

# MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2009

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

Studio C, Rarig Center--Twin Cities Campus  
105 Kiehle Hall--Crookston Campus  
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus  
7 Humanities and Fine Arts--Morris Campus

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 44 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. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

### Resolution on a Tuition Cap

Approved by the: Student Senate December 4, 2008

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\*The University remains fully committed to identifying strategies that provide adequate tuition revenue for the University without unduly burdening Minnesota students and their families. The University has done this by providing free tuition to all low-income Minnesota students, generating \$260 in the past five years to support new scholarships, and creating incentives to encourage timely degree completion, thereby reducing total tuition costs for students. Low-income families no longer face the highest hurdles in terms of affordability. The University is also committed to improving financial support for middle-income Minnesota students, one of the biggest priorities moving forward.

### Statement on Student Access to Student Release Question Data

Approved by the: Student Senate December 4, 2008

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\*The Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs are working together to explore the concept of the University publicizing a list of the top third excellent teachers based on student ratings, similar to a system used by the University of Illinois. Such a system would give students positive information about teachers in a way that will assist them in choosing their courses.

### Resolution on a Twin Cities Campus Smoking Ban

Approved by the: Student Senate February 4, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\*A small working group has been exploring the feasibility of an outdoor smoking ban for the Twin Cities campus. The working group has been consulting with faculty, staff, students, and others during the academic year and has heard a wide range of differing opinions about a potential smoking ban as well as other related smoking policy issues. No decisions related to a

campus-wide smoking ban have been made.

**Resolution on Transparency for the University of Minnesota Leadership**

Approved by the: Student Senate March 5, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* With respect to the Graduate School efforts, the provost has charged a team of faculty, staff, and students to formulate recommendations for restructuring graduate education to enhance student services and support, preserve or further promote academic excellence, and conserve fiscal resources. The team has held open meetings to consult with the University community and their recommendations will be posted for a public comment period shortly. It is important to stress that no final decisions have been made. While the President understands that there has been much debate about the way in which this effort was rolled out, the University is committed to consulting openly with faculty, staff, and students on this and other key decisions to address budget challenges and academic improvements moving forward.

**Resolution on Opportunity Minnesota**

Approved by the: Student Senate March 5, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* Passage of this legislation was unsuccessful at the legislature. The University's commitment to student scholarships remains a significant priority and we will continue our current efforts, and find additional ways, to make college more affordable and reduce the amount of debt students have upon graduation.

**Resolution on All-Campus Vote for Student Fee Increases**

Approved by the: Student Senate April 2, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* Passage of this legislation was unsuccessful at the legislature.

**2. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE  
(5 minutes)**

**3. CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE UPDATE  
(5 minutes)**

**4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
(5 minutes)**

**5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES  
(5 minutes)**

**6. REPORT FROM TWO STUDENT MEMBERS OF THE**

## FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

### Discussion (10 minutes)

The two of us serve both on the Student Senate and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP). Over this year, we had several brainstorming sessions and met with a few administrators. We'd like to bring some topics to your attention. (We emphasize we are not reporting on behalf of SCFP nor other committee members.)

**Meetings.** We met with Richard Pfitzenreuter (vice-president and CFO) on December 17, to talk about the prospects for tuition increases (as a follow-up on the Student Senate resolution on a tuition cap, December 4), student participation in setting priorities early on in the budget process, and fee consolidation. Upon his suggestion, we also met with Kathryn Brown (vice-president and chief of staff) and Lynn Holleran (her assistant) on April 2. We discussed the same topics and ways to help students have a better understanding of how decisions are made. We talked briefly about the Graduate School debacle. Both meetings were very constructive (more on that later).

**Tuition increases.** In both meetings we were reassured the administration will do its best to keep tuition increases as low as possible. However, only after the state budget is settled will it be possible to know the exact value. A factor to be taken into account is that the stimulus funds are one-time money, meaning that in 2012 the budget levels will drop further down. So, on all budget decisions (including tuition levels), the administration will have to balance pain now against pain in the future. **Recommendation.** We strongly encourage the Student Senate to keep in close contact with students serving in SCFP over the next several years.

**Fees.** As you know, the Board of Regents has asked the administration to review the current situation and study consolidation options. Some of the current fees were created, in part, to allocate specific amounts to specific uses and to communicate what those uses were. Over time, some fees have slowly drifted from their original use and additional fees were created. There's a delicate balance between rolling all fees together (to better represent the total cost of education), not appearing to increase tuition by a third (even when the total cost is unchanged), and ensuring specific amounts are indeed allocated to particular uses. **Recommendation.** We did not have time to follow up on this matter recently and encourage the Student Senate to stay in touch with Vice-President Pfitzenreuter as the matter evolves.

**Student involvement in budget decisions.** Students are already involved in the budget process: we have several representatives to the Board of Regents, as well as in several Senate committees and other key positions. Some years ago, in response to requests by students, administrators started meeting with student leaders early in the academic year (before the budget process starts) and during the year (for example, several administrators have met with the Student Senate). **Recommendation.** We think the next step is to initiate regular discussions with administrators at the college and campus level. Our impression is that the central administration would welcome such discussions, but can't realistically force them to take place. **Rationale.** The two of us believe further student involvement would help demystify the (extremely complex) budget process and make everyone aware of the competing priorities of different stakeholders. The more they are part of the process, the more students can take ownership of the outcomes—enabling them to be stronger advocates for the U.

**One-on-one meetings.** We found our meetings with administrators to be an effective means to communicate specific concerns and gather specific information. **Recommendation.** Have specific students be contact persons with specific administrators and aim to build such relationships with as many administrators as possible.

**Policy meetings with administrators.** Helpful as they may be, one-on-one meetings only go so far. For larger policy changes, once all information has been gathered (e.g., from several one-on-one meetings), we need to have everyone sit around the same table and discuss the big picture. **Recommendation.** Establish regular meetings of student leadership and administrators (maybe also University Senate leaders), for broader policy discussion. Though superficially similar to the existing concern forums and town-hall meetings, the meetings we propose would be work meetings, specifically aiming at establishing a roadmap for policy change, and complementing the student leadership retreats discussed at the last Student Senate meeting. We think such retreats can be important to identify common goals, maintain cohesiveness, and help everyone stay aware of everyone else's efforts.

