

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, March 29, 2012**  
**1:30 – 4:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, George Sheets

Absent: Linda Bearinger, Colin Campbell, James Pacala, Richard Ziegler

Guests: Associate Vice President Pamela Webb (Sponsored Projects Administration); Professor Heidi Barajas (Executive Director, Urban Research and Outreach Center), Dean Beverly Durgan (University of Minnesota Extension), Associate Vice President Andrew Furco (Public Engagement), Kent Pekel (Director, College Readiness Consortium)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) policy on declaring and pursuing an undergraduate major; (2) grade point requirement for an undergraduate degree policy interpretation; (3) leaves and sabbaticals guidelines; (4) potential change in effort-certification cycles; (5) public engagement]

**1. Policy on Declaring and Pursuing an Undergraduate Major**

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:30 and turned to Professor Brothen for the first item, about a policy change on declaring a major.

The proposal has come to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) and was approved, Professor Brothen reported. He noted that existing policy calls for an "adviser hold" on the record of any student who reaches 60 credits and has not declared a major; he explained that the proposed change would permit advisers to impose a hold on students' records even before the students reach 60 credits if "programmatically warranted." Advisers are concerned about students waiting until the last minute to declare a major; this gives advisers more ammunition to apply holds before students reach the 60-credit mark. Many students come to the University with credits already accumulated and they need to act fairly quickly in identifying a major; the proposed change allows timely intervention by advisers to help students.

The proposal does not preclude students from changing majors, Professor Brothen said in response to a query from Professor May.

The proposal forces students to talk to advisers, it does not impose a path to which they are irrevocably committed, Professor Cramer said. It also allows advisers to intervene when a student clearly

---

\* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

will not be successful in his or her proposed major (e.g., passing calculus to major in physics) and help them identify alternative educational options.

How will this be implemented and enforced for the student who dawdles, Professor Sheets inquired? They will have a hold on their record and not be permitted to register before seeing an adviser, Professor Brothen said.

Professor Kohlstedt said it will be important to have an early trigger, such as the point at which the student registers for the 60th credit, so that he or she has the time to meet with an adviser and think about a major. Professor Brothen said that SCEP was informed that advisers do all they can to get students to declare a major as soon as possible but that they needed a tool to get students' attention when needed. One of the points of discussion at SCEP was about whether there should be such an emphasis on graduation, which is the point of getting students to declare a major at 60 credits, but the Board of Regents and the President have decided that it is good for students to graduate, so SCEP did not reflag that issue.

Who decides the hold is "programmatically warranted," Professor Chomsky repeated? Is it a standard that applies to all students who reach (for example) 50 credits? Is it uniform in a college, and does the college (through policy) decide that it is warranted? It is at the discretion of the adviser, Professor Cramer said again. Does the college decide how advisers work, that is, what standards are used by advisers to decide whether to place a hold on a record, Professor Chomsky inquired? Students are in programs and need to know about decisions that must be made, for certain majors, by the time they reach 35 or 40 credits, Professor Jacobs said. Professor Chomsky said she would like clarification in the policy of who decides when a hold is programmatically warranted.

Who decides the hold is "programmatically warranted," Professor Chomsky repeated? Is that true for all students who reach (for example) 50 credits? It is at the discretion of the adviser, Professor Cramer said again. Does the college decide how advisers work, Professor Chomsky inquired? Students are in programs and need to know about decisions that must be made, for certain majors, by the time they reach 35 or 40 credits, Professor Jacobs said. Professor Chomsky said she would like clarification of who decides when a hold is programmatically warranted.

For the College of Science and Engineering, Professor Kohlstedt said, advisers know what students must do to graduate in a program. It is wise to leave the decision to the colleges as long as they have a process. The policy should say that, Professor Chomsky suggested. Professor Cramer said the policy should call for a hold at 60 credits, if the student has not declared a major, or earlier at the discretion of the college advising program. Professor Chomsky said that she is in a unit, the Law School, where this kind of advising does not occur, but the lawyer in her makes her raise questions when she is told a decision is at the discretion of an individual. If the decision is by the college, however, then the policy is fine, she concluded.

The Committee voted unanimously to place the proposed change on the Faculty Senate docket.

## **2. Credit and Grade Point Requirement for an Undergraduate Degree Policy Interpretation**

The next item is an Interpretation of a policy, Professor Brothen reported. Existing policy provides that on the Twin Cities campus, a "D" grade in a major course is not counted toward the major.

The Interpretation provides that "D" grades do not count in minors, either, and the policy provisions are extended to the Rochester campus (at its request). Morris and Crookston currently allow some D grades in major courses.

Professor McCulloch asked why some campuses allow a D grade in the major and others do not if this is one university system. What happens if someone transfers from Morris to the Twin Cities and has a D in a major course, Professor Bitterman asked? Professor Cramer asked Professor Ericksen if she recalled why D grades are permitted in major courses at Morris; she said she did not but that there has been discussion about changing the rule so they are not counted toward the major. As for the student who transfers, Professor Kohlstedt observed that a student may always petition to have the grade accepted.

The problem will come up when the student seeks to graduate and when his or her record is reviewed, Professor Sheets commented. If an adviser finds one D grade, the tendency is probably to let the student graduate, but the policy should be the same across campuses. And it should also be made clear to students before they come to graduation that they have a deficit that must be remedied. Are not transcripts reviewed when a student transfers, Professor May asked? The problem should be identified at that point. Professor Brothen said he would ask the question of Assistant Vice Provost Suzanne Bardouche.

Professor May said she would press for standardization across the campuses. With grade inflation, to receive a D in a major course is unacceptable. No one wants to see a student held up from graduation because of a discrepancy in the rules across campuses. Professor Ericksen reported that she did not believe very many majors at Morris actually accepted a D grade in a major course.

The Committee could make a statement that students should not graduate with a D in a major course, Professor Cramer suggested. Professor Sheets said he believed that when a student transfers, no course is accepted for the major unless approved by the major field (or the minor field). Even if the course were accepted at Morris in the major, the Twin Cities department could reject it.

Professor Cramer suggested that this item be given two minutes at the Faculty Senate so there can be discussion about why D grades in a major are not acceptable.

### **3. Leaves and Sabbaticals Guidelines**

The Committee next took up the proposal for guidelines for leaves and sabbaticals that had come from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). Professor Sheets provided background.

