

2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 5, 2012

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 4

The fourth meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2011-12 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, April 5, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 22 academic professional members, 17 civil service members, 114 faculty/academic professional members, and 20 student members. Vice Chair Carol Chomsky presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Code of Conduct
Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Amendments to the Policy on Teaching Awards
Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees
Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 1, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents
Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 1, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Readmission and Changes to Master's and Doctoral Degree Objectives
Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 1, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. LIBRARY COMMITTEE Federal Research Public Access Act Information for the University Senate

The Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) of 2012 (S. 2096/H.R. 4004) was introduced to the House and the Senate on February 9, 2012 with robust bipartisan sponsorship. FRPAA would require that any federal agencies with annual extramural research budgets greater than \$100 million provide public access to the published results of funded research within six months

after publication. The University of Minnesota Senate Library Committee members write in support of FRPAA; we believe increasing access to research stimulates progress and innovation within the academic enterprise, in industry, and in broader social contexts.

Research and scholarship thrive in environments of open sharing and collaboration, and peer review and critique. Tightly-restricted access to publications that result from federally sponsored research introduces barriers for researchers, industry innovators, and interested members of the public. When such research publications are openly available:

- Researchers in the United States and around the world are able to more effectively and efficiently learn from, review, and collaborate with one another.
- Published research reaches a wider audience:
 - Authors often find increased citations to their works, as well as interest from unexpected quarters.
 - Research errors or controversies can be more quickly detected and addressed.
 - Industry researchers, entrepreneurs, and innovators are better able to keep abreast of relevant research advances.
 - Funding agencies can read published results, enabling better review of the quality and productivity of funded research.
 - Members of the public have access to cutting-edge information relevant to their lives.
- Intellectual property interests of authors, funders, research institutions, and industry research partners are largely unaffected by open access.
 - Copyrights can still be transferred to publishers, retained by authors, or shared among multiple parties via traditional contracts and licenses.
 - Copyright holders retain most of their rights even over publicly accessible works, although they may choose to make the works more broadly usable under the terms of existing open licensing schemes.
 - Entrepreneurs may be more able to learn of innovative research, but existing requirements for licensing of patents and other intellectual property rights will not change.

A recent competing bill, the Research Works Act (RWA), would have rolled back the existing successful NIH public access programs, as well as preventing the passage of FRPAA. In removing their support for RWA, its sponsors acknowledged that open access “appears to be the wave of the future.” FRPAA provides a clear path towards that future of open access for federally sponsored research. While opinions vary on the optimal embargo period across all types of publications and publishers, the current NIH policy that provides public access to the published results of funded research within 12 months after publication appears to be working well. That said, a shorter embargo term could provide enhanced public access, and for many publications and publishers, will have little impact on finances.

We urge your support for FRPAA to facilitate the advancement of research and public access to the results of federally supported research.

Approved by the Library Committee, March 2012.

**NEIL OLSZEWSKI, CHAIR
LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

STUDENTS

Scott L. Anderson

University of Minnesota Crookston

Nathan Helmer
College of Science and Engineering

Nicholas J. Moore
College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences

4. INTRODUCTIONS

Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson

Senior Vice President and Provost was introduced to the Senate.

5. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that SCC has met once since the last Senate meeting. It discussed how best to express the sense of the University community with respect to the proposed Minnesota constitutional marriage amendment as the Student Senate already took action in March.

SCC requested that the Equity, Access, and Diversity and Social Concerns Committees draft language for presentation to the University Senate. This resolution will be an action item at the May meeting.

SCC also heard and approved a report from the Senate Budget Subcommittee on Senate Office finances, including a recommendation to encourage, as much as possible, networking technologies and University vehicles to reduce the high costs associated with inter-campus travel to Senate committee meetings.

6. MINUTES FOR MARCH 1, 2012

Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate and Faculty Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/120301.pdf>

STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

7. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Kaler spoke on a few subjects. First is the idea of a full summer term, the plan for which he is calling the three-period plan. He has several goals for considering this proposal. One is facilitating student access and success. By simply having more classes available, there is increased flexibility and the opportunity for students to get back on track sooner. It also allows other periods of the year to be used for out-of-classroom learning. A motivated student would also be able to graduate in three years. This proposal also offers more flexibility for faculty as nine-month faculty will still only be expected to reach two periods per year. If faculty members wanted to put non-teaching terms together, they would have eight months to do research without having to take a semester leave. Facilities will also be better utilized and a third period would permit a modest increase in the size of the student body. He said that this is a Twin Cities initiative, which could also be explored at any of the other campuses. This is a complex proposal to undertake and will require considerable planning and consultation. He noted that this is just the beginning of the process.

He then noted that the graduate assistants had a vote last month regarding unionization and that they voted against a union. He hopes that everyone can agree that this prompted a robust and civil conversation about the pros and cons of a union, and that the vote was a fair and transparent exercise in democracy. During the organization activity, it was not possible for him and others to engage in as much conversations with graduate students at the beginning of his term as he would have preferred. He is committed to providing the best possible experience and is looking forward to addressing the root causes that affect the quality of working life and educational experiences of graduate students. This conversation needs to engage department chairs, program directors, and deans, as they are the people whose decisions directly affect graduate students.

President Kaler said that the *Star Tribune* has had several articles critical of the University in the past few weeks. These stories concern him and he is engaged with the Regents on ensuring that policies are strictly followed when campus leaders step down and return to the faculty. A more robust set of administrative guidelines will be developed on what can and cannot be done.

The University recently has the opportunity to reaffirm its commitment to academic freedom. Professor Leigh Turner had engaged in interactions with Celltex which generated publicity. This forced the University to formally respond and defend the academic freedom of the faculty who express opinions.

For the Academic Health Center (AHC) review he has engaged three colleagues. However, the scheduling is so complex that their visit will not occur until this summer. The audience for this review is him as well as the AHC as a whole. He wants an outside view of the role of the AHC, how it compares nationally, and its organization.

President Kaler then announced that there is a new Regent, Tom Devine, who has a long history of engagement with the University. He is delighted to welcome him as a new member of the Board of Regents.

Finally, he has been spending considerable time at the legislature. Support the U Day was last week with faculty, staff, and students participating from each of the campuses. 600 messages were also sent advocating for the University. Currently, the Minnesota Senate bonding bill has MnSCU receiving substantially more than the University, which is not an equitable situation. The University is working to change these numbers before the end of the session. He continues to encourage everyone to reach out to their representatives to garner support for the University.

8. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Under the three-period proposal, would students be required to attend year-round?

A: No. Students would not be required to attend year-round but would be an option for those students who are interested. Part of the process is to determine student interest and how work can be spread throughout the year. The idea is also to spread internships and fellowships across an entire year.

Q: 10 years ago a task force developed recommendations on a trimester operation. One of the challenges at that time in understanding the feasibility was that there were not clear criteria in moving to this proposal. Have a set of criteria been developed, or are they being worked on, to guide this proposal?

A: The first two elements are a discussion with the faculty regarding curricular considerations, being moved forward by the Provost, and a financial analysis of the costs and expected student enrollment. These two items will be completed before more work is put into the proposal. This is meant to be an evolution, not a revolution, so that a traditional path will still be an option. He proposes starting in incremental ways, and if the proposal is not feasible, it will be scaled back and readjusted.

Q: To cover basic courses in a department, the size of the faculty would need to increase to avoid instructors doing all the teaching in one period. Is this increase anticipated?

A: There is agreement that some increase will be needed in certain areas. The focus on quality will be a key to any plan.

Q: How will sequence courses be handled under a three-period plan?

A: Sequence courses will be harder to fit but it can be done. A process will need to be developed.

9. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

10. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

12. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Interpretation of the Administrative Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree Information for the Faculty Senate

To align policy language with the current practice, the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) has approved revising the language in section 7 of the Administrative Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree as follows (new text is underlined):

[Twin Cities and Rochester only] D grades not permitted in major or minor courses. Required courses for the major or minor in which a student receives a D grade (with or without plus or minus) do not count toward the major or minor (including transfer courses). All other courses, including courses in the major or minor field that are not required to complete the major or minor, will count toward a degree if the student earns a D or better.

COMMENT:

SCEP approved the following interpretation of the policy to clarify that (1) on the Twin Cities campus, no grades of D are accepted for minor requirements, and (2) on the Rochester campus, no grades of D are accepted in major or minor requirements.

Currently the Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements provides that no D grades may count toward a student's major program. In practice, colleges do not allow D grades to count toward minor programs, either, but this is not explicitly provided for in the policy.

Note: Morris and Crookston currently allow varying amounts of Ds for courses in the major. Rochester does not, and Rochester has asked to be included in the language above to reflect current practice.

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

13. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that FCC has met three times since the last Senate meeting. The committee met with Provost Hanson to discuss the development of concrete procedures to review and rectify cases of salary inequities that can be attributed to gender discrimination, whether intentional or not. The development of remediation strategies follows receipt of the final report of the Gender Equity in Salaries consultant. FCC also discussed with the Provost possible modification to the University-wide teaching awards, including last year's Senate-approved amendment to expand the pool to include eligible academic professionals.