**Student leader networking.** The two of us happen to serve in the Student Senate, as well as SCFP and either MSA or COGS/GAPSA. This made it easier for us to connect (some of) the dots. As we all discussed at the last Student Senate meeting, personally knowing other student leaders can make the difference. The chances are high that other students serving in Senate committees will occasionally come across important information they wish to communicate to someone, but do not know whom to communicate it to. **Recommendation.** Create a mailing list (similar to the ones already in existence) including all student senators and student members of Senate committees (who could opt out if they so wished). Other interested students could opt in. This list would be used solely for short reports (e.g., on topics discussed in a small meeting) or queries (e.g., looking for other students with expertise in a specific topic).

Submitted April 15, 2009

**JOÃO PEDRO BOAVIDA, SENATOR AND MEMBER OF SCFP  
MIKAEL MOSELEY, SENATOR AND MEMBER OF SCFP**

**7. COORDINATION OF STUDENT GOVERNANCE  
Discussion  
(20 minutes)**

**8. APPOINTMENT OF 2009-10 STUDENT SENATE MENTORS  
(10 minutes)**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

Whereas, many issues in Student Government take more than one year to fully complete; and

Whereas, each year many new Student Senators spend a great deal of time learning the University's intricate governance system; therefore be it

Resolved, the Student Senate Chair appoints at least three Student Senators by May 15 each year to serve as mentors to new Student Senators; be it further

Resolved, the appointed Student Senate Mentors can be either a returning Senator or an exiting Senator that will be a student through the following fall semester.

Approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee on April 17, 2003

**9. ELECTION OF 2009-10 STUDENT SENATE/  
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**Election by 2009-10 Senators Only  
(15 minutes)**

**10. ELECTION OF 2009-10 TWIN CITIES UNDERGRADUATE  
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBER**

**Election by 2009-10 Twin Cities Undergraduate Senators Only  
(10 minutes)**

**11. ELECTION OF 2009-10 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE  
STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**Election by 2009-10 Twin Cities Senators Only  
One Twin Cities undergraduate senator and one Twin Cities graduate/professional senator  
(10 minutes)**

**12. OLD BUSINESS**

**13. NEW BUSINESS**

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

**CONSECUTIVE MEETINGS OF:**

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
THE FACULTY SENATE**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2009**

**2:30 - 5:00 P.M.**

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

This is a consecutive meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate. There are 257 voting members of the University Senate and 166 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 ACTIONS  
Information**

**Faculty Senate**

Revised Set of Educational Policies

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009  
Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Board of Regents Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009  
Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009  
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING (review in May and action in June)

2013-14 Twin Cities Calendar

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009  
Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

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

**FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF**

Paula J. Bowman  
Professor  
Epidemiology  
1955 – 2009

Barbara L. Lee  
Professor  
Public Health  
1931 – 2009

Barbara L. Lukermann  
Professor  
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs  
1930 – 2009

Anna E. Smits  
Professor  
Curriculum and Instruction  
1919 – 2009

Harriet E. Viksna  
Professor  
Liberal Arts – University of Minnesota Duluth  
1920 – 2009

### **STUDENTS**

Guadalupe Avendano  
College of Continuing Education

Nhi T. Dao  
College of Biological Sciences

Jeremy Windahl  
University of Minnesota Crookston

### **3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements Information for the University Senate**

#### **FOR INFORMATION:**

On February 18, 1999, in adopting a policy on "Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements," the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was required to provide to the Senate "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages . . . for grades awarded each Fall Semester." The policy also provides that "data should be reported for all undergraduate students."

#### **COMMENT:**

These data are also available on the web at: <http://www.irr.umn.edu/grades/>

SCEP Grading Distribution  
 Fall 2008  
 Report Run Date: 4/14/2009  
 Data as of 1/30/2009

Campus	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
UMNCR	3554	2.78	39.05%	715	2.58	26.57%	1681	2.94	42.36%	193	3.34	53.89%	23	2.76	30.43%
UMNDL	22006	2.78	34.97%	7127	2.83	32.51%	10337	3	37.63%	4211	3.19	46.97%	649	3.21	49.46%
UMNMO	3732	2.96	41.77%	1248	2.96	36.22%	1429	3.13	42.55%	550	3.45	51.45%			
UMNTC	51259	3.06	42.23%	10377	2.91	33.62%	44445	3.2	44.67%	15913	3.22	45.82%	5965	3.37	54.67%

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group  
 Fall 2008  
 University of Minnesota, Crookston  
 Report Run Date: 4/14/2009  
 Data as of 1/30/2009

Acad Grp	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Acad Aff	3554	2.78	39.05%	715	2.58	26.57%	1681	2.94	42.36%	193	3.34	53.89%	23	2.76	30.43%

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group  
 Fall 2008  
 University of Minnesota, Duluth  
 Report Run Date: 4/14/2009  
 Data as of 1/30/2009

Acad Grp	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Accad Supp	1546	3.49	63.32%				87	3.97	97.70%						
Bus/Econ	930	2.6	20.11%	1588	2.74	26.01%	2463	2.67	19.65%	915	2.86	23.61%			
Cont Ed				26	3.37	69.23%	10	3.58	60.00%						
Ed/Hum Srv	2894	2.96	43.85%	1221	3.12	48.16%	2884	3.1	47.26%	1060	3.53	61.60%	103	3.35	69.90%
Fine Arts	3620	2.97	45.66%	634	3.05	41.32%	592	3.3	60.14%	554	3.52	74.37%	14	3.49	57.14%
Lib Arts	7716	2.85	30.53%	1069	2.89	31.71%	2891	3.12	38.81%	639	3.32	49.45%	301	3.29	50.50%
Medicine													41	3.05	31.71%
Pharmacy	34	2.62	32.35%												
Sci/Eng	5136	2.53	22.66%	2571	2.62	26.86%	1343	2.91	32.76%	1041	2.99	36.60%	183	3.05	40.98%
UMD-Acad A	128	3.46	58.59%	18	3.32	33.33%	61	3.5	50.82%						

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group  
 Fall 2008  
 University of Minnesota, Morris  
 Report Run Date: 4/14/2009  
 Data as of 1/30/2009

