

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 19, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Carol Chomsky, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, Richard Ziegler
- Absent: Linda Bearinger, Colin Campbell, Nancy Ehlke, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, George Sheets
- Guests: Professor Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (incoming Committee member); Professor Nita Krevans (Chair, Graduate Education Policy Review Committee); Provost Karen Hanson; Vice President Scott Studham
- Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents)

[In these minutes: (1) policy on University-Administered Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships (the committee suggested a few amendments); (2) election of the committee's vice chair for 2012-13 (Professor Michael Hancher); (3) Minnesota constitutional amendment concerning marriage on the University Senate docket (discussion); (4) discussion with Provost Hanson; (5) ad hoc committee on college constitutions (membership and charge); (6) discussion with Vice President Studham; (7) approval of the Faculty Senate docket]

1. Policy on University-Administered Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Professor Krevans back to continue the discussion about the draft fellowships policy. [The draft before the Committee read as follows (between the * * *)]:

* * *

POLICY STATEMENT

This policy ensures consistent benefits for recipients of fellowships and traineeships administered by the University of Minnesota (University) and aids the University in recruiting high-quality graduate students.

Graduate student fellowships and traineeships are awarded on the basis of academic merit and provide actively enrolled students with the opportunity to pursue study, training and research without service obligations.

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

I. Eligibility for Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships

University of Minnesota (University) graduate students are eligible to hold a University-administered fellowship or traineeship if they are admitted to a University graduate program and are registered for the minimum number of credits required by the fellowship or traineeship for a particular term.

II. Fellowship and Traineeship Stipends and Benefits

- a) Ranges for graduate fellowship and traineeship stipends are established each fiscal year by the awarding collegiate unit, department, academic program, and/or external agency. These ranges must follow the rules and guidelines set by the sponsoring entity.
- b) Benefits are stipulated by the awarding collegiate unit, department, academic program, and/or external agency. These benefits must follow the rules and guidelines set by the sponsoring entity.
- c) Graduate students who hold fellowships or traineeships that are administered by the University and provide a stipend that is at least equal to a 25% graduate assistantship are eligible for resident tuition rates. Eligibility for resident tuition rates also extends to members of the student's immediate family.
- d) Unless specifically provided for by the fellowship or traineeship, fellows and trainees are responsible for payment of charges not covered by the tuition benefit (e.g., lab, installment, or late registration fees) that are assessed and charged to the student's account.
- e) Fellowships and traineeships may be supplemented by other University-administered support (e.g., a graduate assistantship) unless restricted by the terms of the fellowship or traineeship.
- f) University colleges and departments, or other University units as appropriate, must publicize the fellowships the unit offers on a regular basis.
- g) All students who meet the eligibility criteria for a fellowship or traineeship must be considered for the fellowship or traineeship in accordance with a specified review and selection process.

III. General Requirements for Fellowship and Traineeship Recipients

- a) Recipients of graduate student fellowships and traineeships must meet registration requirements and other terms and conditions of their award.
- b) Fellows or trainees who terminate their graduate program before the end of a semester in which they hold a fellowship or traineeship may be required to re-pay all or a portion of the stipend for that term.

IV. Exceptions

This policy does not apply to first professional degrees. (The first professional degrees are the J.D., M.D., Pharm.D., D.V.M., D.D.S, and L.L.M. degrees.)

* * *

Professor Cramer asked about section II(g): What if a student is only eligible for a fellowship if he or she has been nominated by a faculty member in the department? That is fine, Professor Krevans said. They will have an FAQ that answers such questions. They have a fellowship committee in her department that is accountable for nominations. The policy does not require public forums or procedures, just accountability.

Professor Chomsky said that the policy says "All students who meet the eligibility criteria for a fellowship or traineeship must be considered for the fellowship or traineeship in accordance with a specified review and selection *process*," but it doesn't say anything about the standards that will be used. The policy does say they are awarded "on the basis of academic merit." Is that sufficient? In some cases, the decision is not based solely on academic merit, Professor Krevans said (e.g., one must be of Norwegian descent, or must have completed a class that taught a particular laboratory method). So it could be academic merit AND something else, Professor Chomsky concluded. They intended to take care of that in the policy statement, Professor Krevans said, which indicates there may be conditions that attach to an award (III(g)). Professor Chomsky suggested the point could be clarified.