FCC agrees with the President's proposal to discuss a three period calendar and believes that both governance and the administration should begin giving careful thought to how such a calendar could be put to optimal use.

The committee received a report from Professor Tim Johnson, Chair of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA), presenting recommendations for policy and procedure changes that were then approved by the FCC. In general, FCC is pleased with the careful oversight exercised by FAOCIA and its commitment to academic and eligibility standards often set at a higher level than the minimum requirements established by the Big 10 or the NCAA.

FCC also met with Associate Vice President Pamela Webb to discuss a plan to move the University from a three effort certification cycle annually. FCC very much welcomes this initiative as it will substantially reduce faculty and staff time spent on these efforts, and also permit B-term faculty to average summer and academic year effort over a six-month window.

Lastly, FCC had an engaging discussion with Associate Vice President Andy Furco, Dean Beverly Durgan, Associate Dean Heidi Barajas, and Kent Pekel about the activities of their

various organizations that focus on public engagement. FCC continues to be keenly interested in better promoting the outreach and public engagement activities of faculty and staff as a means to better enhance the awareness of Minnesota citizens of the impact that the University has all across the state. FCC is planning to engage various governance committees to offer advice and policies suggestions, where appropriate, regarding challenges that can arise when University activities are interfaced with surrounding communities.

14. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE

Professor Elizabeth Boyle, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons along with Professor Caroline Hayes, stated that it has been a busy month at the capital due to a few issues. The first is the omnibus capital education bill which encourages faculty who use textbooks to note in the syllabi whether a previous edition is acceptable for use and then to delineate the differences. This language is to allow students to save money by not buying new editions. This bill is not a mandate, but is encouragement. While they suggested to legislators that this was not the best practice to state in legislation, this is going forward.

President Kaler has also spoken regarding the bonding bill, which is still in process. There will be a further update in May.

She mentioned that Professor Chris Cramer had an editorial in the Star Tribune earlier this week regarding funding for the University. She encouraged everyone to read the article as it lays out the financial pressure being dealt with at the University.

She had the good fortune last year to hear Tom Devine interview with the selection committee, and he has recently been named as the new Regent. He is committed to undergraduate education and is interested in housing and extracurricular life for students. He believes that being involved in the community is a good way to ensure that students complete their degrees in a timely manner and successfully.

Lastly, she and Professor Hayes continue to work on long-term relationships with people at the capital, helping with Support the U Day, participating in a Twin Cities campus building tour, and reaching out to alumni to harness their support.

President Kaler stated how much he appreciates the efforts of both faculty legislative liaisons in St. Paul and how effective there are.

15. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Approval of Faculty Senate Officers Action by the Faculty Senate

The chair of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee recommend the following officers for 2012-13:

Clerk – Professor Stuart Goldstein
Parliamentarian – Professor Allan Erben
Faculty Senate Vice Chair – Professor Russell Luepker

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**16. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Amendments to the Administrative Policy on Declaring an Undergraduate Major
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Administrative Policy on Declaring an Undergraduate Major: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester as indicated. Language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~:

**Declaring and Pursuing an Undergraduate Major:
Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester**

POLICY STATEMENT

All degree-seeking undergraduate students are required to declare a major or be admitted into a program before or upon the completion of 60 semester credits. Once a student has completed 60 credits, or earlier if programmatically warranted, an “adviser hold” will be placed on the student’s record, preventing the student from registering for additional classes until the student has declared a major or been admitted to a program.

1. Colleges determine ~~how~~ the process by which students declare a major or gain admission to a degree program.
2. Departments set the academic standards for being allowed to enter ~~declaring~~ a major in the field.
3. Department standards are subject to college review and approval. Department, college and campus standards for declaring a major are subject to review and approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate.
4. ~~All freshmen admitting colleges will have available a student status of “undeclared.”~~

Exclusions

This policy is not applicable to the Duluth campus.

REASON FOR POLICY

Undergraduate degree-seeking students are admitted to the University to pursue an undergraduate degree. The University expects students to complete their degrees in a timely manner, and declaring a major is a fundamental part of this progression. This policy exists to promote timely intervention by advisers that will guide students toward majors that suit their talents and interests. To make the best use of students’ resources, as well as University resources, students are not allowed to continue registering for courses indefinitely without having a formal plan for completing a degree.

RELATED INFORMATION

~~There is no related information for this policy. Promoting Timely Graduation by Undergraduates: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester, <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/TIMELYGRADUATION.html> Holds on Records and Registration: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester, <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/REGISTRATIONHOLD.html>~~

COMMENT:

Background: Currently if an undergraduate student has not declared a major or been admitted to a program by the time he or she has completed 60 credits, colleges will place a hold on the student's record that stops the student from being able to register for courses. For some colleges, the 60-credit mark is too late in the student's career; many of our undergraduate students reach the 60+ mark after spring semester of their sophomore year. Colleges have requested the flexibility to apply the "major declaration hold" to student records earlier in the credit total, when programmatically warranted. This would force students who may be off track (either through course choices or GPA) for their desired major to meet with an adviser to discuss alternative plans.

Proposed Changes:

1. Amend the current policy to allow colleges to apply this hold to student records before the 60-credit mark, when programmatically warranted.
2. Clarify that this policy applies to all degree-seeking students.
3. Reinforce the expectation of timely graduation.

Approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy 2/29/12

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**17. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Amendments to the Administrative Policies on High School
Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates and Admissions for Undergraduates
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the language associated with the Administrative Policies on High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates and Admissions for Undergraduates as indicated in the following.

Recommendation from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education:
High School Preparation Requirements Viewed as a "Graduation Requirement"

Current policies and practice on the Twin Cities campus:

If undergraduate students (both new freshmen and new transfer students) are admitted without having completed the stated high school preparation requirements for the campus, they are

required to make up the missing requirements during their undergraduate career prior to being cleared for graduation.

The Administrative Policy on High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates, <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/HIGHSCHOOLPREP.html>, states the current HS requirements for students seeking admission to the Twin Cities campus. The FAQs following the policy note the current practices regarding if students may be admitted with a missing requirement and how missing requirements are tracked and made up.

The Administrative Policy on Admissions for Undergraduates, <http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/ADMISSIONS.html>, mentions conditional admission and uses missing high school preparation requirements as a possible example of “conditional admission to graduate.” This policy notes in #2 that “Each college will set the criteria and standards that are to be used by the Admissions Office in admitting both New High School and New Advanced Standing students to the college.” These standards are in addition to the HS preps (e.g., CSE requires specific levels of calculus, physics, and chemistry).

Proposed change to policy language and practice:

If a student has been admitted with a missing HS prep, do not require the student to satisfy it as a requirement for graduation. HS preps will continue to be tracked and noted on a student’s record by Admissions. The “missing HS preps” service indicators will still be visible to advisers, to help inform the advising considerations for each student.

In High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates, make two changes: First, delete the FAQ regarding making up the missing HS requirements. Second, in the Responsibilities section, for the Academic Adviser, remove the requirement of checking on the HS requirements as part of graduation clearance. Academic Adviser responsibilities would read “Advise students on the coursework needed to satisfy their campus, college, and degree requirements, taking into account the student’s prior coursework and background, including high school and any courses at the college level.”

In Admissions for Undergraduates, delete the sentence referring to missing high school preparation requirements as an example of conditional admission to graduate: (e.g., that any deficiencies in satisfying high school preparation requirements are made up).

Background and Reasons for Change:

Fundamentally, we admit students because we believe they can be successful, based on a holistic review of their application materials, and using the standards developed by the University and the colleges. The high school prep requirements were developed for each campus to assure a minimum level of preparedness and a breadth of knowledge, and most NHS students admitted will have met all of them. However, we regularly admit some students who do not meet all of the high school preparation expectations, often because their high school did not offer courses that met all of the exact requirements, or due to other special circumstances.

For fall semester 2011 and spring semester 2012, 93.1% of the new freshmen students and 85.4% of the new transfer students had met all of the HS preps. Only 371 of 5,375 new freshmen and 418 of 2,862 new transfer students had not; the vast majority of the missing requirements were either the visual/performing arts or the two years of a single second language.

The University of Minnesota Liberal Education and Writing Intensive requirements ensure that students have been exposed to and developed skills and knowledge in a breadth of areas by the

time they graduate, along with demonstrating through major coursework and grades that they have mastered the body of knowledge related to their major(s).

In the case of transfer students, their holistic review also includes their college coursework at other institutions. A logistical problem is created for advisers and students because the high school transcripts for transfer students are often transmitted to the Office of Admissions well after the admissions decision is made and even after orientation and registration have occurred; this delay means that our transfer students may not be aware that they could face additional requirements based on missing HS preps.