Acad Grp	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's									
Acad Aff	549	3.25	47.72%	59	3.1	45.76%	84	3.4	29.76%	25	3.97	96.00%			
Div Educ	384	3.68	36.72%	179	3.27	48.04%	118	3.45	44.07%	255	3.67	50.20%			
Humanities	1325	3.2	57.28%	390	3.12	44.10%	378	3.3	54.50%	78	3.33	55.13%			
Sci/Math	865	2.71	25.90%	399	2.76	25.56%	182	2.94	34.62%	138	3.17	40.58%			
Social Sci	609	2.76	28.41%	221	2.85	29.41%	667	3.02	39.28%	54	3.53	59.26%			

SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group  
 Fall 2008  
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
 Report Run Date: 4/14/2009  
 Data as of 1/30/2009

Acad Grp	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
AHCS	110	3.47	38.18%				18	3.63	66.67%	482	3.05	31.33%	173	3.79	63.01%
Bell Mus													13	3.4	23.08%
CBS	1964	2.74	24.44%	1064	3.2	36.09%	1286	2.95	34.29%	1516	3.05	38.52%	62	3.23	43.55%
CCE	28	3.52	67.86%	46	3.13	19.57%	622	3.24	38.42%	644	3.19	46.43%			
CDES	964	3.05	34.96%	455	3.26	38.02%	1145	3.35	49.96%	913	3.36	48.19%	96	3.33	46.88%
CFANS	2482	3.12	40.77%	264	3.22	47.35%	1969	3.15	44.18%	1016	3.35	51.57%	144	3.39	57.64%
CLA	26455	3.19	46.55%	615	3.17	48.82%	24493	3.24	47.67%	3506	3.26	49.32%	1769	3.45	60.77%
CSOM	405	3.17	31.85%	1492	2.98	32.17%	4646	3.16	28.13%	1531	3.34	44.81%	550	3.23	46.18%
Dent				72	3.34	36.11%	115	2.77	33.04%						
EHD	5542	3.31	63.06%	485	3.25	50.72%	3277	3.36	53.59%	1283	3.15	44.74%	1695	3.58	64.19%
Health Sci	181	3.58	76.24%												
HIPA	74	3.52	70.27%				67	3.59	73.13%	87	3.41	57.47%	40	3.37	25.00%
IT	11589	2.71	25.13%	5391	2.74	28.51%	3389	2.88	29.51%	3631	3	35.61%	1224	3.13	41.58%
Med	115	2.98	13.91%				1637	3.1	43.31%	152	3.3	48.68%	121	3.05	22.31%
Nursing	75	4	42.67%	158	3.31	52.53%	209	3.69	83.25%	860	3.66	76.28%	28	4	17.86%
Pharmacy	697	3.29	53.37%				86	3.55	68.60%				40	3.23	52.50%
Pub Health	245	3.35	56.73%				583	3.12	47.17%						
SRVPA				123	3.73	78.86%	115	3.75	80.87%						
Ugrd Ed Ad	203	3.38	48.28%	25	3.29	12.00%	139	3.54	64.03%	60	3.57	45.00%			
VMed				182	2.38	12.09%				31	3.1	35.48%			
VP Sys Adm	130	3.26	47.69%				649	3.61	68.72%	201	3.9	96.52%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR  
 EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**4. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT  
(5 minutes)**

**5. MINUTES FOR MARCH 5, 2009, AND APRIL 2, 2009  
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/090305sen.html>  
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/090402sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK  
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**6. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT  
Ex Officio Membership  
Action by the University Senate  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article II, Section 1 of the University Senate Rules as follows (new language is underlined). A simple majority vote is required for approval.

**ARTICLE II. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)**

**1. Ex Officio Members of University Senate Committees**

...

- **Senate Consultative**--Vice chair of the University Senate (voting); past chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (voting if not otherwise a voting member); Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee; Chair of the Educational Policy Committee; elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections

...

**COMMENT:**

When the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules were amended in 2004, the intention was for the Educational Policy Committee chair to be included as a Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) member since it allows the chair to report to SCC on issues that affect students (and, on occasion, staff who teach). This amendment makes clear this intention.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT**  
**University Senate Term Limits**  
**Action by the University Senate**  
**(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article I, Section 2 of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (129) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

**ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP AND OFFICERS (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)**

...

**2. Elections**

All members elected to the University Senate shall begin service on July 1 and shall serve for three years. Elected members of the University Senate shall not serve more than two consecutive terms, and shall be eligible for re-election only after a one-year interval of nonmembership in the University Senate.

...

[Subsequent sections will be renumbered]

**COMMENT:**

When the University Senate Constitution and Bylaws were rewritten, a statement on term limits was included for Faculty Senate and Student Senate members, but not for University Senate members (civil service and academic professionals). This language adds term limits for University Senate members and reflects the same term limit as Faculty Senate members.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR**  
**SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Report on the Graduate School**  
**Discussion by the University Senate**  
**(45 minutes)**

The report will be sent to senators in advance of the meeting and will be available in paper copy at the meeting.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR**  
**SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**9. RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE GRADUATE SCHOOL**  
**Action by the University Senate**

**(20 minutes)**

The text will be sent to senators in advance of the meeting and will be available in paper copy at the meeting.

**ANNA CLARK, SENATOR**

**HARVEY SARLES, SENATOR**

**10. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**11. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

**12. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

---

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

---

**MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**13. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT  
(5 minutes)**

**14. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE  
(5 minutes)**

**15. REPORT OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES  
FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION  
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Delegation confirm the reappointment of two faculty members on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval.

**ARTHUR ERDMAN:** Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1986-89, 1997-2000, 2004-10. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Advisory Committee on Athletics, 2000-05 (Chair, 2003-05), Capital Projects and Campus Master Planning Subcommittee, 2002-06 (Chair, 2004-06); Committee on Committees, 1988-89; Council on Liberal Education, 2001-04; Facilities Management, 1986-90 (Chair: 1988-90); Finance, 1988-89; Finance and Planning, 1989-90 (Ex Officio, 2002-06); Judicial, 1988-2001; Nominating, 2006-09; Support Services, 1990-93.

**ANN MASTEN:** Professor of Child Development, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1991-94. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Nominating, 2007-09.

**INFORMATION:**

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that the Faculty Committee on Committees each year shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Nominating Committee. In those instances when an incumbent member of the Nominating Committee is eligible for re-election and is willing to serve, the Faculty Committee on Committees may present to Faculty Consultative Committee the name of that individual for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position.