In the previous discussion in this Committee, Professor Sheets said, there seemed to be support for the general principles that SCFA had enunciated in its proposed guidelines, but there was also some resistance to the specificity of the guidelines as too prescriptive. SCFA did not intend that they prescribe; they were intended to provide an example of the kinds of criteria that colleges should define beforehand and follow in the evaluation of proposals for leaves and sabbaticals. If this Committee endorses the guidelines, he can add language indicating that the suggested criteria are merely one specific way in which a college might implement the guidelines. [The proposed guidelines are appended to these minutes.]

The key points are the numbered sections of the guidelines, Professor Sheets said: Use of a review committee, attention to conflict of interest, clarity and specificity of selection criteria, etc. If some version of the guidelines is accepted by all colleges, SCFA and the Office for Conflict Resolution believe there will be greater equity in access to these awards across units and perhaps, as Professor Bitterman suggested at the last meeting of this Committee, there will also be more visibility for the availability of such leaves and sabbaticals.

Professor Kohlstedt agreed with the goal of more equity and visibility but said that sabbaticals and single-semester leaves are quite different. While the central administration allocates funds for sabbatical supplements, single-semester leaves require that departments and programs manage the costs of covering courses for the person on leave. She said she would prefer that the guidelines be recommended only for sabbatical supplements.

Professor Sheets agreed that the funding sources of the two programs are different but observed that both policies are University policies approved by the provost. In the case of single-semester leaves, the department must cover the curriculum for the person who goes on leave—that is a mandate to the colleges from central administration. Professor Kohlstedt's objection, he said, is an aspect of the problem Professor Bitterman pointed out: There is not a well-developed single-semester leave policy in the Medical School because most faculty don't know about them—and the few that do find the logistics of arranging to be away for a semester daunting (according to what he understood Professor Bitterman to have said). A Medical School faculty member could apply for a single-semester leave and the department could say "no," and University policy would never be implemented. While it is true that departments bear the replacement costs of a single-semester leave, nevertheless the existence of the program is centrally authorized and the policy behind the program is to promote faculty development without taking into consideration the cost to departments.

Professor Cramer observed that University policy **ALLOWS** single-semester leaves; Professor Sheets and SCFA, he said, appear to be taking the position that a college **MUST** award them. Professor Sheets said not, but SCFA would favor promoting them. The guidelines do not address funding or the obligation to fund. They are concerned solely with making the application and review process be consistently and transparently implemented.

"The system is all screwed up," Professor Cramer opined. He has heard Provost Hanson say that there should be a more strategic way to use resources to finance leaves and sabbaticals, so perhaps it is time for more consultation with the provost rather than tinkering around the edges of the existing programs.

Professor Sheets acknowledged that it would perhaps be desirable to distinguish between sabbaticals and single-semester leaves. Procedures relating to only the former could be standardized, if it is felt that bringing uniformity to the latter is not possible. With respect to changing the funding mechanism for single-semester leaves, that is a can of worms, he said. If departments are provided with single-semester-leave funds, where will the money come from? Any proposal could be stillborn because there is no money. Given the existing system, however, the proposed guidelines say that even with all the funding constraints, let's have a fair system that is implemented in the same way across departments within units.

Professor Bitterman said it makes sense to have a fair system for college use. The point of leaves and sabbaticals is faculty development, he observed. He took a leave (only after a great deal of trouble) and it was extremely valuable; it led to winning grants and a number of papers. If the University really wants to facilitate faculty development, it should look at a program of sabbaticals and leaves that can be implemented in the colleges, should look at what they can actually do. It would help to have the provost engaged in this issue and looking at it as one of faculty development.

Professor Kohlstedt said that there is a deadline from the dean to department heads; if everyone knew about the deadline that would help make the possibility of semester leaves more visible. She agreed that it would also help if the provost were to take leadership and make faculty development opportunities and strategies for obtaining them clear to all faculty. Professor Cramer noted that the provost is scheduled to join the Committee at its fall retreat, and faculty development programs could be a focus of the discussion.

Professor McCulloch indicated that there seems to be some hesitancy to provide sabbaticals over a calendar year rather than over an academic year. If the University is concerned about what is best for the faculty member's research plan, variability in the timing should be given consideration. It is possible that having these two options would also assist departments in covering the faculty member's departmental commitments. Why would there be a problem carrying over the allocated supplemental dollars to the second academic year? Professor Cramer agreed and emphasized that a careful look at all current policies and procedures surrounding sabbaticals and leaves would provide an opportunity to demonstrate, with reasoned discussion, the developmental value of leaves and sabbaticals to any interested public.

Professor Sheets agreed to an amendment to the guidelines that would remove references to single-semester leaves. The Committee agreed that the proposed guidelines should be brought to the provost and then brought to the Faculty Senate for information/discussion.

#### **4. Potential Change in Effort Certification Cycles**

Professor Cramer turned next to Associate Vice President Pamela Webb to lead a discussion of a proposal to change the effort certification cycle.

Ms. Webb reported that she has been working for about a year on what will happen with respect to effort certification cycles. If someone has sponsored research funds, federal regulations require effort reporting. This process is used by the federal government to verify that salary charged to sponsored projects is commensurate with effort devoted. Anyone who does sponsored research receives a message three times per year notifying them of the need to certify effort. Her plan is to reduce the number of times per year that effort reporting is required from three to two. She provided Committee members a handout that summarized the change.

The current plans, from the Office of the Vice President for Research, are to (1) by May 1, 2012, reduce effort certification cycles from 3 times per year to 2 times per year, and (2) by June 15, 2012, decommission the summer effort policy and replace with FAQs. There is a related issue, to update the Cost Transfer Policy to promote more timely processing of cost transfers (the policy is owned by the Controller's Office and the change is under active consideration now). The sample dates for new reporting cycles would be 6/20/11 to 12/18/11 (pay periods 1-13) and 12/19/11 to 6/19/12 (pay periods 14-26).

### Major Arguments for Making the Change:

- Reduce number of effort statements that must be certified by approximately 10,000 per year (from 30,000 to 20,000)
- Reduce effort certification notifications, reviews, and related follow-up actions for researchers and ~300 departmental effort coordinators and 2 SPA staff
- Two times per year is a method that is in common use nationally; Minnesota would still be in a "safe zone" by adopting a practice that is unlikely to raise eyebrows among auditors
- Reduce audit exposure for B term [9-month] faculty doing research in summer months. Because federal rules allow effort to be "averaged" over the effort cycle, a few days absence in the summer or devoting modest time to non-sponsored activities would be less of a concern so long as the effort had been devoted within the effort period and regular University rules are followed.