COMMENT:

Approved unanimously (with one abstention) by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy
3/21/12

Approved unanimously by the Faculty Consultative Committee
3/22/12

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**18. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Master's Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following new policy:

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

Master's Degree: Performance Standards and Progress

Policy Contents

- **Policy Statement**
- **Reason for Policy**
- **Procedures**
- **Forms/Instructions**
- **Additional Contacts**
- **Definitions**
- **Responsibilities**
- **Appendices**
- **FAQ**
- **Related Information**
- **History**

Effective Date: Month, YYYY

Last Updated: Month, YYYY

Responsible University Officer:

Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost

Policy Owner: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

Policy Contact: Belinda Cheung

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for knowing all program requirements of their master's program when they matriculate. If program requirements change, students may elect to continue under the requirements in effect when they matriculated, provided they have remained in good standing.

The advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) for the program are jointly responsible for helping the student plan appropriately to complete the requirements in a timely fashion. The DGS is also responsible for ensuring that the student receives training appropriate to the discipline in the responsible conduct of research and ethical teaching and scholarship.

Programs and collegiate units may have additional and/or more stringent requirements.

I. Pre-Matriculation Requirements for Programs

Programs must, before students begin their first term of study:

- Provide each student a current graduate program handbook, specifying the program's requirements and policies governing successful degree completion
- Assign each student a temporary advisor

II. Progress Review

a) **Annual Review** Programs must review the progress of each master's student annually. Students deemed not to be in good standing must be informed of the results of the review in writing, with a copy to the student's advisor.

b) **Degree Plan** Master's degree students must have a degree plan on file in the collegiate unit at least one term (fall or spring semester) before the intended term of graduation. For students intending to pursue a minor:

i) In master's programs that include a final examination/defense, students must declare the minor prior to the examination/defense.

ii) In master's programs that do not include a final examination/defense, students must declare the minor prior to filing for graduation.

III. Performance Standards

a) **Continuous Enrollment** Students are required to enroll every semester (fall and spring) from the time of matriculation until degree completion.

b) **Time Limit for Earning the Master's Degree** All requirements for the master's degree must be completed and the degree awarded within five calendar years after initial enrollment in the graduate program or within a more restrictive time frame specified by the program.

Students who are unable to complete the degree within the most restrictive time limits described above due to extraordinary circumstances may petition the program and collegiate unit for an extension of up to 12 months. Students must obtain approval of their advisor/s and program DGS and submit the petition by the deadline set by the college.

- If a petition is approved, the student is notified in writing of the expectations for progress and completion of the degree.

- If the petition is denied, the student is notified in writing that he or she will be terminated from the graduate program upon expiration of the most restrictive time limit.

Students who have been terminated under such circumstances may apply for readmission to the program; however, readmission is not guaranteed.

c) **Minimum Grade Requirements** To remain in good academic standing students should meet the minimum GPA requirement specified by the graduate program or 2.800 (on a 4.000

scale), whichever is higher. Students who have filed a master's degree plan should maintain a 2.800 GPA for courses included on the degree plan. Students who have not yet filed a degree plan must maintain an overall GPA of 2.800. Graduate programs may require a higher GPA for individual major fields and may apply the requirement to the overall GPA instead of only to degree plan coursework. Students who fall below the program's minimum GPA requirement may be terminated from the program.

Note: Students must have a 2.800 GPA for courses included on the degree plan at the time of graduation for the degree to be awarded.

d) **S/N grades for courses** A minimum of 2/3 of the course credits included on a degree plan must be taken A/F.

Exception

Programs with a distinctive student population or approved joint-degree programs may request a program-wide exception to the five-year time limit for earning the master's degree.

REASON FOR POLICY

Assists student and advisor in planning for timely completion of program requirements; provides timely evaluations to students as they proceed through program; alerts student and advisors to problems, and provides opportunity to develop best approach for addressing those problems; creates clear record in cases where program decides to terminate student.

PROCEDURES

There are no procedures associated with this policy.

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

Master's degree plan

Master's Degree: Request for Extension to the Maximum Time Limit

Master's Degree: Program-Wide Exception to the Maximum Time Limit

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Belinda Cheung	612-625-6977	cheun002@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

Good standing/good academic standing

Students remain in good standing if they: (a) make timely progress towards degree completion as required by the program and by this policy; (b) maintain a GPA at or above the minimum set by the program and by this policy; and (c) pass all appropriate examinations within the time frame specified by the program.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Collegiate Units

- Set college deadline for students who are requesting an extension to the time limit for completing master's degrees.

Departments/Programs

- Clearly state the program requirements for maintaining good standing in the Graduate Program Handbook, even if they are identical to the requirements in this policy

Students

- Must obtain the approvals required on the degree plan before it is filed with the collegiate unit
- Must obtain the approval of their advisor/s and program DGS and submit their request for an extension of the maximum time limit for earning the master's degree by the deadline set by the college

APPENDICES

Graduate Program Student Handbook: Guidelines

Annual Graduate Student Reviews: Issues to Consider

FAQ

1. The policy states that students must file a degree plan with their collegiate unit. What is the difference between the degree plan and the official degree program form?

The degree plan replaces what was previously referred to as the official degree program form.

2. When should students file the master's degree plan?

A degree plan must be on file in the collegiate unit at least one term (fall or spring semester) before the intended term of graduation; however students may file the degree plan at any time.

3. How many S/N courses can I include on my degree plan?

A maximum of 1/3 of the courses on the degree plan may be S/N.

4. Some of the courses required for my degree program are only offered S/N. Will these count toward the S/N limit on the degree plan?

No. Courses offered only S/N (that is, without the option of A/F grades) will not be counted as part of the student's permissible number of S/N registrations.

5. I was given "S" grades for course credits transferred from an international institution where an equivalent A/F grade could not be determined. Do these credits count toward the S/N limit?

No, the transferred credits will be treated similar to credits for University courses only offered S/N, and will not be counted toward the S/N limit on the degree plan.

6. Does applying graduate course credits earned at another accredited institution to the master's degree plan affect how time to degree is calculated?

No. The time spent earning graduate course credits at other institutions is not included in the time to degree calculation even if those credits are applied to the degree plan.

7. If a student is terminated from a program for exceeding the time limit on earning the degree, can the student apply for readmission to the program?

Yes. However, readmission is not guaranteed and the faculty in the major field may set any readmission conditions on the student's resumption of work toward the degree, such as registering for additional coursework, completing the degree within a specified time period, or other appropriate terms.

Because the student was terminated for exceeding the time limit, the student must also request and be approved for an extension to the time limit in order to be readmitted.

8. I have been admitted to take graduate courses as a Graduate Professional Development (GPD) student. Do I have to register every term?

Yes, students admitted for Graduate Professional Development status must adhere to the same registration requirements as other admitted students and must register in the fall and spring semesters. Registration during the summer is not required.

9. My graduate program has admitted a student for Graduate Professional Development. How long may the GPD student remain in the program?

If the student is a domestic student, the graduate program determines how long the student may continue to take courses as a GPD student. Ideally, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student should be clearly stated in the letter of admission.

If the student is an international student, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student is in part determined by federal visa regulations and SEVIS requirements. International students admitted to GPD are given an I-20 for one year and must be admitted to a degree program if they wish to continue their advanced education at the University after the one-year period.

10. A student admitted for Graduate Professional Development in my program is performing poorly and the program would like to terminate the student at the end of the semester. Can the program do this?

Yes, the program can terminate the student if clear expectations were set at the time of admission and the consequences of the student's failure to meet them were also clearly stated. If this information was not included in the letter of admission, the program should communicate performance expectations to the student in writing, along with the consequences for failure to meet them, before making a decision to terminate the student.

RELATED INFORMATION

Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students

COMMENT:

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that this policy is new. It aligns the University with its peers and provides two types of exemptions for longer degree completion time. On the master's level, there is no limit on the number of individual exemptions that can be granted, if a leave of absence is not applicable. These exemptions are granted by the department. On the doctoral level, individual exemptions can be granted to expand the limit to 10 or 12 years. A program can also look at their population of students and can request an exemption for all students in their program.

A senator reiterated his objection to a 'one size fits all' model for graduate education as five years of continuous enrollment does not work for everyone and turns away part-time students who have other obligations that prevent completing a degree in this manner. He believes that steady progress towards a degree, even if slow, should be acceptable.

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), called attention to the exemption clause included in the program. For students in most programs, it is valuable to provide an expectation of when the student will finish their degree.

Q: Can a student be accepted into the University without graduating high school?

A: Yes. This decision can be made by the college and department.

Q: What are the changes in this policy compared to current policy?

A: This policy, along with the other graduate education policies, are consistent with current practices that were incorporated either in the Graduate School catalog or constitution.

Q: Have graduate students been consulted on this policy?

A: There was a graduate student on the Graduate Education Committee. All policies were consulted with the Council of Graduate Students, the Registrar's Advisory Committee, collegiate representatives, and the Graduate Education Council.

A senator spoke in favor of this policy. There was a robust discussion at FCC a few hours ago regarding the responsibility and accountability of the faculty and department regarding helping students progress towards a degree in a timely manner. When the question is raised, she believes that students pay more attention to the timeline and their own progress. This policy serves the best interest of graduate students.

Professor Krevans stated that students are governed by the policies in effect when they enrolled unless they choose otherwise, so these new policies would only be applicable to new graduate students.

Q: Where are exemptions explained in the policy?