**ELAINE CHALLACOMBE, CHAIR  
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

**16. REPORT OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES  
FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION  
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation approve the following slate of nominees to fill one 2009-12 Twin Cities faculty vacancy on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

**RICHARD LEPPERT:** Regents Professor of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1985-88, 1992-95. Senate Committee participation: None.

**JOHN SULLIVAN:** Regents Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation: Computing and Information Systems, 1987-88; Consultative, 2004-07; Finance, 1983-85; Research, 1982-85, 1990-91 (Chair, 1984-85, 1990-91).

**FOR INFORMATION:**

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that the Faculty Committee on Committees will propose a slate composed of twice as many tenure-track or tenured faculty members as there are positions to be filled, each confirmed as willing to serve. The Faculty Committee on Committees will strive to include a diverse pool of candidates and, to ensure that the Nominating Committee as a whole will include balanced representation from across the Twin Cities campus, the Faculty Committee on Committees shall select candidates from appropriate academic units, and the slate of nominees, other than those for reappointment, shall pair candidates from related academic units. The slate and the proposed reappointments shall be submitted to the Faculty Consultative Committee for approval. In the event that additional nominations are made by members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee shall vote by secret ballot to reduce the slate to twice the number to be chosen through contested election, continuing to strive for appropriate balance on the slate. The final slate and the approved nominations for reappointment shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting.

Additional nominations of tenured or tenure-track faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting at which the slate is to be presented; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. Such nominees may be named to run against a pair of candidates or against a candidate for reappointment. To ensure appropriate balanced representation on the Nominating Committee, any additional nominations shall specify against whom the nominee will run.

After a final slate is selected as specified above, the clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for a vote. The election for contested seats will be conducted by secret ballot. The candidate receiving the most votes in each pair or group will be elected. Uncontested elections for reappointment may be conducted by voice vote.

In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.

The elected members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2009-10 are:

- Jean Bauer, College of Education and Human Development
- Susan Berry, Medical School
- Daniel Feeney, College of Veterinary Medicine
- Catherine French, Institute of Technology
- Mindy Kurzer, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences
- Mary Jo Maynes, College of Liberal Arts

**ELAINE CHALLACOMBE, CHAIR  
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

**17. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE  
FOR THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION  
Action by TC Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Delegation confirm the appointment of the following faculty for the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

**CARL ADAMS:** Professor of Information/Decision Sciences, Carlson School of Management. University Senate member: 1984-87, 2005-06. Senate Committee participation (past and present): All-University Honors, 2007-10; Committee on Committees, 1991-92, 2000-06; Consultative, 1994-97 (Chair, 1995-96); Faculty Affairs, 1990-94 (Chair, 1992-94); Finance, 1986-87; Planning, 1985-88 (Chair, 1986-87).

**ELIZABETH BOYLE:** Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 2006-09. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

**JAMES CAREY:** Associate Professor of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Medical School. University Senate member: 2005-08, 2008-11. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Disabilities Issues, 1996-2001 (Chair, 1998-2001).

**WILLIAM GARRARD:** Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1996-99. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2008-09; Council on Liberal Education, 1995-98; Tenure, 2002-03 (Chair, 2002-03)

**LOIS HELLER:** Professor of Molecular Physiology, Medical School-Duluth. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 2002-08 (Chair, 2007-08; Vice Chair, 2005-07); All-University Honors, 2005-08; Consultative (Ex Officio, 2007-08).

**JOAN HOWLAND:** Professor of Law, Law School. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2005-09; Computing and Information Systems, 1996-97; Faculty Affairs, 2000-02; Judicial, 1996-2000, 2005-11; Library (Ex Officio, 1995-2009); ROTC Subcommittee, 2006-12; Student Behavior, 1993-96.

**LINDA LINDEKE:** Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing. University Senate member: 2003-08. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

**NATHAN SPRINGER:** Assistant Professor of Plant Biology, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2008-09.

**FOR INFORMATION:**

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that it shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Committee on Committees, composed of as many tenured and tenure-track faculty members, confirmed as

willing to serve, as there are positions to be filled. This slate has been approved by the Faculty Consultative Committee.

Additional nominations of individuals confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; or (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. To ensure appropriately balanced representation on the Committee on Committees, any additional nomination shall specify against which candidate the nominee will run. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall vote by secret ballot on any contested position(s) and the individuals who receive the most votes will be elected to the positions. For any uncontested positions, the election may be conducted by a voice vote. In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.

The elected Twin Cities faculty members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2009-10 are:

Jay Coggins, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences  
Jeanne Higbee, College of Education and Human Development  
Roberta Humphreys, Institute of Technology  
Joanna O'Connell, College of Liberal Arts  
Stephen Weeks, College of Design

**CATHY FRENCH, CHAIR  
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**18. FACULTY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT  
Ex Officio Membership  
Action by the Faculty Senate  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate Rules as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~). A simple majority is required for approval.

**ARTICLE IV. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)**

**1. Ex Officio Members of Faculty Senate Committees**

...

- ~~Research~~--Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (two representatives, including the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station); Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance; Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Vice President for Research (two representatives, ~~including the Associate Vice President for Regulatory Affairs~~); University Librarian; Director of Institutional Compliance

...

**COMMENT:**

The Research Committee has been informed that there is no longer a position entitled 'Associate Vice President for Regulatory Affairs.' Therefore the Research Committee is asking that the rules be amended to remove this entitled position, but yet retain two ex officio positions on the committee to represent the Vice President for Research.

**DAN DAHLBERG, CHAIR  
RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**19. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT  
Eligibility for Faculty Senate Committee Service  
Action by the Faculty Senate  
(2 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article IV, Section 2 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (84) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

**ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)**

...

**2. Eligibility for Membership**

...

e. With the exception of the Faculty Committee on Committees, only individuals tenured or tenure-track faculty eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate may serve as the chair of a committee of the Faculty Senate. The chair of the Committee on Finance and Planning, which reports to both the Faculty Senate and the University Senate, must also be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member.

...