### Issues and Concerns to Address:

1. Faculty would need to "remember" how effort devoted for a longer period of time (as long as ~8 months if you include the actual effort certification period itself). There is no diminution in accuracy permitted just because the cycle is longer.
2. The effort cycle could no longer be used as a "reconciliation and error correction tool"
3. Incorrect charges might not be caught for an extended period of time, resulting in:
  - Violation of NIH policy – often used as a de facto national standard (error fixed within 90 days of detection; systems must be in place to detect such errors within a reasonable time frame)
  - Increased administrative workload for departmental staff (e.g., have to perform the fix in 10 pay periods rather than 4, etc.)
  - Increased chance of improper billing to sponsors (sponsor is billed before error is caught)
  - Increased likelihood of having to send money back to sponsors (errors are caught too late for PIs to have time to spend the money)
  - Increased chance of losing money from sponsors (awards are closed out/funds returned before legitimate costs are transferred on to the project)

### Remedies for items (2) and (3):

1. Implement cost transfer requirements that are more time-sensitive
2. Verify whether new PI reports are adequate to allow PIs to quickly detect errors; work to make any necessary adjustment in reports
3. Promote faculty reviewing their expenditures regularly (monthly is ideal). This can happen alone or with departmental staff.

The reason the University adopted a Summer Effort policy was because of increased federal scrutiny of effort, with a particular focus on summer certification for B-term faculty, Ms. Webb reported. Under federal rules, however, it is permissible to average effort over the period of certification, so if the University goes to reporting twice per year, six months each period, faculty members working in the summer can average their effort, which will help if someone needs to do a modest amount of University business (or, for example, wishes to take time to prepare another grant application) during the summer, noting that some balancing work on sponsored research obviously occurs during the academic year, as well.

Her office is responsible for tracking effort certification cards, about 30,000 per year, Ms. Webb observed. This policy change would reduce that by one-third, a substantial saving of work for researchers, departmental effort coordinators, and SPA staff.

They did look at policies elsewhere to see if there are practices that appear to lead to increased federal auditing. Institutions that report twice per year, a common practice, do not elicit a higher rate of audits. Institutions reporting only once per year do seem to attract more federal attention.

Ms. Webb outlined the issues and concerns.

Professor McCulloch asked if faculty members who are paid 100% in the summer could take a two-week vacation. Ms. Webb said the change will not be a free-for-all but they could take time off if the effort was devoted at another time. For example, if a faculty member were planning a two week vacation they should either take that specific period of time as unpaid effort, or they could average that in to their applicable appointment; for example, if they took 2 weeks off, they could charge ~87% throughout the summer. The change does not eliminate the concept that there is a fundamental obligation to indicate vacation time versus time working, or other University business versus specific activities devoted to the sponsored project(s) paying the person's salary, but the change allows more flexibility in the summer.

Professor Chomsky asked if there are tools available so that one can look ahead, given hours per week of work, vacation, etc., to come up with a percent that should be charged to a project. There are, Ms. Webb said, and most department administrators are good at doing that kind of projection. They train people how to do that in sponsored projects training (SPECTRUM) courses, and will be expanding effort-management training for both staff and researchers.

Professor Boyle said she supported the change because it would save time, and she liked the proposed dates of the reporting cycles. She said she would like to be clear that many faculty members in CLA have NSF grants, which do not allow salary to be charged during the academic year. Now they can, Ms. Webb said. NSF changed its rules some time ago so that their limit of two months of salary (across all NSF grants) applies to costs incurred anytime during the year, rather than just during the summer. Many were averaging and capturing the time in the summer, Professor Boyle said. Ms. Webb said she has known of faculty members who devote their effort to a project in the spring but charge it in the summer. The best practice is to charge the effort at the time it is devoted, but at a minimum, it must be done within the effort period itself. It is not permissible to devote the effort during one effort period and charge it during the next cycle.

If a B term faculty member devotes time to sponsored projects during the academic year and charges his/her salary accordingly, this might free up departmentally-funded academic year salary. If that happens and if the department so chooses, they have the option to use those funds to pay for some of the faculty member's time during the summer. That is perfectly permissible, and it works well if the faculty is spending some of the summer months on University business (such as preparing classes for fall or writing grant proposals).

Professor Cramer commented that averaging properly reflects the manner in which faculty work, unlike contractors. Faculty are constantly performing many tasks concurrently, so averaging over a six-month period is both convenient and accurate and avoids the paradox that B-term faculty are forbidden to

pay themselves 100% during the summer if they so much as think about their next semester's syllabus for five minutes. This is a marvelous idea, he said.

Professor Cramer then posed a question about effort certification. All grants, even enormous ones involving possibly scores of junior researchers, are administered by a single PI for certification purposes, and that PI is asked to certify effort for people they may not even know. Apparently the system permits certification to be delegated only one level down, which may not accurately capture a more vertically stratified organization of supervision. Ms. Webb said there is a way to manage that. Faculty members must always certify their own effort. Beyond that, someone certify the effort of others who has suitable means of verifying the work. This can be the employee him or herself, or it can be someone who is in a position to know how they spent their time (usually a supervisor). For faculty members with a large grant, they can set up the award in EFS so that they have "child" projects run by their colleagues who have more knowledge of that particular subproject. The effort certification statements will be sent to the person named as the head of that "child project" in the financial system. Some PIs feel that does not give them enough control and want to be named on the main project and every "child" project; if so, they will be notified about all effort statements. One can have as many child projects as wanted; they can be divvyed up by supervisor or however the PI wishes (except that faculty members on a project must always certify their own effort). So one would have to look at pages and pages of paper to reconcile the budget, Professor Cramer said. "Why can't there be different levels that roll up?" That is the tradeoff, Ms. Webb agreed. PIs are always responsible for effort certification on their awards, but they have this option to decide if they want to delegate some of the work of ensuring effort is certified. PeopleSoft doesn't have "nested" levels of "child projects"—there is just the main project and as many "child" projects as one wishes.

Ms. Webb and Professor Hayes had a discussion about reporting activities by students. Professor Hayes explained that she often sets up salaries for her students working on sponsored projects at the beginning of a semester according to her best estimates of how time will be spent, but the students often spend their time differently than planned because they offer each other help, and collaborate. They often do this without her instruction or knowledge, but she considers such collaboration beneficial to their professional development. She typically grills them about their actual activities and "trues up" their salary charges towards the end of the reporting period based on what they actually did. Ms. Webb explained that the federal rules (which the University uses for all projects) would consider a semester too long a period to wait before correcting salary inaccuracies. The University would be considered guilty of receiving improper payments, because a sponsor would have already been billed and the University would have been paid by the sponsor for work that wasn't a legitimate charge to that project—and the University would then hold on to those funds for several months. Errors can be corrected, of course, but this should happen more rapidly than by semester. Some agencies, like NIH, are specific—they allow 90 days for correction from detection of an error and they expect one to find the errors within a reasonable period of time--waiting a full semester would not be considered "reasonable" from their perspective. A month or two would be considered appropriate. This is what the updates to the cost transfer policy will address.