A: They are under 'Related Information' due to the formatting restrictions for University policies when they have related policies.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**19. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Master's Degree: Completion
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following new policy:

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

Master's Degree: Completion

Policy Contents <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy Statement• Reason for Policy• Procedures• Forms/Instructions• Additional Contacts• Definitions• Responsibilities• Appendices• FAQ• Related Information• History	Effective Date: Month, YYYY Last Updated: Month, YYYY Responsible University Officer: Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost Policy Owner: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Policy Contact: Belinda Cheung
--	--

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for meeting all requirements for completing the master's degree, including thesis or project defense and submission, where applicable.

I. Final Examination Committee: Plan A and B Master's Degrees

- a) The final examination committee must consist of at least three members, including the advisor/s. All members of the committee and the student must participate in the final examination. Committee members and/or the student may participate remotely as long as all conditions for remote participation in examination are met.
 - i) At least one member must represent a field outside the student's major field, preferably from a different budgetary unit than that housing the student's major field program.
 - ii) If the student has a declared minor(s), the outside member(s) must be from the minor field(s).
 - iii) Members cannot represent more than one field.
- b) Changes in committee membership may be made after filing the degree plan if approved by the program Director of Graduate Studies and the collegiate unit. Changes must also be archived by the Graduate School.

II. Final Examination:

- a) For students submitting a Plan A thesis, the final examination must contain an oral component. Programs may also require a written examination.
- b) For students submitting a Plan B project, the final examination may be oral, written, or both
- c) Students must provide the reviewers with a copy of the Plan A thesis or project submitted in lieu of a thesis at least 14 days before the scheduled date of the final examination.
- d) Every member of the final examination committee must certify on the master's thesis reviewer's report that the thesis or project submitted in lieu of a thesis is ready for defense before the final examination may take place.
- e) A majority vote of an examining committee is required to pass the master's final examination.
- f) If revisions are required as a condition of passing, the advisor/s must certify that the revisions have been completed before the degree is awarded.
- g) If the student fails the final examination, he or she may retake the examination only if all committee members, or all committee members save one approve this option.
- h) The second attempt to pass the master's final examination must use the same committee members as the first examination.
- i) If the committee does not approve a retake, or if the student fails the second attempt, the student will be terminated from the program.

III. Thesis Submission: Master's Thesis/Professional Engineering Design Project

All students who complete a Plan A Thesis or Professional Engineering Design Project must file a digital copy of the thesis with the University in accordance with University standards. Students may request that the University embargo publication of the thesis for a limited period of time.

IV. Plan C Master's Degrees

Plan C master's degrees typically do not include standard final examination formats like those for Plan A and Plan B master's degrees. However, students must satisfy all of the course and other requirements specified by the program in order to complete the degree.

V. Minimum GPA required for graduation

Students must have a 2.800 minimum GPA for courses included on the degree plan at the time of graduation in order for the degree to be awarded.

REASON FOR POLICY

Establishes uniform standards for the master's final examination; ensures timely submission of copies of the thesis for University archives, maintains Regent's policy on public dissemination of University-sponsored research.

PROCEDURES

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

Preparing the Thesis/Design Project: Formatting ▪ Submitting ▪ Publishing

Degree Completion Procedures

Master's Graduation Packet Request

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Belinda Cheung	612-625-6977	cheun002@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

RESPONSIBILITIES

Graduate School

- Maintain an archival record of changes in committee membership made after the filing the degree plan if approved by the program DGS and collegiate unit
- Provide guidelines for formatting and submitting the thesis dissertation, to include not only current instructions for electronic formatting and filing but also guidelines governing the use of already published material in the thesis. Guidelines should take account of possible copyright issues.
- Provide guidelines governing the submission of jointly authored theses. Guidelines should take account of possible copyright issues and contain specific provisions for intercollegiate joint theses if these are permitted.

Collegiate Units

- Approve and record the specific procedures used by programs for administering and grading the master's final examination.
- Maintain and publish and additional collegiate-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of the thesis (e.g., language of the thesis).
- Maintain and publish and additional collegiate-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of jointly authored theses.

Departments/Programs

- Publish the specific procedures used for administering and grading the master's final examination and identify whether candidates for each degree and track offered must take written examinations, oral examinations, or both.
- Provide program-specific information in the graduate handbook

- Maintain and publish and additional program-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of the thesis (e.g., language of the thesis).
- Maintain and publish and additional program-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of jointly authored theses.

APPENDICES

Required Conditions and Best Practices for Remote Participation in Graduate Examinations

FAQ

1. What if the student needs to change committee members after filing the degree plan?

Changes in committee membership may be made after filing the degree plan; such changes require program and collegiate approval and must be recorded by the collegiate unit and archived by the Graduate School.

2. Why does my final oral examination committee have to include an outside committee member? Who qualifies as an outside member?

An outside committee member is required to both ensure fairness and due process for the student in the examination and to ensure that the student is examined across the breadth of knowledge represented by his or her field of study.

3. What is considered to be a majority vote of an examining committee on the master's final examination?

[Link to info on what is considered majority with different committee configurations.](#)

4. Can a committee member abstain from voting in the master's final examination?

No, all committee members are required to vote in the master's final examination.

5. An emergency situation has arisen with one of my committee members. Am I allowed to identify a substitute?

Yes. Substitutions for an oral examination that are necessitated by emergency situations should be approved in advance. In such cases, the adviser should consult with the Graduate School staff before the start of the examination.

6. Can a collegiate unit delegate responsibility for approving changes in committee membership to the program level?

No. It is the responsibility of the collegiate unit and the program to ensure that all replacement members are eligible to serve on the master's final examination committee.

7. Is there a requirement that a minimum amount of time elapse between a first attempt at the master's final examination and an approved retake?

There is no University requirement that a minimum amount of time elapse between the first and second attempts at the master's final examination. However, collegiate units and/or programs may set a minimum time requirement.

8. Who is responsible for communicating with a student who has failed the first attempt at the master’s final examination and what information should be communicated?

The committee chair must communicate with the student in writing to inform him or her of the reasons the first attempt at the examination was graded “fail” and what the student will be expected to do in order to pass a retake.

9. When should students request an embargo on the publication of the thesis?

The request for an embargo must be made prior to the completion of the degree requirements.

RELATED INFORMATION

Administrative Policy: Appointments to Graduate Examination Committees: Twin Cities, Rochester

Administrative Policy: Master’s Degree: Performance Standards and Progress

Administrative Policy: Admission for Master’s and Doctoral Degrees

Administrative Policy: Readmission or Changes to Master’s or Doctoral Degree Objectives

COMMENT:

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that the only change from current policy is that Master’s Plan A thesis will now be filed electronically within the Digital Conservancy.

Q: Why are joint MA or Ph.D. degrees between departments not allowed?

A: This policy does not prohibit joint degree programs. If both programs agree and the Dean of Graduate Education agrees, there should be no barrier.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**20. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following new policy:

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Progress

Policy Contents

- **Policy Statement**
- **Reason for Policy**
- **Procedures**
- **Forms/Instructions**
- **Additional Contacts**
- **Definitions**
- **Responsibilities**
- **Appendices**
- **FAQ**
- **Related Information**
- **History**

Effective Date: Month, YYYY

Last Updated: Month, YYYY

Responsible University Officer:

Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost

Policy Owner: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

Policy Contact: Belinda Cheung

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for knowing all program requirements of their doctoral program when they matriculate. If program requirements change, students may elect to continue under the requirements in effect when they matriculated, provided they have remained in good standing.

The advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) for the program are jointly responsible for helping the student plan appropriately to complete the requirements in a timely fashion. The DGS is also responsible for ensuring that the student receives training appropriate to the discipline in the responsible conduct of research and ethical teaching and scholarship.

Programs and collegiate units may have additional and/or more stringent requirements.

IV. Pre-Matriculation Requirements for Programs

Programs must, before students begin their first term of study:

- Provide each student a current graduate program handbook, specifying the program's requirements and policies governing successful degree completion
- Assign each student a temporary advisor.

V. Progress Review

a) **Annual Review** Programs must review the progress of each doctoral student at least once a year and must provide the results to the student in writing.

b) **Degree Plan** Doctoral students must file a degree plan and must declare a minor prior to taking the preliminary oral exam. It is recommended that the degree plan be filed, at minimum, three months prior to the exam date.

VI. Performance Standards

a) **Continuous Enrollment** Students are required to enroll every semester (fall and spring) from the time of matriculation until degree completion.

b) **Time Limit for Earning the Doctoral Degree** All requirements for the doctoral degree must be completed and the degree awarded within eight calendar years after initial enrollment to the graduate program or within a more restrictive time frame specified by the program.

Students who are unable to complete the degree within the most restrictive time limits described above may petition the program and collegiate unit for one extension of up to 24

months. Student must submit the petition for an extension at least six months prior to the end of the time limit.

- If a petition is approved, the student is notified in writing of the expectations for progress and completion of the degree.
- If the petition is denied, the student is notified in writing that he or she will be terminated from doctoral candidacy and from the graduate program upon expiration of the most restrictive time limit.