**COMMENT:**

The Committees of the Faculty Senate are: Academic Freedom and Tenure, Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative, Council on Liberal Education, Educational Policy, Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Committee on Committees, Faculty Consultative, Finance and Planning, Judicial, Nominating, and Research. These committees deal with academic and faculty welfare issues that are primarily the responsibility of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. In addition, the Chairs of these committees are often in the position of commenting to central administration on sensitive or controversial matters. Because of these responsibilities and pressures, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) recommends that the Chairs of the Faculty Senate committees be tenured or tenure-track faculty.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**20. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Amendments to the Faculty Compensation Policy  
Action by the Faculty Senate  
(15 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following revised Faculty Compensation Policy (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

**FACULTY COMPENSATION POLICY**

**BACKGROUND ON COMPENSATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

Faculty are compensated for their contributions to teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service to the institution and the state/region/nation/other nations, as well as their professions. Total compensation includes annual base salary plus fringe benefits, including retirement, health and dental coverage, and life and disability insurance. In some instances, annual base salary is augmented through internal sources, such as overload teaching, or from external sources in the case of approved external consulting.

Initial annual base salary is negotiated at the time of hire, with floors established for the instructor and assistant professor ranks only. Increases to annual base salary for faculty occur in the following ways: through annually determined merit increases; through acceptance of a retention offer that includes an increase; in conjunction with a promotion in rank and/or the awarding of indefinite tenure; through an augmentation attached to an administrative title or a set of administrative duties; or in conjunction with an honorary or endowed title. For many faculty, annual base salary is supplemented with summer school or other internal summer employment, such as grant research. Annual base salary may also be supplemented internally during one's contract period through means such as extension teaching. Normally, new salaries go into effect for A base faculty on July 1 and for B base faculty on September 16 of each year.

The salary determination process must provide an objective unbiased evaluation of each faculty member following a thorough review of his/her work. The process must encourage continued good or improved performance, which in turn, should be rewarded by the compensation system.

**CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES AND PROMOTION**

Any salary determination process at the University of Minnesota must be nondiscriminatory. Initial salary offers, periodic increases, and retention offers may not be based on considerations related to the race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual preference, marital status, public assistance status, veteran status, or age of the person being considered.

The criteria for determining salary increases must be similar to those used for promotion and tenure. The tenure and promotion regulations of the University, ~~adopted in 1985~~, provide the following instructions which form the framework within which salary decisions must be made: (See Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure, sections 7.11, 7.12, 9.2, and 5.5, and administrative Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)

## 7.11 GENERAL CRITERIA

~~The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the achievements of an individual have demonstrated the individual's potential to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching, research, and service over the course of the faculty member's academic career. The primary criteria for demonstrating this potential are effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research; outstanding discipline related service contributions will also be taken into account where they are an integral part of the mission of the academic unit. The relative importance of the criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision.~~

## 7.12 DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT

~~Each academic unit must have a document that articulates with reasonable specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria of Section 7.11.~~

### FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

~~Faculty ~~input~~ participation into the discussions surrounding criteria and procedures for salary increase determination is essential to maintaining an equitable and collegial environment. (For the purposes of salary discussion and determination, the relevant academic unit is the departmental or budgetary unit, whichever is smaller.) With the administrator of each unit, the faculty must have the opportunity to develop the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which annual salary increases are determined, including for those faculty who hold endowed chairs. The process determined through consultation may include faculty participation in the judgments regarding compensation changes as a committee of the whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members. The documents that describe these criteria, formats, and processes shall be shared with the college dean, the ~~appropriate vice president~~ Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate, and finally the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This process must include the provision that the ~~department chair (unit head leader)~~ meet with each faculty member individually, at least once per year, to review his or her performance. The sessions shall review the past year's performance and offer suggestions for enhancing productivity, where appropriate. Units may choose to conduct more in depth evaluations on a periodic basis (e.g. 4 or 5 years) that would include outside evaluations.~~

### ALLOCATION FORMAT

~~Each year the annual salary increase pool for meritorious performance received by the unit will be distributed based on the criteria specified in the University's Regulations Concerning Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure and appropriate departmental faculty evaluation documents.~~

~~Unsatisfactory performance, which shall be documented and communicated to the individual involved, shall serve as justification for withholding an individual's increase.~~

~~This policy does not apply to any across-the-board component of salary increases.~~

### PROMOTION INCREASES

~~Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$2250 increase in base salary ~~and promotion from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$3000 increase in base salary.~~ These amounts ~~figures~~ should be interpreted as minima ~~and are in addition~~ to the annual increase given for meritorious performance. The minima~~

amounts will be adjusted annually to reflect inflation using the Higher Education Price Index. 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 Provost's office will, after calculating the increases, round the results to the nearest \$50 or \$100, and no particular ratio between the two promotion increments need be maintained. 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.

#### OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS PROVISIONS

1. A standing administrative and faculty compensation committee (including representatives of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee) will examine and make recommendations on policies such as salary levels in the University as a whole, salary disparity among units, minimum salary levels for associate and full professors, and salary compression.
2. Goals and expectations for endowed chairs and professorships must be established in each unit, in consultation with the dean, and must be used as the basis for review of the performance of individuals who hold endowed chairs and professorships.
3. The Provost will receive an annual report from each college on reviews of endowed chairs and will provide a summary report to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

#### NOTES

~~\*For the purposes of salary discussion and determination, the relevant academic unit is the departmental or budgetary unit, whichever is smaller.~~

~~\*\*The process determined through consultation may include faculty participation in the judgements regarding compensation changes as a committee of the whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members.~~

~~\*\*\*No mention is made of a possible across the board component of compensation increase because it is assumed that no faculty input is required at the unit level for such increases.~~

~~<sup>†††</sup>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.~~

#### **DRAFT**

#### **APPENDIX**

#### **POLICY FOR STATEMENT ON EVALUATING LECTURESHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, PROFESSORSHIPS, AND CHAIRS**

#### **Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs** **(Adapted from an ad hoc subcommittee report, September, 2006)**

There are more than 700 Endowed Chairs at the University of Minnesota. The expenditure of dollars to those holding endowed chairs and professorships exceeded \$30 million in fiscal year 2003. The number and dollar expenditures are expected to grow due to shrinkage of historical means/levels of support coupled with expansion of charitable campaigns.

