The University Senate recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

The University Senate also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

The University Senate believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and the University Senate believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

The University Senate also believes that current severance policies can cost the University of Minnesota money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, the University Senate recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job, to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, the University Senate recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current University employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages.
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

The University Senate believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

**12. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Vacation Policy for Academic Professionals and 12 month Faculty
Discussion by the University Senate
(10 minutes)**

**13. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Retirement Waiting Period for Academic Professionals and 12 month Faculty
Discussion by the University Senate
(10 minutes)**

**14. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)**

**15. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(10 minutes)**

Questions to the President should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, November 29, 2005.

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

17. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

**THIS CONCLUDES THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BUSINESS.
THE SUBSEQUENT ITEMS ARE FACULTY SENATE BUSINESS ONLY.**

**18. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction
Discussion by the Faculty Senate
(20 minutes)**

**Draft Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction
September 16, 2005**

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve instruction of the highest quality so that students learn to their maximum potential. The evaluation of instruction is one way to help ensure excellence in instruction, so the Faculty Senate adopts the following policy and protocol on evaluation of instruction.

There are at least three reasons to evaluate instruction: (1) to improve instruction, (2) to provide information for (a) salary and promotion decisions based on merit and (b) faculty tenure decisions, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy and protocol is intended to meet all three objectives. With respect to the second, the purpose of this policy and protocol is to define what shall constitute adequate documentation for student and peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching contributions.³

The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student evaluation of teaching. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure, promotion, and salary increases, and for other instructional staff being considered for reappointment, promotion, and salary increases. The peer review information for individuals is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses.

³ In this policy and protocol, the term "instructor" includes all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank, appointment status, and so on. At some points in the policy, there will be a distinction between (1) tenured and tenure-track faculty, and (2) all others who deliver instruction; in the latter case, the language will refer to faculty and instructional staff.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions, common to all courses throughout the University, will be used in the student evaluations of instruction. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. This type of information can be used with other types to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. This information does not have the resolution necessary to allow fine discrimination between instructors in intermediate categories. In addition to questions that request a numerical response, survey forms must include provisions for written comments by students.

POLICY

--Every course with a University course number shall be evaluated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, internships, and classes with fewer than five students shall not be evaluated using such forms. **[Note: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy will appoint an ad hoc subcommittee to develop guidelines for departments to evaluate small classes, internships, directed/independent study, and so on. Those guidelines do not have to be in place to adopt this policy.]** A department that wishes permanently to exempt a course or courses from use of the standard student evaluation form must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.⁴

Data and information from student evaluations shall not be used in isolation from peer evaluation and (for faculty) research and service in evaluating faculty and instructional staff.

The directions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses (the "student release" questions). The instructions should be written in a manner that will motivate students to complete the forms. The instructions should explain why demographic data are being collected.

--The student rating forms shall be anonymous.

--Students may not be required to fill in a student rating form for any course. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including multiple-instructor courses that are otherwise covered by a different evaluation protocol.

-- No incentives may be given for filling in a student rating form. Instructors are not to know who filled out a form and who did not.⁵

--The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy and protocol applies to all instructors regardless of whether they are tenure-track/tenured, term/P&A, or adjunct faculty or hold any other kind of teaching appointment at the University. Specific provisions are noted for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

⁴ This policy and protocol shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. Units whose curricula feature courses with more than two instructors shall develop their own procedures for student evaluation of such courses and shall be reported to the dean of the college or other appropriate campus academic officer. These procedures for multi-instructor course evaluations shall be made available to all instructors in the unit.

⁵ For extra credit (such as points) to be awarded for filling out the form, the instructor must know who did and did not fill out the forms. It is not permissible for the instructor to have this information.

--Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching shall include review by appropriate department, college, and University officers, as set forth in pertinent rules and policies, all numeric data from the teaching evaluation forms from their courses.