Professor Cramer said that if asked a postdoc to spend a week on a project that he or she was not being paid by, he could make a robust defense that the postdoc will have learned something to help his or her work; the academy is a learning process and needs flexibility. Ms. Webb agreed. If that work can be considered within the goals of the sponsored projects paying the salary, it can be an allowable cost. The longer effort-reporting period will help. PIs need, however, to be routinely reviewing expenditures so that

they can detect if they inadvertently forgot to tell their departmental staff to update the projects their students and employees are working on. If someone is charged incorrectly, there should be a correction quickly to avoid improper payments. Prompt corrections also help avoid cases where a grant has already been closed out and thus a retroactive adjustment is no longer possible to cover legitimate costs. In these cases, the PI or department has to eat the costs. Professor Hayes said she wanted to stay auditable, but if she must do reviews every 90 days, that adds to the existing administrative burden.

Professor Luepker agreed that the change would reduce the burden. He said that he signs about 100 effort-certification statements per term and his accountants do not want to create child accounts for people who may be hired for only three months. But when he looks at the names on some of the statements, he has no idea what they are doing. He indicated he has a particular problem when the employee does not work full time for him, but instead also works part time for other faculty or in another college. He need not do that, Ms. Webb said. It is possible for each fund source to be separately certified (e.g, by the employee or by each other supervisor/ college). The PI is responsible to make sure that happens, not necessarily to do it himself or herself. These nuances of the system are part of why SPA is developing additional RCR training for faculty, she said. EFS is not perfect at tracking expenses, Professor Luepker said, and has not eliminated the need to run shadow systems. He can know in an hour who he is paying and what amount, something he cannot do with EFS. Ms. Webb said that Sue Paulson (the Director of Sponsored Financial Reporting) is very open to suggestions to create better reports for PIs; she said she would be happy to carry any recommendations or she can be contacted directly. The new Business Intelligence tool is very impressive.

Professor Luepker said he had one suggestion, something their system does that is helpful: It projects what total costs will be so that one can make plans if a deficit is predicted. Some EFS reports include encumbrances for that very reason, Ms. Webb said, and one can decide if one wants to encumber by budget period or for the entire project period. Departmental staff can update these settings. .

Ms. Webb said she had hoped that the federal government would make this regulation go away. There are national pilot programs in project certification. This process, instead of doing effort certification, asks PIs to annually verify that the salaries charged to grants are appropriate and reasonable with respect to the work actually performed. That regulatory change has not happened, so she is proceeding with these plans. While that change might not happen in the near future, she and the national research community continues to fight for it. Even if the system is not perfect, this is a step in the right direction, Professor Cramer concluded, and he thanked Ms. Webb for her report.

## **5. Public Engagement**

Professor Cramer now welcomed Dr. Barajas, Dean Durgan, Associate Vice President Furco, and Mr. Pekel to the meeting to discuss public engagement and outreach. He said the Committee had two motives for inviting the guests today: It has been awhile since the Committee has heard from their offices, and the Committee has been grappling for some time with the question of the degree to which the State's people do or do not appreciate the University's impact on their lives—irrespective of whether they participate in any University program—and if there are ways that the programs directed by the guests can be leveraged to improve that appreciation.

Dr. Furco began with an overview of the broader public-engagement agenda. As a land-grant, public institution, outreach has always been part of the University's work; now it is carried out within a

broader framework that is more international and global, and more integrated with the research and teaching missions of the University. The University of Minnesota is a public, land-grant, urban, research university with a public-engagement agenda that is about providing support and infrastructure to fulfill the institution's community engagement obligations. In the last ten years there have been many efforts to deepen the University's public-engagement activities.

Then-Provost Bruininks set up the Council on Public Engagement (COPE) in 2002 to build a more robust public-engagement agenda in the context of a national discussion of the subject about demonstrating the value of higher education to the state and community. A number of things happened after that, Dr. Furco said. They established a definition of public engagement, from the CIC:

Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

Public engagement is about partnership with the community, working *with* the community, not just doing "to" or "for" the community or even just working "in" the community. The "community" means business, non-profit, and governmental partners. Achieving the public service and outreach missions of the University is just one piece of the public engagement agenda, Dr. Furco related. This part focuses on extending the University's intellectual and human capital address the needs of State and society. Associate Vice President Furco went on to explain that the public engagement agenda is much broader than fulfilling the outreach and public service parts of the University's mission. The public engagement agenda is also about advancing the University's research and teaching missions. It is about how the University does research of significance that benefits society. It is all about ensuring that the University fulfills its promise to provide to its students a quality education, including a community experience to enhance that education.

Dr. Furco used a Venn diagram to illustrate how public engagement helps to meet all three of the University's missions in that it includes community-based scholarship, research, and teaching. Public engagement is different from outreach, he explained, but outreach is a part of public engagement. One outcome of the establishment of COPE was the creation of the Office for Public Engagement, which he directs. The Office for Public Engagement is responsible for supporting the work of existing units at the University that do community-engaged research, teaching, and outreach. The Office for Public Engagement focuses on advancing the University's *internal* policies, infrastructure, and systems to ensure that the many engagement-focused units and offices across the University system can maximize and optimize their potential to provide high quality programming. In essence, the Office for Public Engagement focuses on leading the University's strategic goal of furthering the institutionalization of community engagement into research, teaching, and outreach.

Dr. Furco provided the Committee a list of some of the programs that his office has sponsored (between the \* \* \*):

\* \* \*

**Engaged Department Grant Program:** Provides grants between \$6,000 - \$10,000 to department teams to develop and implement actions plans that deepen the integration of community engagement into the

departmental research and/or teaching initiatives. Of the 44 departments/academic units that have applied to the program, 21 have received grants.

**Metrics Initiatives:** Infusing public engagement measures within new and existing data collection and measurement systems at the U. A public engagement metrics framework was developed in 2010 to align with the University's overarching metrics and strategic goals. A Public Engagement Metrics Committee was launched in 2011 to identify ways to qualify and quantify the range and scope of public engagement activities across the more than 200 offices and units at the University that conduct community-engaged research, teaching, and outreach.