Currently, there is no policy that requires faculty oversight or involvement in the development or implementation of review processes for faculty holding these positions. In fact, there is no requirement of a review. The faculty compensation policy does not recognize the existence of this form of compensation and the tenure code makes no mention of these factors. Therefore, it

behooves the Faculty Senate to provide clarification to the tenure code and post-tenure review process as well as to develop a policy to require review of those faculty that receive awards, honors, and recognition and the inclusion of faculty from the appropriate academic unit in the review process.

Section 7a.1 of the ~~TENURE CODE~~ Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure requires that

faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

According to the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW ~~Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee January 5, 1998~~  
~~Revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998~~, the implementation of Section 7a of the tenure code requires the following:

The faculty of each academic unit should adopt two policy statements. One is a statement of goals and expectations for all faculty members in that unit (Section 7a.1). The other is a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews (Sections 7a.2, 7a.3). Many Academic Units already have these (or similar) policies in place for compensation review purposes. If so, the faculty need only make any modifications it feels necessary and identify them as the policies applicable to post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a.

The two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. If existing policies are being designated for this purpose, there should be a vote of the faculty designating them as such. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

The Subcommittee of SCFA asserts these policies must be applied to those that receive special awards, honors and recognition. This would include lectureships, fellowships, professorships, or chairs (referred to more generally as endowed chairs to distinguish the appointment from administrators) as defined in the Board of Regents policy: Awards, Honors, and Recognition. The special recognition, honor or compensation bestowed upon the faculty must be considered in establishing the goals and expectations for that faculty in a manner analogous to taking into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

Pursuant to the Tenure code (Section 7a.1), each unit must have a statement addressing the goals and expectations for all faculty including those that receive special recognition, honor, or compensation. Each unit must also have a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews of all faculty, including those specially recognized faculty. In keeping with the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW ~~Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee~~, the two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every academic unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

For the recognition, honor, or compensation that is awarded by an entity other than the academic unit (for example, the college, university, or outside entity), rules and procedures for timely

review must be developed by the awarding entity. These procedures must have a component involving the review conducted by the academic unit of the faculty.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**21. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**22. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

**23. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

Information for the Faculty Senate

**Statement on the Regent Candidate Advisory Council  
Faculty Consultative Committee**

The University of Minnesota Faculty Consultative Committee urges the legislature to retain the Regent Candidate Advisory Council (RCAC) as part of the process by which it exercises its responsibility for choosing Regents for the University of Minnesota.

Oversight of the University of Minnesota is of extraordinary importance to the well-being of the state. The current Regent selection method has served the state well by allowing the public to learn about the abilities and ideas of a broad range of candidates for this important public post. Unlike the RCAC hearings, which occur over several days with a full 30 minutes devoted to each individual on an extended list of candidates, legislative committee hearings are likely to focus on a shorter list of finalists selected by legislative committee. Truncating the public part of the selection process to include only legislative hearings thus would provide much less information to the community, reduce the number of people who are on the short list, and risk undermining public confidence in the outcome.

Under the current selection scheme, members of the legislature remain free to review and meet with candidates, both those recommended by the RCAC and any others they choose to consider. The legislature can override the recommendations of the RCAC, as happened this year with respect to the Regent selected from the 6th District. Because the current selection method combines legislative control with needed transparency, we urge the legislature to retain the role of the RCAC in the selection process.

Adopted unanimously 4/24/09

## 1 I. Executive Summary

### 3 Committee Charge

5 The Committee on Graduate Education was given its initial charge by Senior Vice  
6 President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan on February 20, 2009.  
7 Originally, the charge was to make recommendations for implementing the plan for restructuring  
8 the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota that had been  
9 announced to the University community on February 9. At the outset the committee was referred  
10 to as the Implementation Team, but this name was eventually changed to Committee on  
11 Graduate Education — hereafter simply “the committee” — to reflect an evolving revision of the  
12 original charge, including the option of recommending a streamlined version of the current  
13 Graduate School instead of a new Office of Graduate Education, as called for in the February 9  
14 restructuring plan.

### 16 Meetings: Procedures, Consultation

17  
18 The committee held eight two-hour meetings between February 27 and April 17. These  
19 meetings were devoted to interviewing key Graduate School staff, discussing issues that had  
20 been identified by one or more committee members, reviewing the current budget for the  
21 Graduate School, and considering options for restructuring. The last two meetings were  
22 dedicated to a discussion of the committee’s recommendations and review of the draft report.

23  
24 Members of the committee consulted broadly with the University community through  
25 meetings with individuals, directors of graduate studies (DGSs) and their assistants, department  
26 heads and chairs, Graduate School Staff, and students. In addition, three open meetings were  
27 held: one on the West Bank, one on the East Bank, and one on the St. Paul Campus. The latter  
28 two open meetings were Webcast.

29  
30 The committee approached its assignment by asking (or otherwise seeking answers to)  
31 the following questions:

- 33 1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current arrangement (i.e., the existing  
34 Graduate School operations)?
- 35 2. Which activities/functions of the Graduate School should be administered centrally, and  
36 by which office?
- 37 3. Which activities/functions should be taken over by the colleges?
- 38 4. Which activities/functions should be discontinued?
- 39 5. What activities/functions that are not currently being done should we be doing?

40  
41 These questions were used to frame the conversations at the open meetings as well as to guide  
42 the committee discussion throughout its deliberations.

43  
44 Based on the totality of responses and suggestions received by the committee, 15 specific  
45 recommendations were developed for consideration by the University administration. It is the  
46 committee’s understanding that the University community will have ample opportunity to  
47 comment on these recommendations before any decisions are made about the restructuring of  
48 graduate education at the University of Minnesota.

49 **II. Recommendations**

50  
51 Based on conversations within the University community, as well as examination of  
52 administrative structures for graduate education at peer institutions, the committee concluded  
53 that a strong, central administrative entity is essential for oversight and support of quality  
54 graduate programs. At most universities this central entity is a Graduate School or a combined  
55 Graduate School and Office of Research.

56  
57 The committee considered three possible organizational structures for administering  
58 graduate education at the University of Minnesota. The first of these is an Office of Graduate  
59 Education, led by a Vice Provost and Dean, and administratively housed within the Office of the  
60 Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, as proposed in the February 9  
61 restructuring plan. The second possibility is a recombination of the Graduate School with the  
62 Office of the Vice President for Research, led by a Vice President for Research and Dean of the  
63 Graduate School. Finally, the third possibility is a streamlined version of the existing Graduate  
64 School, henceforth called the "Graduate College" to differentiate it from the current Graduate  
65 School.