Under extraordinary circumstances, students may file a second petition for an additional 24 month extension after the first 24 months have expired; however such petitions after the initial extension must be reviewed and approved by the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education.

Students who have been terminated under such circumstances may apply for readmission to the program; however, readmission is not guaranteed.

c) **Minimum Grade Requirements** To remain in good academic standing students should meet the minimum GPA requirement specified by the graduate program or 3.000 (on a 4.000 scale), whichever is higher. Students who have filed a doctoral degree plan should maintain a 3.000 GPA for courses included on the degree plan. Students who have not yet filed a degree plan must maintain an overall GPA of 3.000. Graduate programs may require a higher GPA for individual major fields and may apply the requirement to the overall GPA instead of only to degree plan coursework. Students who fall below the program's minimum GPA requirement may be terminated from the program.

d) **S/N grades for courses** A minimum of 2/3 of the course credits included on a degree plan must be taken A/F.

VII. Doctoral Preliminary Written and Oral Examinations

- a) Each doctoral candidate must pass a written examination in the major field.
 - i) Programs will grade the doctoral preliminary written examination either pass, pass with reservations, or fail in accordance with University standards.
 - ii) For students who pass with reservations, conditions to be met must be given in writing to the student within ten working days, including a timeline for completion.
- b) Every doctoral student must pass a preliminary oral examination in the major field. The preliminary oral examination is conducted as a closed examination, attended by only the student and the examining committee.
 - i) The oral examination may not take place before examiners have certified that the candidate received a passing grade on the preliminary written examination and that any reservations have been removed.
 - ii) Programs will grade the doctoral preliminary oral examination either pass, pass with reservations, or fail in accordance with University standards.
 - iii) If a student fails the exam, he or she may retake the examination once. All committee members, or all committee members save one must approve this option.
 - iv) The second attempt to pass the preliminary oral examination must use the same committee members.
 - v) If the committee does not approve a retake, or if the student fails the second attempt, the student will be terminated from the program.
- c) The doctoral preliminary oral committee must consist of at least four members, including the advisor/s. All members of the committee and the candidate must participate in the

preliminary oral examination. Committee members and/or the student may participate remotely as long as all conditions for remote participation in the examination are met.

- i) At least three members must be from the student's major field.
- ii) At least one member must represent a field outside the major, preferably from a different budgetary unit than that housing the student's major field program
- iii) If the student has declared a minor, at least one member must represent the minor field.
- iv) Members cannot represent more than one field.

Exceptions

Programs with a distinctive student population or approved joint-degree programs may request a program-wide exception to the eight-year time limit for earning the doctoral degree.

REASON FOR POLICY

- Ensures clear communication to the student about degree requirements and the student's progress; sets minimum standards for satisfactory progress in doctoral programs; establishes clear standards and procedures for administering and grading doctoral written and oral preliminary examinations. Ensures fair, correct procedures at doctoral preliminary examinations.
- Assists student and advisor in planning for timely completion of program requirements, provides timely evaluations to students as they proceed through program; alerts student and advisors to problems, and provide opportunity to develop best approach for addressing those problems; creates clear record in cases where program decides to terminate student.

PROCEDURES

There are no procedures associated with this policy.

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

Doctoral degree plan

Request for extension to the maximum time limit for earning the doctoral degree

Request for program-wide exception to the maximum time limit for earning the master's and /or doctoral degree

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Belinda Cheung	612-625-6977	cheun002@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

Good standing/good academic standing

Students remain in good standing if they: (a) make timely progress towards degree completion as required by the program and by this policy; (b) maintain a GPA at or above the minimum set by the program and by this policy; and (c) pass all appropriate examinations within the time frame specified by the program.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Graduate School

- Maintain an archival record of changes in committee membership made after the filing the degree plan if approved by the program DGS and collegiate unit
- Approve and record the specific procedures used by programs for administering and grading the doctoral preliminary and final examination.

Collegiate Units

Departments/Programs

- Clearly state the program requirements for maintaining good standing in the Graduate Program Handbook, even if they are identical to the requirements in this policy

Students

- Must obtain the approvals required on the degree plan before it is filed with the collegiate unit.
- Must obtain the approval of their advisor/s and program DGS and submit their request for an extension of the maximum time limit for earning the doctoral degree by the deadline set by the college, which will normally be several months before the time limit expires

APPENDICES

Graduate Program Student Handbook: Guidelines

Annual Graduate Student Reviews: Guidelines

Doctoral degree plan

Required Conditions and Best Practices for Remote Participation in Graduate Examinations

Standards for the result of 'pass' on doctoral preliminary written and oral examinations

Documentation responsibilities associated with this policy

FAQ

11. The policy states that students must file a degree plan with their collegiate unit. What is the difference between the degree plan and the official degree program form?

The degree plan replaces what was previously referred to as the official degree program form.

12. When should students file the doctoral degree plan?

A degree plan must be on file in the collegiate unit at least three months before taking their preliminary oral examination; however students may file the degree plan at any time.

13. Some unexpected circumstances have arisen and I need to request an extension to the maximum time limit for earning the doctoral degree; however, it is less than six months prior to the end of my time limit. Can I still be granted an extension?

14. If a student is terminated from a program for exceeding the time limit on earning the degree, can the student apply for readmission to the program?

Yes. However, readmission is not guaranteed and the faculty in the major field may set any readmission conditions on the student's resumption of work toward the degree, such as registering for additional coursework, completing the degree within a specified time period, or other appropriate terms.

Because the student was terminated for exceeding the time limit, the student must also request and be approved for an extension to the time limit in order to be readmitted.

15. Why does my preliminary oral examination committee have to include an outside committee member? Who qualifies as an outside member?

An outside committee member is required to both ensure fairness and due process for the student in the examination and to ensure that the student is examined across the breadth of knowledge represented by his or her field of study.

16. Do the student and the committee members have to be physically present on campus for the preliminary oral examination?

No, neither the student nor the committee members are required to be physically present on campus for the preliminary oral examination as long as all of the conditions required for remote participation in the exam are met.

17. FAQ on extraordinary circumstances that warrant replacement committee members for retake.

18. Can a committee member abstain from voting in the doctoral preliminary oral examination?

No, all committee members are required to vote in the examination.

19. Is there a requirement that a minimum amount of time elapse between a first attempt at the doctoral preliminary oral examination and an approved retake?

There is no University requirement that a minimum amount of time elapse between the first and second attempts at the doctoral preliminary oral examination. However, collegiate units and/or programs may set a minimum time requirement.

20. How many S/N courses can I include on my degree plan?

A maximum of 1/3 of the courses on the degree plan may be S/N.

21. Some of the courses required for my degree program are only offered S/N. Will these count toward the S/N limit on the degree plan?

No. Courses offered only S/N (that is, without the option of A/F grades) will not be counted as part of the student's permissible number of S/N registrations.

22. I was given "S" grades for course credits transferred from an international institution where an equivalent A/F grade could not be determined. Do these credits count toward the S/N limit?

No, the transferred credits will be treated similar to credits for courses only offered S/N, and will not be counted toward the S/N limit on the degree plan.

23. I left the University after completing my master's degree and want to come back to complete my doctoral degree in the same program. How will my time to degree be counted?

A student who completes a master's degree in a program, leaves the University, and returns to enroll for the doctoral degree in the same program will have their time to degree clock stopped after the master's and restarted upon enrollment in the doctoral program.

24. Can a student pursue two Ph.D. degrees at the same time?

Students are not permitted to earn two Ph.D. degrees at the same time in two fields using the same program of study and dissertation. Although students are generally discouraged from doing so, special circumstances may warrant taking a second Ph.D. degree at a later date, but only when a completely separate program and dissertation are involved.

25. I have been admitted to take graduate courses as a Graduate Professional Development (GPD) student. Do I have to register every term?

Yes. Students admitted for Graduate Professional Development status must adhere to the same registration requirements as other admitted students and must register in the fall and spring semesters. Registration during the summer is not required.

26. My graduate program has admitted a student for Graduate Professional Development. How long may the GPD student remain in the program?

If the student is a domestic student, the graduate program determines how long the student may continue to take courses as a GPD student. Ideally, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student should be clearly stated in the letter of admission.

If the student is an international student, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student is in part determined by federal visa regulations and SEVIS requirements. International students admitted to GPD are given an I-20 for one year and must be admitted to a degree program if they wish to continue their advanced education at the University after the one-year period.

27. A student admitted for Graduate Professional Development in my program is performing poorly and the program would like to terminate the student at the end of the semester. Can the program do this?

Yes. The program can terminate the student if clear expectations were set at the time of admission and the consequences of the student's failure to meet them were also clearly stated. If this information was not included in the letter of admission, the program should communicate performance expectations to the student in writing, along with the consequences for failure to meet them, before making a decision to terminate the student.