--For tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work in order to measure their quality and appropriateness. Faculty and instructional staff must do the same for all other instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class.⁶

--The information collected pursuant to this policy to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remains confidential.⁷ The results must be shared with the faculty member being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment (where applicable), promotion, tenure (where applicable), and salary adjustments.

--Faculty must always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files

--All student evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.⁸

--Responsibility for implementing the provisions of this policy and protocol rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, deans and department heads, all of whom must clearly convey to faculty the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.

--Department heads and chairs should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and protocol.

PROTOCOL

--Department heads and tenure and promotion review committees will be provided with comprehensive information on the interpretation and use of student rating data (including

⁶ It is to a faculty member's benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation. This policy is not meant to exclude continued use of other mechanisms for peer review that may already be in place in academic units, such as classroom visitation.

⁷ As required by Minnesota state law at the time this policy is adopted.

⁸ The Senate Committee on Educational Policy is concerned about the very low response rates when students are asked to fill out evaluation forms on the web, outside of class.

questions of reliability and validity) in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction.⁹

--The student rating form shall contain the following questions, with the verbal anchors as identified:

How would you rate the instructor's overall teaching ability?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's respect and concern for students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How much would you say you learned in this course?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost Nothing Amount Expected An Exceptional Amount

--All student rating forms shall have spaces for two questions permitting open-ended comments: "Describe things about the course that you found helpful" and "What suggestions do you have for improving the course?"

ALTERNATIVE ONE:

--All written comments on student evaluation forms shall be provided only to the instructor, after data processing by the designated unit on the campus. The evaluation form shall include the following statement: "All written comments will be provided only to the instructor. If you have a complaint about the instructor, you should contact _____."¹⁰

ALTERNATIVE TWO:

--The disposition of written comments on student evaluation forms shall be decided by each college or campus.

Faculty and departments are free to add additional open-ended questions to the required form, but such questions will be in addition to rather than replace the required questions.

--Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this evaluation (including the evaluation forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course." [Suggestion has been made to list these points in bullet form.]

⁹ Responsibility for providing this information rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information as well.

¹⁰ Students will thus understand that if they write comments that insult the instructor, the department will not see the comments. There are ways other than anonymous comments on forms that students can make their dissatisfaction known to the department or college

--The evaluation form will ask for information on the student's major, gpa and class year, as well as whether or not the course is in the student's major and whether the course is required or elective for the student. There will also be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity. [Note: Information about the class size and type (lab, lecture, seminar, etc.) will be included, but this information will be compiled elsewhere.]¹¹

--The following question shall be included in the demographic section of the student evaluation form. The data from this question shall be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number shall be provided to the chief academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus to help guide decisions on facilities resource allocation.¹² [It has been suggested the information should be collected, but not in a demographic section.]

How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Poor		Satisfactory			Exceptional	

-- The instructions on the evaluation forms shall state that harassing comments or comments on irrelevant factors are not helpful for evaluation of instruction. Faculty should be provided with guidelines on how to process and interpret open-ended student comments, particularly those that are inappropriate.

-- Administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the term. The instructor may give instructions but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. The evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. It is suggested that a student be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit shall develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered to the appropriate office. If the forms are delivered to the department office, the department should deliver the envelopes to the data processing center without opening the envelopes. The instructor must never touch or see completed forms until after grades are turned in.

--Each campus will determine the appropriate manner of administering and evaluating student evaluation forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student evaluation forms, each campus administration will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data; the original questionnaires will be returned to the instructor. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful data base exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or

¹¹ Age/gender/ethnicity information shall be requested because the information obtained can be useful to instructors in demonstrating how different groups respond to his/her teaching; problems with different race/gender/age groups can be identified and addressed. Other personal information--class year, GPA, major, and whether the class was elective or required--will be requested (not marked optional) because these factors have been shown in prior research to have an effect on student evaluations.

¹² Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture-in-one-room format.

major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.