**Graduate Student Task Force:** A task force to explore ways in which the University can better support graduate students who are interested in community-engaged research and community-engaged teaching opportunities.

**Intercultural Competence Work Group:** A network of faculty, students, administrators and staff, led by the Office for Equity and Diversity, the Global Programs and Strategies Alliance, and the Office for Public Engagement, who are exploring ways to advance the University's capacity to engage effectively in diverse, multicultural settings.

**Faculty Development Initiatives:** A set of initiatives designed to support faculty interested in community-engaged research and teaching. Initiatives include workshop on community-based participatory research, and faculty technical assistance support for developing courses with community-based learning activities.

**Engaged Faculty Learning Communities:** Extramurally-funded programs that bring together faculty from different disciplines to develop their individual capacities to do high quality community-engaged teaching and learning.

**Linking Strategic Initiatives:** Supports work that uses public engagement as a means to accomplish institutional priorities such as enhancing interdisciplinary work, meeting the "broader impact" requirements of NIH, NSF, DOE, and other federal funding agencies, advancing the University's student learning and development outcomes, facilitating liberal education requirements, internationalizing the curriculum, achieving diversity and equity goals, and other initiatives.

**Engagement Staff and Leader Networks:** Fosters internal networking among staff and academic leaders that have responsibility for advancing various aspects of the community engagement agenda. Includes groups such as the Associate Deans Network (group of Associate Deans who are responsible for advancing public engagement in their colleges) and the Campus-Community Coordinators Network (group of individuals who direct, coordinate, and manage community engagement initiatives).

**Engagement Zones:** Neighborhood-based collaboratives designed to improve impact by bringing together and building synergy among existing projects within a community that are addressing the same issue but are otherwise working independently. The goals are to avoid duplication of efforts, maximize resource efficiency, and build collaborative partnership to leverage capacity and maximize societal impact.

\* \* \*

One problem has been that public engagement has been heavily reliant on individuals, Dr. Furco said, and when someone decides to withdraw from a public-engagement activity, that activity has stopped.

There have been complaints from the community that people just leave, so one of their aims is to build engaged departments that develop more sustainable and ongoing relationships, something that cannot happen in just two semesters or even two years. The focus on departments is important because this is where faculty and students have their closest affinities. The Engaged Department program focuses on getting the department to own the engagement agenda so that engagement activities are more embedded in the structures and academic programs of the department. Thus far, 44 departments have applied for grants, and 22 departments have received them.

Professor Jacobs noted Dr. Furco's comment that partnerships are not "in" or "for" the community, they are "with" the community. Does it matter who initiates them? That will vary, Dr. Furco said. The community may identify issues it wants studied, or areas where it could use students; it may be that faculty members receive research grants and are able to reach out for community partners. Some units and centers help negotiate partnerships for faculty members and the community.

One major public-engagement initiative is metrics, Dr. Furco told the Committee. There really are not good measures of achievement, nor is the University fully aware of the scale and scope of the public-engagement activities that are taking place. The University does not know the number of faculty, staff, and students who are doing public-engagement work. So they are trying to get a better sense of what is being done and how well the institution is doing. The Public Engagement Metrics Committee, charged by Associate Vice President Furco, just completed a report on metrics and they are now working with the approximately 200 units that do public-engagement work to explore how to best implement a University-wide public engagement metrics plan that can facilitate data collection, analysis, and reporting. Dr. Furco's office is working closely with the Office of Planning and Analysis on aligning the public engagement metrics with the University's other metric priorities.

Professor Cramer asked for an example of what a public-engagement metric might be. Dr. Furco said that the extent to which one garners research funding through public-engagement partnerships is one; another might be the extent to which an activity enhances civic capacity, learning, or employment as a result of people being involved in an activity. [Prior to the meeting, Associate Vice President Furco had submitted a report on the community engagement experiences of undergraduate students at the University of Minnesota, which provides some metrics on the extent to which students are interested in community engagement initiatives and the extent to which they participate.]

Dr. Furco said that the University's road map to advancing the public engagement agenda is the ten-point plan to "advance and institutionalize public engagement," developed in 2008:

- 1. Scholarly Value of Engagement:** Develop, support, and implement strategic initiatives that raise the status and legitimacy of engaged scholarship in ways that promote the advancement of the University of Minnesota as a top research university.
- 2. Accounting and Assessment:** Establish a set of systems for accounting and assessing the broad range of engagement activities, programs, and initiatives across the university.
- 3. Student Scholars and Leaders:** Support the cultivation of emerging, engaged scholars who will serve as civically engaged leaders, researchers, citizens, and employees.

- 4. Community Connections:** Strengthen the University's reputation as a visible, reliable, and present body in addressing the most pressing immediate and longer-term public needs.
- 5. Cultivating and Supporting Campus Leaders:** Support University personnel, programs, and centers in the development of their expertise and prominence as national and international leaders in the engagement field.
- 6. Marketing and Visibility:** Share the University's engagement work far and wide through national and international engagement networks as a means to build the University of Minnesota's status as one of the world's leading engaged research universities.
- 7. Program Alignment:** Support, implement, and evaluate innovative approaches that employ public engagement activities as an effective strategy for advancing the University's key institutional priorities.
- 8. Internal Networking:** Provide and support opportunities that bring together individual, departments, centers, units, etc. from across the University to share their work and expertise, cultivate new collaborations (e.g., new interdisciplinary initiatives, etc.) and build alliances that enhance each participants' capacity to advance his/her work.
- 9. National and International Networking:** Strengthen the University's participation as a key player in the leading national and international engagement networks.
- 10. Leverage Extramural Funds:** Garner extramural funds that support new engagement initiatives and programs, the institutionalization of existing engagement initiatives, and the building of a strategic vision for the University of Minnesota's development as an engaged university.

It contains metrics and funding and is about aligning programs (e.g., if there is more than one working in the same community) and the University's strategic priorities (e.g., aligning public engagement with international programs, urban agenda, K-12 agenda, equity and diversity agenda, etc.).