RELATED INFORMATION

Appointments to Graduate Examination Committees: Twin Cities, Rochester

Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students

COMMENT:

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that this policy continues current practices and policies. However, there are a few doctoral programs that were not under the Graduate School that will now be covered by this policy. The old policy on time limits stated five years from the date of the preliminary oral examination. This provided an incentive to move the date of the preliminary oral examination, and it also did not correlate with how time to degree is calculated by every other national and international agency that assesses graduate education. The new eight-year limit is standard across research institutions in the United States. Again, program-wide exemptions are possible. Finally, there is now a minimum GPA requirement for doctoral students. There was no standard before, while all other institutions do have one. After consultation with collegiate units, the requirement was set to have the student be in good standing. This allows advisors and directors of graduate studies to track, document, and advise students who fall below this level. However, it was not made an exit requirement, which permits the department to decide if a student can proceed to candidacy.

Q: If a student in a doctoral program is not required to have a minor, then why does 5B state that a minor must be declared prior to taking the preliminary oral examination?

A: This is poor wording and will be changed before being finalized.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**21. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Doctoral Degree: Completion
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following new policy:

**ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY
Doctoral Degree: Completion**

Policy Contents

- **Policy Statement**
- **Reason for Policy**
- **Procedures**
- **Forms/Instructions**
- **Additional Contacts**
- **Definitions**
- **Responsibilities**
- **Appendices**
- **FAQ**
- **Related Information**
- **History**

Effective Date: Month, YYYY

Last Updated: Month, YYYY

Responsible University Officer:

Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost

Policy Owner: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

Policy Contact: Belinda Cheung

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for meeting all requirements for completing the doctoral degree, including dissertation defense and submission.

VIII. The Doctoral Final Oral Examination

- a) The doctoral final oral committee must consist of at least four members, including the advisor/s. All members of the committee and the candidate must participate in the final oral examination. Committee members and/or the student may participate remotely as long as all conditions for remote participation in the examination are met.
 - (1) At least three members must be from the student's major field.
 - (2) At least one member must represent a field outside the major, preferably from a different budgetary unit than that housing the student's major field program.
 - (3) If the student has declared a minor, at least one member must represent the minor field.
 - (4) Members cannot represent more than one field
- b) Thesis Reviewers for final oral examination:
 - i) A minimum of 2 major field reviewers and 1 minor/supporting program reviewer are required. In the case of multiple minors, there must be a reviewer for each minor.
 - ii) Advisor(s) must serve as reviewers.
 - iii) Students must provide reviewers with a copy of the dissertation at least 14 days before the scheduled date of the doctoral final oral examination.
 - iv) Every designated reviewer on the doctoral dissertation reviewer's report must certify that the dissertation is ready for defense before the doctoral final oral examination may take place.
- c) The doctoral final oral examination must include:
 - i) A public presentation of the candidate's dissertation to the doctoral final oral examination committee and the invited scholarly community.
 - ii) A closed session (open only to the doctoral final oral examination committee and the candidate) immediately following the public presentation.
- d) To be recommended for the award of the doctoral degree, all committee members, or all committee members save one must certify that the student has passed the doctoral final oral examination.
- e) Students are not allowed to retake the final oral examination.

IX. Submission of final copy of the doctoral dissertation

All students who complete a doctoral dissertation must file a digital copy of the dissertation with the University in accordance with University standards. Students may request that the University embargo publication of the dissertation for a limited period of time.

X. Reactivation in order to graduate

A student who is currently inactive may be reactivated for the purpose of awarding the degree if the student has completed all requirements for the degree, including submission of the approved copy of the doctoral dissertation.

REASON FOR POLICY

Establishes uniform standards for the doctoral final oral examination; ensure timely submission of copies of the dissertation for University archives, maintain Regent's policy on public dissemination of University-sponsored research.

PROCEDURES

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

Preparing the Doctoral Dissertation: Formatting ▪ Submitting ▪ Publishing
Graduation Instructions/Checklist for Doctoral Students

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Belinda Cheung	612-625-6077	cheun002@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

RESPONSIBILITIES

Graduate School

- Maintain an archival record of changes in committee membership made after the filing the degree plan if approved by the program DGS and collegiate unit
- Provide guidelines for formatting and submitting the dissertation, to include not only current instructions for electronic formatting and filing but also guidelines governing the use of already published material in the dissertation. Guidelines should take account of possible copyright issues.
- Provide guidelines governing the submission of jointly authored dissertations. Guidelines should take account of possible copyright issues and contain specific provisions for intercollegiate joint dissertations if these are permitted.

Collegiate Units

- Maintain and publish and additional collegiate-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of the dissertation (e.g., language of the dissertation).
- Maintain and publish and additional collegiate-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of jointly authored dissertations.

Programs

- Provide program-specific information in the graduate handbook

- Maintain and publish and additional program-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of the dissertation (e.g., language of the dissertation).
- Maintain and publish and additional program-level standards or guidelines for the formatting and submission of jointly authored dissertations.

APPENDICES

Standards for the result of 'pass' on doctoral final written and oral examinations

Required Conditions and Best Practices for Remote Participation in Graduate Examinations

FAQ

10. What if the student needs to change the dissertation abstract or title after filing the dissertation proposal?

Changes in title and abstract may be made after filing the doctoral dissertation proposal and require program and collegiate approval; such changes must be recorded by the collegiate unit.

11. What if a student needs to change committee members after filing the dissertation proposal?

Changes in committee membership may be made after filing the doctoral dissertation proposal and require program and collegiate approval; such changes must be recorded by the collegiate unit and archived by the Graduate School.

12. Can a collegiate unit delegate responsibility for approving changes in committee membership to the program level?

No. It is the responsibility of the collegiate unit and the program to ensure that all replacement members are eligible to serve on the master's final examination committee.

13. If a student's status is "inactive," can s/he file the approved copy of the dissertation?

Yes.

14. Can a faculty member representing a formal track within a graduate program satisfy the requirement that one committee member represent a field outside of the student's major field?

Yes.

15. Do the student and the committee members have to be physically present on campus for the preliminary oral examination?

No, neither the student nor the committee members are required to be physically present on campus for the preliminary oral examination as long as all of the conditions required for remote participation in the exam are met.

16. Can a committee member abstain from voting in the doctoral final oral examination?

No, all committee members are required to vote in the final examination.

17. When should students request an embargo on the publication of the thesis?

The request for an embargo must be made prior to the completion of the degree requirements.

RELATED INFORMATION

Administrative Policy: Appointments to Graduate Examination Committees: Twin Cities, Rochester

Administrative Policy: *Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Degree Progress*

Administrative Policy: *Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees*

Administrative Policy: *Readmission or Changes to Master's or Doctoral Degree Objectives*

COMMENT:

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that this policy has the same basic processes and requirements as the Master's policy, including filing a digital copy of the dissertation.

Q: Under 8(b)(i), thesis reviewers, wording is included regarding a program reviewer from the minor or supporting program. Should this language be removed as with the previous policy?

A: Yes.

Q: The policy uses the terms 'field,' 'program,' and 'budgetary unit' in different points in the document. Can these terms be defined?

A: 'Budgetary unit' is a predefined entity that exists in the University accounting system. The faculty member's budgetary unit is defined for each faculty member in terms of which department holds the faculty member's appointment. This was included simply as an example since there are many interdisciplinary programs that have a tendency to use their own faculty as outside committee members. The policy is expressing a preference for someone from a different unit because functions of the outside committee member are to ensure fairness for the student and intellectual breadth.

A senator urged that these terms be clarified or changed as there are many people within a budgetary unit but who serve as members of many graduate committees outside of their department. There are only so many graduate faculty at the University and many times students are stuck trying to find someone from outside the department who will serve.

Professor Krevans noted that the policy states that an outside faculty member is preferred, but it does not state that it is required. She suggested that an FAQ could also be developed.

Another senator noted that using the budgetary unit as the distinction for the outside person is ridiculous and inadequate for many programs at the University that already cross departments. Interdisciplinary should be encouraged and new rules should not be established based on budgetary lines that inadequately describe these programs. He suggested that the policy should just stipulate someone outside the program.

Q: There are times when a student must seek a committee member from outside campus. How is this situation covered by the policy?

A: This situation is already covered by the Policy on Appointments to Examination Committees.

Q: For the doctoral final examination committee, the policy stipulates four members for the oral examination and three members for the thesis examination committee. Why does the number required decrease between these two steps?

A: The oral examination committee stipulates a minimum of four members, but a student could request additional faculty. For the thesis examination committee, there is a short review period so her committee felt that only three faculty should be required to read the document and serve on the committee. By increasing the number of faculty who must complete this process, it could jeopardize the student's ability to schedule their examination.

Q: The policy does not allow a student to retake a final oral examination. What are the procedures to handle a situation where a student would fail their final oral examination?

A: There are instructions for the chair of the examination committee about situations when it would be appropriate to recess the examination.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

22. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

23. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

24. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 5, 2012

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 4

The fourth meeting of the Student Senate for 2011-12 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, April 5, 2012, at 11:30 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 26 student members. Chair Joshua Preston presided.

1. P&A SENATE UPDATE

For Information:

The P&A Senate represents the academic professional and administrators (P&A) class of 5400 non-unionized employees at the University. This class was started in 1980 and the governance body was formed as an advisory committee to the President. P&A have skills between civil service employees and faculty in jobs such as teachers, researchers, advisors, counselors, and extension service workers. Most people stay in this classification or move to a faculty position. P&A employee have some of the same benefits as faculty, but work on annually renewable contracts.