-- Every instructional unit shall have a policy on peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. Each unit shall determine what documentation will be used for peer review, and (for faculty) how to evaluate theses and dissertations as well as (for all instructors) samples of graded student work. The documentation is to be used as a basis for evaluating the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter as well as the quality of the instructor's instructional activities. Each unit shall determine who shall have access to the documentation for purposes of peer review, and which materials will be retained for future reference.

The documentation shall reflect what each unit determines to be an appropriately cumulative record of the instructor's contributions to the instructional mission of the University. It is the responsibility of the instructor to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student evaluations of the instructor's courses. Each unit shall assume responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of commentaries or conclusions based on the contents of the documentation.

The documentation for each instructor shall contain an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor, a comprehensive syllabus for each course, and examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor. Units may also wish to include, where appropriate, a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor, information about student performance on certification exams, and a listing of other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, etc.) Documentation may also include a one- to-two page self-assessment of the instructor's teaching strengths and weaknesses. Instructors have the option of adding any other materials they believe are indicative of their contributions to teaching.

--Instructors are encouraged to adopt a mid-semester course evaluation process so that the course can be improved as it is delivered.

--The student evaluation form shall also include the following questions, the responses to which shall, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students.¹³ The responses to these questions may not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure-track faculty) tenure decisions.

[NOTE: The Senate has delegated to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy final authority to approve new questions to be used; they will be inserted here.]

--In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, a question bank will be provided for the student evaluation process.¹⁴ The questions would be supplemental to the required questions, would be selected by the instructor, and would be used primarily for improving teaching. Because the supplemental questions from the question bank are to be used for improving teaching, summary results should go to the instructor only. Use of supplemental questions from the question bank is optional. Provision will be made for instructors, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom questions that are not included in the bank.

¹³ On the web, for instance.

¹⁴ The University administration will provide the question bank on a website.

Departments or schools may also require questions from the question bank or from other sources to be used on all forms used in their area. These additional required questions could be used either for evaluation of instructors or for improving teaching, courses or programs. If for the evaluation of instructors, summary results should go to the department. If for improvement of teaching, courses, or programs, summary results should go to the instructor only if the results are to be used by the instructor, or to curriculum committees if the results are to be used for program improvements. Data from questions that are to be used only for improving teaching should not be released by the University to anyone other than the instructor . Data from questions that are to be used for program improvements may be released to department heads and curriculum committees. [LANGUAGE TO BE INCLUDED AT THE END OF THIS PARAGRAPH IF OPTION ONE IN THE PROTOCOL IS ADOPTED: As with the standard forms, written comments are to be provided only to the instructor. The student evaluation form shall notify students that department heads will not see any written comments. (See footnote 8.)]

--Departments shall develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines (1) which data from student rating forms will be used for personnel decisions and available to department heads and committees charged with reviewing instructor performance, and (2) which data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs. (It is assumed that all information from the four required questions will be used for personnel decisions; the written policy required by this section refers to any additional questions that a unit may require on the evaluation forms.)

--Department and college administrators should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each faculty member. However, for peer review of the documentation for the purpose of promotion or of teaching-related merit pay increases, the faculty in each unit should be free to decide whether they want their dean or head or chair to take responsibility for assessing the quality of teaching, on the basis of the materials, or whether they prefer that the evaluation be done by an advisory group from within the unit or college.

--Each semester, an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.¹⁵

When adopted, this policy and protocol replaces all earlier policies, protocols, and questions approved by the University or Faculty Senates.

19. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom
Action by the Faculty Senate
(10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following policy.

Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom

¹⁵ Reminders each semester coupled with a very easy method to grant permission should increase the number of instructors who choose to release their data. The course release information should be cataloged by course along with instructor and should have a link at the entry for the course in the on-line Course Guide. This will make it easier for students to find information about a course

Every instructor at the University of Minnesota has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices in his or her classroom, lab, or any other instructional setting. It is expected that faculty will make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in working with the Office for Disabilities Services.