A number of thorny issues arise every year and there is no mechanism to address them, Dr. Furco said. He described the establishment of the newly formed Public Engagement Council (2012), which is charged with addressing a number of these issues. The Council is a new University-wide body (not related to the 2002 COPE, which ended in 2008) which establishes guidelines and strategies for addressing critical, overarching issues in public engagement programming and practice (both academic and non-academic). Associate Vice President Furco pointed to the description of the Council on the handout and described that the Council provides guidance to the Office for Public Engagement on how to best address the various issues, which include the following:

### **1: Liability Policies**

*Issue: Further clarity of liability policies for students and faculty participating in community engagement activities.*

### **2: Community Engagement in Faith-Based Organizations:**

*Issue: Allowable faith-based activities in community-engagement work.*

### **3: Academic Credit and Community-Based Experiences**

*Issue: Equivalency of classroom-based instruction and community-based experiences and the need for consistency*

**4: Faculty Issues Regarding Community-Engaged Work**

*Issue: Criteria for reviewing, reporting and reviewing community-engaged scholarship*

**5: Indirect Cost Recovery**

*Issues: Low or no indirect cost Recovery grants and contracts and issues of academic freedom*

**6: Protection of Human Subjects and Community-Engaged Research**

*Issues: Constraints to community-engaged research protocols and participation due to human subjects reviews*

**7: Background Checks for Community-Based Activities**

*Issues: Cost and privacy issues regarding required background checks*

**8: Public Engagement Awards**

*Issues: Procedures for processing public engagement-related awards*

**9: Intellectual Property Issues in Community-Partnered Work**

*Issue: Ownership of intellectual property when that property is co-produced by the University and the community*

**10: Martin Luther King Day of Service**

*Issue: Proposal from the Equity and Diversity Senate Committee to make Dr. King Day a “day on” rather than a “day off”.*

**11: Graduate Student Community Engagement**

*Issue: Opportunities and support systems for graduate students interested in community-engaged research and teaching.*

Discussion turned next to Minnesota Extension. Dean Durgan distributed a handout that outlined the activities and reach of Extension and began by saying that Extension was established in 1909 by the state legislature; the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 created the federal extension system that included the land-grant universities. The general charge, at the state and federal level, is to use University research to solve the problems that citizens face. Extension has about 800 employees and a budget of about \$70 million; the majority of the employees are outside the Twin Cities in 15 regional offices; they also have local offices in every county that are supported by county partners (the county government) that decide what kinds of programs are needed in that county.

Her concern, when she became dean, was the decline in public funding from both state and federal sources, Dean Durgan related, so she began focusing on grants and gifts. Now about 30% of Extension funding comes from grants, gifts, and contracts, and they have also begun to impose fees where they can.

In the communities across the state, they say that they are the "front door" of the University. They have an Extension Advisory Committee in every county, which they do, so about 1000 citizens

provide advice at the local and regional levels. There is also a Citizens Advisory Council at the state level that she works with, Dean Durgan said, so they receive a great deal of advice. They try to look at local needs but they cannot do everything that is asked of them; they try to connect the citizens of the State with the University.

The Extension youth programs include 4H and after-school programs and have 140,000 participants—Extension is the largest youth-serving organization in the State, Dean Durgan said. With respect to metrics, a study conducted by Tufts University of the impact of 4H (for those 9-18 years of age) found that girls who participate are twice as likely to go to college and much more likely to go into STEM disciplines. In addition, 6400 youth in 4H go to the State Fair every year.

Many Extension programs are conducted because of the work of volunteers, Dean Durgan said, and there are about 45,000 of them (and on all of whom they must conduct background checks because they are working with children). It takes a great deal of time to train and manage volunteers so that both they and the program participants have a good experience.

Professor Cramer asked about the demarcation between the Office of Public Engagement and Extension. Is there a bright line or is it fuzzy, he asked? Extension is public engagement, Dean Durgan responded; that is what they do. It is non-credit education, it is a planned program to address, measure, and assess outcomes through long-term engagement that includes faculty. Extension is part of the public-engagement mission but is much more "delivered" than other programs might be. Dr. Furco said it is the job of his office to see that the internal infrastructure and University policies are in place so that the many units, like Extension, UROC, and other units involved in public engagement can do their work.

Dr. Barajas next explained the work of the Urban Research and Outreach Center (UROC) in North Minneapolis. They are a little different because they are place-based at Penn and Plymouth Avenues. North Minneapolis communities were initially skeptical about the establishment of the UROC because of uneasy relationships with University researchers in the past, but now appear to be happy with the work of the UROC.

UROC is new and typifies what it means for the University to engage with the local community, and so it can be distinguished from the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, for example, Dr. Barajas explained. UROC is aligned with the University's ten-point plan that Dr. Furco described; those who work at UROC see themselves as working with faculty to support the development of engaged scholarship as well as train the next generation of graduate students who will become engaged scholars. They try to leverage long-term partnerships in the University but also work with faculty and graduate students to create new understandings of how engagement can be defined and enacted. Dr. Barajas mentioned a smoking study that Center for Health Equity (CHE) and it illustrates how they facilitate discovery, how they get research information to people, and how they work with (as opposed to "in") communities.

Dr. Barajas said they are also responsible for being a neighbor, which includes bringing in the community and identifying questions to be addressed. UROC works in three areas: Health and well-being, education, and economic and community development. The building itself receives considerable use; about 25,000 people per year go through it in some way and hundreds of organizations also use it. They have a remarkable ability to work with the community because they are there, she said. The faculty

are beginning to recognize and to understand that if they invest in engaged methods they obtain richer results in research outcomes.

Dr. Barajas mentioned some of the programs with which UROC is involved, said that part of what they do involves outreach and the Extension is a key to much of their work, and observed that what is done at UROC is both outreach and research mingled together.

Mr. Pekel from the College Readiness Consortium came next; he explained that he is a former K-12 teacher and administrator. The Consortium's mission is increasing the number and diversity of Minnesota students who graduate from high school with the knowledge, skills and habits needed for success in post-secondary education. Mr. Pekel explained that as entrance to the University becomes increasingly competitive, the Consortium is working to ensure that Minnesota students can meet the standards for admission and success at our institution and others across the state. Absent a strategy for enhancing the college readiness of Minnesota's K-12 students, Mr. Pekel explained, it might seem to many Minnesotans that as the University becomes a more selective institution, it is pulling up the ladder to higher education behind it. While the Consortium works to enhance the college readiness of all Minnesota students, it's most urgent work is focused on students of color and low-income students. Both of those groups are under represented in higher education today but are also the fastest growing groups in Minnesota's K-12 schools.

Mr. Pekel said that the Consortium has not focused on what might be called pipeline programs, through which a college or university partners with a high school with the intention and expectation that students from that high school will eventually enroll at the postsecondary institution. Rather, he said the Consortium seeks to strengthen readiness for all types of postsecondary education, including for community and technical colleges. To not have a such broader aim would squander the University's unique opportunity to have a positive impact on college readiness across the entire state. For example, when the University sets admissions requirements, that action affects course-taking behavior in all Minnesota high schools (e.g., requiring four years of math for entrance to the University).