The P&A Senate meets from 9:30-11:30 am the first Friday of most months and meetings are open to the public. The P&A Senate consists of 40 representatives from campus units and colleges and has four subcommittees: Benefits and Compensation, Communications, Outreach, and Professional Development and Recognition.

Discussion:

Ann Hagen, Vice Chair of the P&A Senate, said that the PULSE survey was discussed at the March P&A Senate meeting. They also heard from P&A serving on three Senate committees. As these committee members are not members of the P&A Senate, their reporting at the meeting creates an important connection.

Tomorrow's meeting includes the announcement of the Outstanding Unit Award winner, a discussion with Provost Hanson, elections, and a discussion of a resolution on the proposed marriage amendment.

2. CIVIL SERVICE SENATE UPDATE

For Information:

The Civil Service Senate represents the approximately 4300 employees in the civil service category which includes accountants, scientists, executive assistants, and administrators. The classification was started in 1945 with the passage of the civil service rules by the Regents. In 1984 PELRA was passed which allowed for the creation of a bargaining unit separate from civil service employees.

The Civil Service Senate is composed of 50 elected members. The body elects a vice chair each year, with the vice chair becoming next year's chair. The Civil Service Senate meets twice per year.

Discussion:

Donald Cavalier, Chair of the Civil Service Senate, said that at the March 22 Civil Service Consultative Committee (CSCC) meeting all subcommittees reported and discussion topics included job classification study concerns such as difficulty transferring from civil service to P&A positions, TEXT-U changes, seniority in units, and the legislative request. President Kaler also attended the meeting and discussed the three-period proposal.

Next year's leadership will be Amy Olson as chair and Tom Sondreal as chair-elect.

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Joshua Preston, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, reported that he is reaching out to senators to create a cohesive and organized group to work on behalf of all students.

Additionally, several topics have been brought to SSCC for discussion. The first was gender neutral housing options at each of the campuses. SSCC learned that this option does not currently exist except at Rochester. SSCC then spent time determining the practicality of instituting it in current residence hall facilities. Morris stated that they would be willing to implement a change in fall of 2014 but wanted to know if the Twin Cities would be making a change as well. The Twin Cities has moved to gender neutral floors but would likely not move to gender neutral housing without widespread support and demand from residence hall students.

Another SSCC topic was problems with advising at each of the campuses, although the issue arose from a Duluth task force study. The task force report found that students have many concerns about the way that it is being done and faculty do not have any accountability to provide timely and accurate advising. A resolution on this issue will be brought to the May 3 Student Senate meeting,

Joshua Preston then spoke about the Minnesota Higher Education Office Student Advisory Council (SAC). He serves as the representative from the University of Minnesota, along with one other student from each of the other higher education organizations in the state. He was recently informed that the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition (MSLC) has spoken with legislatures and had a bill introduced at the capital to add an MSLC representative to SAC, despite the fact that MSLC has never attended a SAC meeting, which is open to the public, or spoken with any SAC members about the proposal. Representatives from these other higher education organizations are now upset that the University of Minnesota wants an additional seat. He is working with SAC, MSLC, and the Higher Education Office on how to resolve this issue.

He has also been contacted by MPIRG regarding a proposal to excuse students from classes on election day. This proposal has been approved from the Student Affairs Committee and will be presented to SSCC later this month. Dean Schwartz from the Humphrey School of Public Affairs has spoken about students receiving a half day of excused absences to vote, while Professor Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), has written that he would be against presenting this proposal to the Faculty Senate and urged other options be considered. Joshua Preston hopes to have a resolution on this issue at the May Student Senate meeting as well.

Lastly, new senators are being elected soon and should be encouraged to attend the May 3 meeting.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Duluth – Harrison Defries stated that Bulldog Lobby Day was last Thursday and 35 students attended. UMDSA also approved the charter for the MSLC with a few amendments and is looking at the new student health care plan. Elections are this Friday.

Crookston – no report

Morris – Evan Vogel reported that MCSA is holding elections through Friday and a student conference was held last weekend.

Rochester – Courtnee Heyduk noted that RSA has elections at the end of the month and a new president will be elected. Communication of future activities and volunteering experiences are still being developed.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – Nicole Conti reported that Brittany Edwards was elected president but the vice president for finance position still needs to be filled. GAPSA will be updating its website this summer and will be working with the Humphrey School on a program analysis to restructure the organization for efficiency. Lastly, all grant funds were awarded this year.

Minnesota Student Association - Sophie Wallerstedt said that Taylor Williams and Jillian Koski were elected president and vice president for next year, along with senators. A meeting is being held tomorrow to determine the Improve U grant recipient and the world fair cultural fest is later this month.

5. MINUTES FOR MARCH 1, 2012 Action

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL:

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/120301stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

6. STUDENT SENATE STIPENDS Action

FOR INFORMATION:

The Student Consultative Committee, less its stipend-receiving members, shall review the performance of duties of all stipend-receiving members and vote on the approval, reduction, or withholding of the portion of their stipends allocated for spring semester. A two-thirds affirmative vote by the Student Consultative Committee is required for modification of stipend disbursement.

The Student Consultative Committee recommendation shall be presented to the Student Senate for approval at or before the Student Senate's last regular meeting of spring semester. Stipend receiving persons have a right to answer questions about or speak regarding the Student Consultative Committee's findings at this meeting if they so chose. A two-thirds vote of the Student Senate is required to modify the Student Consultative Committee recommendation.

MOTION:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee has reviewed the performance of the following stipend-receiving students: Adam Matula, former SSCC/Student Senate Chair; Joshua Preston, former SSCC/Student Senate Vice Chair and current SSCC/Student Senate Chair; and the unnamed SSCC/Student Senate Vice Chair. The recommendation from the committee is that:

- Adam Matula receive \$166.00 of the \$166.00 spring semester portion of his stipend (pro-rated for two months of service)
- Joshua Preston receive \$372.00 spring semester stipend (pro-rated for two months serving as vice chair and four months serving as chair)
- To be named Vice Chair receive \$60 spring semester stipend (pro-rated for three months of service)

COMMENT:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee approved these amounts with no discussion.

**BECKY MOHN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE STIPEND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**7. STUDENT LOBBYING
Discussion**

Evan Vogel, a member of the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition (MSLC), said that the organization is trying to represent student interests on issues such as voter identification and a University bonding bill. They also helped plan Support the U Day at the capital and worked to have student meet with legislators and be comfortable with the political process. MSLC is now meeting to discuss next steps as well as its involvement with the Minnesota Higher Education Office Student Advisory Council (SAC).

A senator said that 70 Twin Cities students attended the event this year, which is a great step forward from last year. She thanked University Relations for their help with the event and scheduling meetings with legislators. Addresses made by Governor Dayton, President Kaler, Lizzy Shay, and Joshua Preston also created excitement in the crowd.

Another senator attended lobby day and stated that he had a wonderful discussion with a legislator about the bonding bill. He also spoke about the success with the Folwell Hall renovation. As he was also a MnSCU student, he was able to speak about what differentiates the University from MnSCU, what draws students, and how the University generates professionals for the workforce. However he was concerned about the event and felt that more students would attend if it was a sanctioned event for missing classes, such as athletic events.

Joshua Preston stated that excused absences were discussed prior to the event and he believed that there was a commitment to provide them for Twin Cities students. However, upon registering, students were provided with a letter stating that excused absences were not being provided for attending Support the U Day.

A senator asked that work begin now to make attendance at the event an excused absence at next year's event.

Another senator stated that while other coordinate campuses are provided excused absences, Rochester was not and therefore only three students were able to attend.

8. NEXT STEPS FOR THE STUDENT SENATE MARRIAGE RESOLUTION

Discussion

Joshua Preston, Chair of the Student Senate, said that after the Student Senate took action in March, the Faculty Consultative Committee, Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee, and the Social Concerns Committee decided to draft a similar resolution to apply to faculty, staff, and students at the University. This resolution will be on the May 3 University Senate agenda for action. He is asking for the same support from students when this item is presented as was given at the Student Senate meeting, including large groups of students at each ITV site.

A senator asked that everyone's vote be respected and that no booing take place if a different opinion is expressed.

Another senator suggested that a secret ballot could be used on May 3 to receive an accurate vote on the issue from each senator as someone may choose to vote differently if it is public.

A senator noted that this is a personal issue for many people and therefore pressure should not be created to vote in a certain way by criticizing people who vote for or against the proposal.

Another senator stated that he voted against the resolution at the last meeting because he did not agree with the third clause although he was supportive of the general issue. He asked that students from both sides be invited to attend the May 3 meeting.

A senator then replied that no senator should have to explain his or her vote during or after a meeting.

Joshua Preston agreed that a respectful debate is the goal for May 3 and diversity is encouraged. However, when he asked some students to attend who would have spoken against the motion, they declined the invitation.

9. STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Action

Sharon Dzik, Director of the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity (OSCAI), presented the revisions to the Student Conduct Code (Code). She said that her office as well as others who work with the Code had been considering amendments for the past few years. A small working group was then assembled to discuss changes and propose the version here today.

She then walked the senators through the changes which include rearranged sections at the beginning, additional definitions, an explanation of how sanctions are imposed, online classes included in subdivision 2, emergency medical staff added to subdivision 4, ordinances added to subdivision 20, and new subdivisions 7, 8, and 12.

Q: Some professional programs also have a professional code of ethics. How does this Code work with those in the professional programs?

A: Professional school students are governed both by this Code and by their professional code of ethics, which usually relates to standards needed in the profession. Subdivision 19 of the Code is Violation of University Rules and is where violations of other codes would be incorporated.

Q: What constitutes a violation of the Code?

A: The University needs to have a substantial interest in a matter for it to be charged under the Code. The intent is not to reach into students' private lives for every offense, but to be able to charge students for incidents that can affect other students. There is discretion in what offenses are charged by OSCAI. The Code is also meant to provide due process protection for students while allowing the University to assess sanctions that are educational and developmental when needed.

Q: The peaceful demonstrations in California have been labeled as disorderly conduct by some which has led to actions taken by officers against the protesters. Could the same actions be taken here and would students be charged under the Code?

A: The University works closely with its law enforcement officials to avoid issues such as those in California. Also, the Code has many built-in checks and balances to protect students. When a report is generated, it is sent to OSCAI for review. Her staff then decide if there is enough to charge a student. If a case is not dismissed at this point, the student is sent an email asking he or she to meet with someone in OSCAI to discuss the report. OSCAI then meets with all pertinent parties to determine the facts of the case. OSCAI then makes an informal determination on the Code items alleged to have been violated and proposes a sanction. The student can then choose to accept the sanction or request a hearing. If a hearing is requested, most cases on the Twin Cities campus are heard by the Student Behavior Committee which assembles a panel of faculty, staff, and students to listen to both sides and make an impartial determination on the Code items charged as well as any sanction. Again, if the student is still not happy with the outcome, he or she can request an appeal hearing.

Q: How is medical amnesty covered in the Code?

A: It is not directly addressed but OSCAI would not want to charge one student for making a call to save the life of another student. These students should instead be commended for doing the right thing. However, OSCAI will still try to meet with the student who made the call to talk about the situation and determine ways to avoid it in the future.

Q: How does the University's constitutional autonomy affect the Code?

A: According to the Code, students who are cited by the police may still be adjudicated under the Code.

Q: How does this Code interface with other University codes that cover employees?

A: Each incident is worked out on a case-by-case basis when the student is also an employee. OSCAI works with many different offices to make sure that cases are being heard in the correct venue.

A senator was concerned about the broad definitions in the Code and how case management seems to rely on who is in OSCAI instead of being strictly dictated by policy.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

10. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

11. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

Rick Di Fabio

Dr. Rick Di Fabio was faculty in the University of Minnesota's Physical Therapy Program for over 20 years and distinguished himself as a wonderful teacher and researcher. His passing on Friday December 9, 2011 leaves a hole in our PT family as well as his own family. Based on his wishes we will celebrate his life and accomplishments here and mourn the loss of a good friend.

Dr. Di Fabio passed away Friday Dec 9th after a prolonged and private battle with a progressive illness. "Dr. D" was on faculty at the University of Minnesota's Program in Physical Therapy for over 20 years, having previously served as Director of the Physical Therapy Department at the University of Wisconsin Hospital in Madison. He was a graduate of the State University of New York (SUNY) – Syracuse, with a Bachelor's degree in Physical Therapy and received his Master's Degree in Health Education from SUNY –Cortland. He completed his PhD at the University of Iowa in 1982.

"Dr. D" was Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy from 1999-2001, and past member of the Editorial Board of the Physical Therapy Journal. He was known nationally and internationally for his research and scholarship. He was a recipient of numerous prestigious awards: The American Physical Therapy Association's (APTA) "Golden Pen Award" for scholarly writing, Excellence in Research Awards from the Geriatric and Orthopaedic Sections of the APTA, and the "Fesler-Lampert Chair in Aging Studies" at the University of Minnesota from 2002-2003. His research was funded by the Minnesota Medical Foundation, NIDRR, and NIH.

Dr. Di Fabio's legacy includes over 65 scientific manuscripts, 5 PhD graduates in Rehabilitation Science, numerous Master's students, and mentorship of 100s of professional physical therapy students. He had recently authored a text "Essentials of Rehabilitation Research" which is in final editing with FA Davis.

He was passionate about research and his research students, but even more so about his family, wife Betsy and two daughters, Danielle and Diana. He and his family have generously decided the proceeds from his textbook and all memorial donations will support development of a physical therapy student scholarship in his name. His spirit will live on in his scientific contributions, the numerous students he has mentored, and through his family.

Harry S. Friedman

Dr. Harry Samuel Friedman, age 96, passed away on April 5, 2012. Dr. Friedman attended the University of Minnesota undergraduate and medical schools. He completed an internship in Minot, ND.

When Hitler invaded Europe, he volunteered for the Army and served five years, reaching the rank of Captain. He was assigned to the 24th Evacuation Hospital during the war, participated in the Normandy Invasion on D-Day, and he was one of the first Americans to enter the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. After the war, he trained in ophthalmology in Boston and Cincinnati, and he completed a residency in Ophthalmology at Hine's V.A. Hospital in Chicago in 1948. He then returned to Minneapolis where he established an ophthalmology practice in the Doctor's Building. He was one of the founders of Mount Sinai Hospital, where he later served as President of the Medical Staff. He served as President of the Minneapolis Eye Society, President of the Minnesota Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, Vice-President of the Vision

Foundation at the University of Minnesota, Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology at the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Friedman established the Friedman Resident Research Award in Ophthalmology in 1992 to recognize the second year resident who presents the outstanding research project of the year. In 2002 he was awarded the George T. Tani, MD Humanitarian Award by the Minnesota Academy of Ophthalmology. He was a lifelong fan and season ticket holder for the University of Minnesota basketball and football teams.

Donald Hunninghake

The Medical School lost a beloved colleague and friend when Dr. Donald Hunninghake, Emeritus Professor of Medicine, passed away on his birthday, February 2, 2012. He was 78.

Donald received his medical degree from the University of Kansas in 1959 and moved on to specialize in Internal Medicine, Clinical Pharmacology, and Preventative Cardiology before joining the University of Minnesota Medical School. He was a professor of medicine and pharmacology and retired in 2004 as the Director of the Heart Disease Prevention Clinic. Upon retirement, Donald became an Emeritus Professor of Cardiovascular Medicine and Pharmacology and joined Astra Zeneca Pharmaceuticals as a Senior Field Medical Director and internal consultant until December 2011. Dr. Hunninghake was instrumental in the development of clinical trials for life-saving lipid drugs that touched many lives worldwide and he will forever be remembered as a legend in the field of Lipidology, and a fantastic mentor, colleague, and friend.

Dr. Hunninghake is survived by his wife of 27 years, Sherrie; his children: daughter Dr. Denise Hunninghake and husband Dr. Joseph Lasnier, daughter Diane Hunninghake, and son Donald Jr. and wife Lisa Hunninghake; four grandchildren: Matthew and Michael Lasnier, and Natalie and Jack Hunninghake; stepchildren Loren Ryter (Deirdre DelaCruz) and Zenna Caiden; and grandson Kai Benjamin Ryter. He will be tremendously missed as a devoted family man and loving Papa to his grandchildren who adored him.

David A. Storvick

David A. Storvick, emeritus professor of mathematics, died in Minneapolis on November 5, 2011, at the age of 82.

David was a distinguished member of the School of Mathematics for 47 years, and a recognized researcher in the fields of complex analysis and mathematical physics. He received a Ph.D. degree in mathematics from the University of Michigan in 1956 as a student of Arthur Lohwater. After two years at Iowa State University, David joined the CLA Mathematics Department in 1957 as an assistant professor. He spent the rest of his career at Minnesota, being promoted to associate professor in 1961 and to full professor in 1966. He enjoyed three sabbaticals, during which he visited the University of Wisconsin, Imperial College, London, and the University of York. During his career, he published 39 papers in top level research journals, many of them written with another former colleague, Robert Cameron. David's research accomplishments led to many invitations to speak at conferences throughout the world.

David was particularly active in service to the Department and University. He served as Associate Head of the School of Mathematics from 1964-70. He served as Associate Dean of the Institute of Technology from 1979-83 and then again from 1993-94. He served as Acting Director of the Gray Fresh Water Biological Institute from 1989-90. He also served several

terms in the Faculty Senate and on University Senate committees. After many years of dedicated teaching, research, and service, David retired in 2004.

David is survived by his wife, Sylvia, children, Kristin Storvick, Jonathan (Sarah) Storvick and Sarah (Timothy) Kunau, and grandchildren, Peter, Erika and Jeremy Storvick, and Rebecca, Christian and David Kunau. He will be missed by his colleagues, family and friends here in Minnesota and throughout the world.