COMMENT:

The question of instructor authority concerning the use of personal electronic devices in the classroom arises regularly with the Committee on Educational Policy. We concluded that a simple policy would be the best response.

Approved November 16, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**20. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Faculty Compensation Policy
Action by the Faculty Senate
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend the Faculty Compensation Policy, adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1993-94, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

FACULTY COMPENSATION POLICY

...

PROMOTION INCREASES

~~Beginning with the 1993-94 salary year, p~~ Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$1,500 \$2250 increase in base salary and promotion from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$2,000 \$3000 increase in base salary. These figures should be interpreted as minima and are ~~It is intended that these promotional increments will be in addition to the annual salary increase award related to given for meritorious performance. The minima will be adjusted annually to reflect inflation using the Higher Education Price Index.¹⁶ It will be the responsibility of the Provost to identify the amounts each year and to communicate those amounts to the deans (or equivalent unit heads). The deans will set aside funding for promotional increases separate from funding normally set aside for merit and retention purposes. Deans may institute higher minima but are required to use consistent and equitable procedures when granting these increases. , from those funds provided to his/her unit for salary increase distribution, sufficient funds to cover these promotional increments. It is understood that the dean may also set aside funds from this overall pool to address special merit or retention~~

¹⁶ The Senate assumes the Provost's office will, after calculating the increases, round the results to the nearest \$50 or \$100. The Senate does not presume that any particular ratio between the two promotion increments will be maintained.

~~purposes. It is intended that this promotion increment will receive inflation related increases in future years.~~

...

COMMENT:

The Provost asked the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to review the policy on promotional increases awarded to faculty. The Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate that the changes to the policy be approved.

The amounts were increased by the HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) from 1993-94 to 2005-06. The Committee was informed that HEPI is a better measure than the CPI because HEPI is geared largely to college and university costs, in particular salaries.

The Committee also recommends that the funding for promotion increases not come from the general salary increase pool. Especially for smaller colleges or campuses, but for all colleges and campuses in general, if a larger-than-usual number of faculty are promoted in one year, and if the promotion increases must come from the general salary increase pool, there could be little left over for those faculty who are not being promoted that year. The Committee thus recommends the policy required the deans and chancellors to fund promotion increases from other sources.

Finally, the Committee recommends, in the amendments, that the Provost be responsible for adjusting the promotion increase amounts each year, by the increase in the HEPI, and that he or she notify the deans of the promotion amounts to be awarded that year.

**FRED MORRISON, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

21. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

22. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

23. ADJOURNMENT

Transforming the U: Metrics and Measurements

TASK FORCE CHARGE

- How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?
- How will we track performance leading to improved outcomes?
- How will we measure progress on the University's five action strategies?
- How will the Minnesota Legislature's higher education accountability project help the University achieve its aspirational goal?
- How will the University's accountability report be modified to reflect our aspirational goal and strategic positioning efforts?
- How will the University gather, analyze, and report information more effectively for planning and decision-making?

MEASUREMENT CATEGORIES (PRELIMINARY)

Action Strategy 1: Recruit, educate, challenge, and graduate outstanding <u>students</u>.	
Student Quality Quality of the Student Experience Student Success/Educational Quality Outcomes	Student Diversity Instructional and Curricular Management Affordability and Accessibility
Action Strategy 2: Recruit, monitor, reward, and retain outstanding <u>faculty and staff</u>.	
Research Funding and Productivity Faculty Distinction and Quality Technology Transfer	Faculty and Staff Diversity Workplace Satisfaction Outreach
Action Strategy 3: Enhance and effectively utilize our <u>resources and infrastructure</u>.	
Research Funding and Productivity Enrollment Management Instructional and Curricular Management Financial Resources	Facilities Management Affordability and Accessibility Quality of Academic Support Resources
Action Strategy 4: Communicate clearly and credibly with all our constituencies and practice <u>public engagement</u> responsive to the public good.	
Research Funding and Productivity Quality of Academic Support Resources Economic Impact of the University on the State	Financial Resources Technology Transfer Outreach
Action Strategy 5: Promote an effective organizational <u>culture</u> that is committed to excellence and responsive to change.	
[Consultation in progress]	