Mr. Pekel also explained that the Consortium conceptualizes college readiness broadly, not just for four-year institutions. They have learned, for example, that the levels of knowledge and skill that students must possess in reading and math are similar at many two and four-year institutions. He cited research by ACT that supports that assertion, and also shared that when faculty at a Twin Cities community and technical college analyzed the manual used in their automotive classes, they found it required students to read at the college level.

The Consortium has four staff (3 professional and 1 administrative assistant) and has obtained over \$3.5 million in grants and contracts to support its work over the last six years. Mr. Pekel explained that the Consortium works to fulfill its mission by working at four levels: (1) at the state policy level, most recently on academic standards and creating a longitudinal data system to track students from K-12 to post-secondary education to employment (and doing so requires statutory changes); (2) with the Minnesota Principals Academy, which is an executive development program designed to help school principals lead schools in which all students graduate ready for college and through which about 250 leaders have gone over the past five years; (3) in middle and high schools through a program called Ramp-Up to Readiness; (4) through building partnerships between University departments and organizations and K-12 schools and systems. He mentioned a summer camp for high school students that the Law School conducted several years ago and a new partnership between the College of Education and

Human Development (CEHD) and the Minnesota Children's Museum as examples. He stressed that while CEHD has a central role to play in the University's partnerships with K-12 education, because college readiness is important for all disciplines, it is an area in which all colleges and campuses of the University can and should be engaged.

Professor May said that all of the units represented today are doing fabulous work that is great for the University and the State. As a faculty member in the liberal arts, she said she knows that many CLA departments and faculty members are involved in projects in the units represented at this meeting, but the way things are structured at the University, most of that activity is under the radar. That has changed since she came to the University in 1978, when there was Continuing Education for Women, for example, and many faculty members were involved in teaching those courses. Then units were rearranged so that now there is Extension, CCE, and so on. Although CLA faculty and units continue to be involved, their contributions seem to be largely invisible in the publicity surrounding these projects (and she is not criticizing them, Professor May emphasized). The question is how the liberal arts can be visible outside the University. The language of some of the programs being discussed today talks about extending scientific knowledge—but the questions posed are not just about science-based research but are about what liberal-arts faculty members do, in terms of disseminating knowledge, informing citizens, working with non-University institutions, etc. It appears from these publicity materials that the sciences are making connections, which subtly implies that the liberal arts are not and that the liberal arts are just a part of the Ivory Tower involved in navel-gazing. But there have been many CLA faculty involved; how can they improve the visibility of the liberal arts participation in these important efforts? CLA is a big part of outreach, as well as the biggest college in the University, but is not recognized for its part in these important town-gown collaborations.

Professor May also addressed the work of Mr. Pekel's office: It will all go for naught if low-income students cannot afford tuition, which is a political problem. Mr. Pekel said they hear that message loud and clear. Politicians criticize the University for raising tuition and then cut the funding, which forces the University to raise tuition, Professor May observed.

Dean Durgan said the pamphlet she provided copies of is the one they use at the legislature and with the federal government—it is what the audience wants. That is the problem, Professor May exclaimed! It contributes to the misperception that the liberal arts are worthless. Dean Durgan agreed that Extension has many connections with the liberal arts and large programs in the arts in many counties. Professor May agreed but said the liberal arts are still not visible. Dean Durgan said she got the message of Professor May's point.

Professor McCulloch said that her department [Family Social Science] has Extension faculty and do part of what CLA faculty might do. They are VERY clear about what their connections are, including on their website, and are vocal about their connection to Extension and why it is important. There are ways to make the point, she said.

Professor Cramer asked the guests to talk about the extent to which their programs cover all campuses. UROC is local but it would appear that the other programs are not.

Dr. Furco said the public-engagement agenda is system-wide and each campus has a unique approach. The most challenging campus is the Twin Cities because it is the one where it is most difficult to manage data, to avoid duplication, and to get the message out. The other campuses have a more

coordinated effort across the whole campus. The Twin Cities has no central office for public engagement to coordinate and oversee the engagement activities (his office, Dr. Furco pointed out, is a systemwide office).

Professor Chomsky reported that she served on COPE before Dr. Furco was hired and there were many things going on even then, but it was hard to identify all of them or figure out how to connect or publicize them adequately. She said she is impressed by the degree to which activities have come together but said she also imagines that they still struggle both to identify faculty who are already involved in public engagement in order to connect them with the central efforts and to encourage those who are not involved in public engagement work to extend in that direction, as well as to help them figure out how to do that. Associate Vice President Furco shared how the public engagement agenda is about advancing the work across the different levels of the University. There is the "Engaged Department" grant program, Dr. Furco said, that focuses on the departmental level. But there are a number of other groups involved, such as an associate deans group that focuses more on engagement issues at the collegiate level. There are faculty development programs that work more campus-wide, coordinating activities with other key administrative offices such as Vice Provost Carney's office, International Programs, and the Office of Equity and Diversity. There is a junior and senior faculty mentorship program; a campus-wide program focused on building faculty members' capacity for community-based participatory —so there are many different efforts at different levels, Dr. Furco concluded.

Dr. Barajas said that her college (CEHD) has restructured its Faculty Activity Report to use correct language—research, teaching and public engagement—and to provide check boxes for faculty to indicate if they are doing engaged work in any of the three designated areas. UROC works with departments and programs across the University, including the Academic Health Center and the Law school, and is currently working to identify faculty in the Department of Art and with the Urban Studies program who may benefit from partnerships through UROC.

One barrier, Dean Durgan said, is the funding to support programs. It costs money to work in the community; they set aside federal dollars and work with the colleges to connect faculty members who do not have Extension appointments with Extension faculty, they also write grants and leverage funds to build a long-term group of faculty who want to work in the community. The work they do is traditionally done by the faculty, Dean Durgan said; they can put money into summer salaries, graduate students, and so on, and they have 15 locations around the state where people can work.

Professor Cramer noted to Mr. Pekel that he imagined that bringing in K-12 teachers to improve their skills was a wonderful investment, because those same teachers then left as ambassadors for the University's programs, both to their colleagues and to their students. Does funding from the University and/or the K-12 districts continue to support such professional development programs, or have the available dedicated resources been shrinking?