66  
67 In discussing these possibilities, the committee decided not to recommend a  
68 combined Graduate School and Office of the Vice President for Research. The committee  
69 reasoned that the current Office of the Vice President for Research has done an excellent job of  
70 focusing attention on critical research-related matters such as technology transfer, regulatory  
71 issues, and expanded research opportunities, and the additional work associated with  
72 management of graduate education would inevitably detract from these efforts. In addition, it  
73 would probably be necessary to appoint a senior associate dean to oversee graduate education  
74 activities (as is done, for example, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Pennsylvania  
75 State University), so the leader of the office (the Vice President and Dean) would be more  
76 involved with research matters than with graduate student education. The committee does  
77 recommend, however, that certain current activities of the Graduate School most related to the  
78 research function of the University, including the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and  
79 Scholarship program and McKnight Awards be moved to the Office of the Vice President for  
80 Research.

81  
82 The committee is divided on the question of whether the central entity responsible for  
83 oversight of graduate education at the University of Minnesota should be an Office of Graduate  
84 Education or a Graduate College (as defined above). In both cases the operations would be led  
85 by a Vice Provost and Dean who reports to the Provost and is responsible for oversight and  
86 leadership of issues related to graduate education. In the case of an Office of Graduate  
87 Education, however, the operation would be an administrative unit, parallel in structure to the  
88 existing Office of Undergraduate Education, and not an academic unit comparable to other  
89 colleges and professional schools. Resolving this issue will require University-wide consultation.

90  
91 While the distinction might seem minor, some committee members (and many people in  
92 the University community) feel strongly that the presence of a Graduate College (School) gives  
93 graduate education at the University of Minnesota a more recognizable identity among peer  
94 institutions. Other members of the committee believe that the name and reporting structure are  
95 less important than the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the unit responsible for  
96 oversight of graduate education functions.

97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144

Regardless of the administrative structure adopted for graduate education at the University of Minnesota, the committee recommends that a strong component of faculty and student governance be maintained. Faculty and student governance is particularly important in relation to matters of program oversight and review, policy, and allocation of student and faculty fellowships. Either structure, however, will need to be efficient and accountable in delivering excellent graduate education. While the Graduate College/Office will need to be more flexible and streamlined than the current Graduate School, the committee recommends that experienced Graduate School staff should be employed in the new unit.

General Recommendations

*Central Oversight.* The Graduate College/Office should administer the following services and programs:

- Graduate fellowships
- Admissions
- Student services, including conflict resolution, and student records
- Communications/Web presence
- Governance: Policy and Review Councils, Council of Graduate Students (COGS)
- Temporary graduate faculty appointments
- Career services
- Postdoctoral services
- New Director of Graduate Studies orientation
- Interdisciplinary graduate programs and initiatives
- Commencement for programs overseen by the Graduate College/Office

*Central Oversight.* The following services should be administered by other central University offices:

- Diversity; Community of Scholars; DOVE Fellowships
- Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship
- Faculty McKnight Awards
- 21st Century Fund
- University Press

*Central Oversight.* The following programs should be added to the Graduate College/Office's portfolio:

- Advising standards and training programs for University faculty
- Metrics for measuring progress in excellence of graduate education

*Either Central or Local Oversight.* Terminal (professional) master's and applied doctorates:

- Optional college control for these degrees
- Optional campus control (Duluth) for these degrees

*Local Oversight.* The following services should be provided by colleges or programs:

- 145  
146 • Development (in cooperation with the University of Minnesota Foundation)  
147 • Student orientation  
148 • Ongoing graduate faculty appointments (automatic with tenure line)  
149 • Award degrees  
150 • Program review  
151

152 Specific Recommendations (see Section IV for details)  
153

154 *Central Services*  
155

- 156 1. University-wide faculty committees are especially important in the award of graduate  
157 fellowships and block grants. A faculty committee should be charged with reviewing the  
158 current allocation processes for these awards, with a view to maintaining merit criteria  
159 while making the processes more efficient, transparent, and accountable, and  
160 recommending how they should be administered. This committee should be convened at  
161 the start of Fall Semester 2009 and asked to submit its recommendations in time for the  
162 new allocation processes to take effect during the 2009–10 academic year, for awards  
163 made for 2010–11.  
164
- 165 2. Work should begin as soon as possible on development of a Web-based graduate  
166 admissions system using program-specific “smart forms” that eliminate any duplication  
167 or unnecessary information in the admissions process and facilitates other process  
168 improvements. The key feature of the system would be a greater focus on the needs of  
169 individual graduate programs. Models for such a system are in place at both the  
170 Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and these  
171 should be examined carefully before designing a system for the University of Minnesota.  
172 Ideally, ApplyYourself would be amended to facilitate such information. However, if  
173 ApplyYourself cannot be efficiently and cost-effectively updated, other systems should  
174 be considered when the University’s contract with the ApplyYourself vendor expires in  
175 2012.  
176
- 177 3. Work should also begin as soon as possible on evaluation of student services processes  
178 and development of a University-wide electronic system for initiating and/or revising,  
179 approving, and archiving student program plans, examination clearances, and other  
180 student records. (The committee understands that the Graduate School had started work  
181 in this area but suspended it because of other staffing priorities.) The Graduate  
182 College/Office should only be involved in reviewing forms, electronic or otherwise,  
183 where there are clear additions to value; primary academic oversight should be the  
184 responsibility of the Directors of Graduate Studies and the faculty.  
185
- 186 4. The diversity functions within the Graduate School Diversity Office (GSDO) should be  
187 moved to the central University Office of Equity and Diversity (OED). Within OED,  
188 significant resources and efforts must be directed toward increasing diversity in graduate  
189 education, including an office and personnel dedicated solely to this goal. This office will  
190 need to work closely with the Graduate College/Office, and an evaluation of the quality  
191 and effectiveness of the move should be conducted after the first full year of operation.  
192