STUDENT SENATE
December 1, 2005

KEY DATES

<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ October – November, 2005▪ December 12, 2005▪ December 13, 2005 – January 27, 2006▪ February 9, 2006▪ March 10, 2006 ▪ May 1, 2006	<p>Task Force/Steering Committee Meetings and Consultation with University Groups</p> <p>Task Force Progress Report Due to Provost</p> <p>Public Comment Period</p> <p>Accountability Report (Draft) to Regents</p> <p>Accountability Report (Final) to Regents and Minnesota Legislature</p> <p>Task Force Final Report Due to Provost</p>
--	---

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Alfred Sullivan (chair), Executive Associate Vice President
Susan Grotevant, Director, Information Management Systems
Richard Howard, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Reporting
Lincoln Kallsen, Director of Financial Research, Office of Budget and Finance
Scott Martens, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement
Elizabeth Nunnally, Associate Vice President for Academic Health Sciences
John Ziegenhagen, Director, University Accountability

Staff to Task Force: Christina Frazier, Assistant to Executive Associate Vice President; Joseph Shultz, Graduate Fellow

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Linda Thrane, Vice President, University Relations
Steve Cawley, Chief Information Officer
Craig Swan, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Tim Mulcahy, Vice President, Research
Gail Dubrow, Vice Provost, Dean, Graduate School
Jerry Rinehart, Vice Provost, Student Affairs
Mike Volna, Associate Vice President, Finance, Controller
Bruce Gildseth, Vice Chancellor, University of Minnesota Duluth
Terry Roe, Professor of Applied Economics, Faculty Consultative Committee Member
Peter Radcliffe, Senior Analyst, College of Liberal Arts
Abu Jalal, Ph.D. Student in Finance, Carlson School
Eric Ling, Undergraduate Student, Institute of Technology

SEND US YOUR COMMENTS: The Metrics and Measurements Task Force invites your comments and suggestions. Visit the “Transforming the U” Website at www.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning and click on “Feedback to Task Forces.” Then click on “Metrics and Measurement” (see end of list).

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON UNIVERSITY MEASURES: For a summary of the University’s current performance and measures, see the *2004-05 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report* at: <http://academic.umn.edu/accountability>. This report is submitted annually to the Board of Regents and the Minnesota Legislature.

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2005

11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.

**165 Peik Hall--Twin Cities Campus
106 Sahlstrom Conference Center--Crookston Campus
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts--Morris Campus**

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 48 voting members of the Student Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

1. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 29, 2005

Action

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/050929stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**2. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**

(5 minutes)

3. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

(5 minutes)

4. UNIVERSITY METRICS AND MEASUREMENTS

Discussion with Associate Vice President Alfred Sullivan, Task Force Chair

(25 minutes)

5. SPRING STUDENT SENATE AGENDA ITEMS

Discussion

(15 minutes)

Senators are asked to bring to the meeting possible items for the Student Senate to discuss and take action on during spring semester meetings.

6. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning

**Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

The Student Senate recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

The Student Senate also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

The Student Senate believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and the Student Senate believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

The Student Senate also believes that current severance policies can cost the University of Minnesota money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, the Student Senate recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job, to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, the Student Senate recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current University employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages.
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

The Student Senate believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

7. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom
Action
(10 minutes)

Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom

Every instructor at the University of Minnesota has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices in his or her classroom, lab, or any other instructional setting. It is expected that faculty will make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in working with the Office for Disabilities Services.

COMMENT:

The question of instructor authority concerning the use of personal electronic devices in the classroom arises regularly with the Committee on Educational Policy. We concluded that a simple policy would be the best response.

Approved November 16, 2005

RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

8. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS

10. ADJOURNMENT