Mr. Pekel said he did not know if the total available funding for professional development for K-12 educators had shrunk or decreased in recent years, but because for the past two legislative sessions the state has waived its requirement that school districts spend 2% of their general education revenue on professional development, he guessed it has decreased. Mr. Pekel told the Committee that a growing number of studies have concluded that the biggest factor within schools affecting student achievement is the quality of the teaching a student receives, and that the second biggest in-school factor is the quality of school leadership. As a result, he suggested that professional development of educators is a very high-

impact way for the University to strengthen student outcomes in K-12 schools and systems. Mr. Pekel commented that several years ago the College Readiness Consortium worked with staff from across the University to develop ways to increase the number and further enhance the quality of the University's professional development programs. That working group identified a range of practical issues that need to be addressed if the University is to achieve those goals, including issues of cost, granting graduate credit and the time and location at which the professional development programs take place. Mr. Pekel commented that some other institutions of higher education are getting very entrepreneurial in this area, offering professional development programs off of their campuses and on dates and at times that work for practicing educators. Mr. Pekel mentioned that the previous working group also concluded that the University should consider creating a university-wide infrastructure for professional development programs for K-12 educators, such as creating a single Web site through which teachers and other educators could learn about and enroll in any of the University's professional development programs. Mr. Pekel commented that the Science Museum of Minnesota does this very well, which is perhaps why the museum reports that it provides ongoing professional development for more K-12 educators than any other organization in the state. Mr. Pekel observed that if one is a high school teacher working with 180 students at a time, as he used to be, one doesn't have much additional time to investigate and pursue one's own continuing education, even though many teachers would very much like to do so. Mr. Pekel also noted that providing professional development for K-12 educators is often a good strategy for use in meeting the "broader impacts" requirements of research grants funded by NSF and NIH and other agencies. That approach allows the researcher to say that the study will not only benefit the K-12 educators that participate in the professional development activities, but also the students in their classrooms for many years to come. Finally, Mr. Pekel noted that the College Readiness Consortium worked with the Carlson Consulting Enterprise to develop a business model for its Minnesota Principals Academy executive development program, which yielded some important insights that have helped sustain the Academy after the loss of funding from the State of Minnesota.

Professor Cramer thanked Dr. Barajas, Dean Durgan, Dr. Furco, and Mr. Pekel for joining the meeting and said he wished to echo Professor May's compliments about the work they do. They are the people who present the most immediately evident public face of the University.

Professor Cramer adjourned the meeting at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

\* \* \*

### **Recommended Guidelines for Evaluating Competitive Faculty Applications for Sabbatical Supplements and Single Semester Leaves**

January 2012

1. **Review Committee(s).** The evaluation of applications for sabbatical supplements and single semester leaves should in all cases be conducted by a collegiate committee of faculty appointed by the Dean. The committee may be subdivided to do the reviews, if the number of applications warrants that. Each review committee or subcommittee should have a minimum of five members, each of whom

independently reviews and rates all timely applications that have been assigned to that committee or subcommittee. Members should represent diverse disciplines, academic ranks, and academic experiences. An experienced staff member is appointed to staff the committee, circulate materials, and make arrangements to complete steps in accord with a schedule. The chair of the committee or subcommittee is appointed by the Dean.

2. **Conflict of Interest.** A committee member has a conflict of interest if an applicant is from the same department, is a co-researcher with the member, is a mentor or mentee of the member, is a family member, or is one with whom the member has a committed or other strong personal relationship. The committee member should not participate in evaluating or discussing such applications. A committee member who wishes to apply for a sabbatical leave or supplement should not serve on the committee. If an Associate Dean or Dean applies, that person does not participate in the collegiate review and decision-making process.
3. **Selection Criteria.** The collegiate committee will recommend the strongest nominees, whatever the scholarly field and without regard to distribution across disciplines, based on the criteria that have been established and publicized by the college. The following criteria are examples.
  - (1) the quality of the proposal—its importance, focus, and clarity of writing;
  - (2) the proposal design and methodology;
  - (3) the potential for significant contribution to the applicant's field and professional development;
  - (4) the strength of applicant's publication record, taking into account the stage of his/her career, and productive use of past leaves and grants; and
  - (5) the feasibility of the plan for completion.
4. **Rankings.** Each committee member will review and rate each application according to each of the established criteria from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) using a standard rating sheet. The rating sheet is used as an aid to judgment and discussion when the committee members later convene, but the numerical ratings need not correlate with the reviewer's rank ordering. If a reviewer ranks some applications as equal, they should be ranked as the following example illustrates. *If numbers 4, 5, and 6 are judged to be equal, they should all be assigned the same numerical rank (e.g. #5). Leave the #4 and #6 spaces on the list empty.*
5. **Confidentiality.** Membership on the committee is public information; however, all committee discussions and ratings are confidential. Individuals' notes taken during the review process will not be considered public information. The College, however, must be able to provide constructive criticism and comment in response to inquiries from unsuccessful applicants after the final decisions are known. Therefore, reviewers are asked to provide their rating sheets and notes to the Dean's office at the end of the final meeting (which notes are destroyed after a reasonable period of time). Comments are always paraphrased and provided without attribution to individual reviewers.
6. **Application Form.** The form should be reviewed to assure consistency with the guidelines. It may be advisable for the form to prompt applicants to write their proposal in such a way that it is accessible to committee members who are not in their discipline.
7. **Calendar.** Each college should annually establish and publicize a calendar for receiving and reviewing applications. Each calendar should include the following items:

- Date \_\_\_\_\_ The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs informs the collegiate Dean of the number of single semester leaves that can be awarded and the amount of funds for sabbatical supplements that will be provided centrally. The Dean's Office determines whether any funds will be set aside specifically for probationary faculty.
- Date \_\_\_\_\_ Applications due. Staff member checks that each application is complete and prepares them for distribution to committee members.
- Date \_\_\_\_\_ Applications distributed to reviewers. Each reviewer reads all the assigned applications and completes a rating sheet for each candidate. The reviewer then lists the applicants in rank order. (#1 is the highest rank.) The ranked lists are turned in to the Dean's office at least 2 business days prior to a meeting of the whole (sub)committee. Committee members bring copies of their rating sheets to the meeting.
- Date \_\_\_\_\_ The review committee meets and receives a collation (prepared by staff in advance of the meeting) of the individual ranked lists. Following review and resolution of differences in the individual rankings, the committee finalizes one ranked list of applicants to recommend to the Dean's office. Members turn in their individual rating sheets to the chair, to be made available to the Dean if needed until the process is complete.
- Date \_\_\_\_\_ The Chair of the review committee provides a memo to the Associate Deans and the Dean forwarding the final ranked list and explaining the rationale for the recommendations. The Chair turns in all documents to the Dean's office.
- Date \_\_\_\_\_ The Associate Deans, in consultation with the Dean, determine the awardees and announce awards.