- 193 5. The committee recommends that the faculty awards programs currently administered by  
194 the Graduate School — the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program,  
195 and the Distinguished McKnight University Professorship and the McKnight Land-Grant  
196 Professorship programs — be transferred to the Office of the Vice President for  
197 Research. Involvement of University-wide faculty selection committees in the selection  
198 processes for these awards is crucial, and must be maintained.  
199
- 200 6. Interdisciplinary graduate programs must be protected. The Vice Provost and Dean of the  
201 Graduate College/Office should be responsible for facilitating conversations among the  
202 deans of units involved in all cross-college programs, resulting in formal memoranda of  
203 agreement regarding financial support for each program. Regular revenue streams and  
204 special funds are needed to support these programs, especially those whose students and  
205 faculty are on different campuses. Allocation of funds should be merit-based and  
206 competitive and the criteria for funding should be transparent. The Graduate School's  
207 Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives should be maintained and supported by the new  
208 Graduate College/Office.  
209
- 210 7. A centralized Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) must be maintained based on the  
211 current and projected needs of the university. Postdocs are likely to play an increasing  
212 role in the research environment of the University in the future and a single-site  
213 organization is likely to be the best organizational structure. Moreover, the OPDA  
214 currently shares several structural functions with the Graduate School such that whatever  
215 unit manages graduate education should also include the OPDA.  
216
- 217 8. Based on information for graduate school operations of comparable size at three peer  
218 institutions (Illinois, Penn State, and Wisconsin), the committee believes that it should be  
219 possible to reduce the staff complement of our current Graduate School by approximately  
220 20 percent. A further reduction should be possible if terminal master's and applied  
221 doctorate degree programs are taken over by colleges. In suggesting this substantial  
222 downsizing, however, the committee wishes to emphasize that due regard must be given  
223 to maintaining acceptable levels of service to faculty, staff, and students in the graduate  
224 programs.  
225
- 226 9. The quality and consistency of graduate and professional student advising, including  
227 supervision of research and teaching assistants, must be improved. The committee asks  
228 that the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office form a committee to study  
229 this issue further, work with Center for Teaching and Learning staff to help build  
230 curriculum, implement an advisor training program, create measures to evaluate the  
231 success of training, and continue to work with the Academy of Distinguished Teachers on  
232 this topic.  
233
- 234 10. The quality of graduate education at the University must be measured and shared with the  
235 University community and administration. The new Graduate College/Office should be  
236 responsible for compiling these data in conjunction with the Office of Institutional  
237 Research (OIR). Suggested metrics are listed in Section IV, and are compiled primarily  
238 from the two strategic positioning task force reports on graduate education (2006).  
239 Ultimately, it is the faculty members who are responsible and accountable for the quality

240 of graduate education in their programs, and the compilation of these data is essential for  
241 demonstrating that quality is, in fact, being maintained.

242  
243 11. Faculty governance over matters of graduate education via the Policy and Review (P&R)  
244 Councils should be maintained, with administrative assistance from the Graduate  
245 College/Office. However, the Council review process is considered cumbersome and is  
246 often an impediment to rapid and effective change. The functions and processes linked to  
247 the Councils should be streamlined by removing the most minor, routine items from the  
248 review process and using subcommittees and e-votes to speed evaluation of more  
249 substantial proposals.

250  
251 12. The Graduate College/Office should be responsible for conducting an all-University  
252 commencement ceremony for the graduate programs it administers, but there should be  
253 only one such ceremony each year rather than the two ceremonies currently held by the  
254 Graduate School.

255  
256 *Decentralized Services*

257  
258 13. Colleges should have the option — but not be required — to administer terminal  
259 (professional) master's and applied doctorate degree programs in-house. Other master's  
260 degree programs (i.e., M.S. and M.A. degrees) are often preparatory to the Ph.D. and  
261 should be administered centrally by the Graduate College/Office.

262  
263 14. Graduate degree programs at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) should continue  
264 to be administered by a central authority on the Twin Cities campus, whether this is an  
265 Office of Graduate Education or a Graduate College. Terminal master's degree programs  
266 at UMD may optionally be administered locally.

267  
268 15. Before any graduate program that is currently under the auspices of the Graduate School  
269 is moved to a college, an analysis should be performed of the implications this has for the  
270 college's cost pool charges. At a minimum, this analysis should include a review of the  
271 original fund transfers that central administration made to the college when the new  
272 budget model was adopted in 2005–06. At that time, revenue-neutral adjustments were  
273 made to each college's budget to pay the initial cost pool charges, based on the prevailing  
274 head count of students and Graduate Faculty.

**9. RESOLUTION REGARDING THE GRADUATE SCHOOL**  
**Action by the University Senate**  
**(20 minutes)**

**Resolution on Central Administration's Proposal to Abolish the Graduate School**

**WHEREAS:** The University of Minnesota's Policy on Reorganization requires that the Senate "be involved in any organizational or structural decision affecting an academic unit" (Preamble); further, that "the campus assembly (or analogous body) of an affected campus or collegiate unit shall review and make recommendations on ... [the] elimination of existing collegiate units" (I); further, that "When the president contemplates (a) the establishment or elimination of senior administrative position(s) of high rank, or (b) a major reorganization of the central administration, he or she shall present a proposal to the Senate Consultative Committee ... for information and discussion," and likewise when the provost contemplates such reorganization for a campus (III.2);

**WHEREAS:** The Provost's plan to abolish the Graduate School, as publicly announced by the Provost in his e-mail of Feb. 9, 2009 to the University faculty, was adopted without any prior consultation or involvement of the University Senate, or any part or committee thereof, in violation of University policy;

**WHEREAS:** The "Implementation Committee" (eventually renamed the "Committee on Graduate Education") appointed by and reporting to the Provost is not a "campus assembly (or analogous body)" and was constituted and charged only after the decision to abolish the Graduate School had already been made and publicly announced;

**WHEREAS:** The formal charge to the "Implementation Committee" (now "Committee on Graduate Education") did not encompass review of the merits of the underlying decision to abolish the Graduate School, having instead been limited to consideration of how the Provost's decision to abolish the Graduate School was to be implemented;

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of the University of Minnesota rejects the Provost's decision to dissolve the Graduate School as illegitimate and demands that any proposal to dissolve or otherwise to restructure the Graduate School hereafter comply with the University of Minnesota Policy on Reorganization.

**ANNA CLARK, SENATOR**

**HARVEY SARLES, SENATOR**