Professor Krevans said she hoped that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy would find it acceptable to bring this revised version of the policy to the Faculty Consultative Committee, given the press of time. Professor Brothen said doing so was fine.

Committee members discussed the language about criteria and eligibility. Professor Krevans explained that the policy is drafted as it is because her committee had been informed that in some programs there has been little or no transparency in why some students receive an award and others do not. The policy is intended to put constraints on arbitrariness in departments and ensure accountability in the process. It seeks to ensure that the criteria and selection process are fair and consistent, Professor Chomsky said; does it say how departments should do that? It does not, Professor Krevans said; they did not propose to micromanage how departments implement the policy. Professor Cramer said he would like to avoid new requirements for departments that have been handling fellowships competently.

The University administers a large number of funds that are pass-through, Professor Krevans reported, and the policy covers those funds. But the policy does not cover, for example, NSF funds that are going directly to a student. The policy is a reminder to departments and colleges that they have to follow the rules of the sponsoring agency. Second, it also requires consistency: If a department has three fellowships to award, it cannot give one with fringe benefits to one student and another without fringe benefits to another student unless there is a good reason. Third, the policy creates accountability, so that award decisions emerge from a fair selection process. Professor Chomsky suggested including those three comments somewhere in the policy because they will help with interpreting the policy in the future.

Professor Bitterman asked what "publicize" means (II(f)). If a fellowship is available federally, must a department do more? It should make note of the awards in its handbook, Professor Cramer suggested. Some handbooks have links to a program-specific page, Professor Krevans noted, and there was general agreement that such a scheme would be the best approach to ensure that lists of available opportunities are as up-to-date as possible.

Professor Cramer thanked Professor Krevans for bringing the policy to the Committee.

2. Election of the Committee Vice Chair for 2012-13

The Committee unanimously elected Professor Hancher as vice chair for 2012-13.

3. Marriage Amendment Resolution on the University Senate Docket

Professor Cramer said that a question has been raised about the appropriateness of the proposal, on the University Senate docket, to oppose the marriage amendment to the Minnesota constitution that will be on the ballot in November. Some have asked about jurisdiction. He asked Committee members for comment.

[The language as finally amended for the docket read as follows:

MOTION:

The University Senate of the University of Minnesota, composed of faculty, staff, and student representatives, opposes the amendment to the State of Minnesota's constitution to "provide that only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Minnesota" (footnote 1). The adoption of such a provision would directly discriminate against (and thus perpetuate the stigmatization of) persons who identify with the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender community, and by enshrining that deprivation of rights in the state constitution would make it unacceptably difficult for those individuals to achieve the same rights, freedoms, respect, legal protections, and legal opportunities as heterosexual couples. The amendment is detrimental to the interests of the University of Minnesota and its faculty, staff, and students. The Senate therefore:

1. Encourages all members of the University community to take a stance in opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment.
2. Encourages all members of the University community to engage in "teach in" activities to educate one another and the public on this issue.
3. Urges Minnesota citizens to reject deliberate and overt discrimination by voting against the proposed constitutional amendment.

COMMENT:

On November 6, 2012, the people of Minnesota will be voting on whether or not to amend the state constitution to "provide that only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Minnesota" (footnote 1). The Student Senate has already passed a similar resolution on the proposed amendment and Committees of the University Senate (Equity, Access, and Diversity, Social Concerns, and Senate Consultative) endorse its position and move the above resolution for the University Senate.

In making their decision, the committees considered:

- (1) The mission statement of the University of Minnesota, which states that in the exchange of ideas it is imperative to "provide an atmosphere of mutual respect, free from racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and intolerance" (footnote 2); and,
- (2) The Board of Regents policy, which states, "[a]s a community of faculty, staff, and students engaged in research, scholarship, artistic activity, teaching and learning, or the activities that support them, the University seeks to foster an environment that is diverse, humane, and

hospitable. . . . The University shall establish and nurture an environment for faculty, staff, students, and visitors that actively acknowledges and values equity and diversity and is free from racism, sexism, ageism, homophobia, and other forms of prejudice, intolerance, or harassment." (footnote 3).

1 <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/mngov/constitutionalamendments.aspx>

2 <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/history-mission/index.html>

3 http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/administrative/Equity_Diversity_EO_AA.html

Professor Chomsky said there is a University connection: it relates to recruiting faculty, staff, and students, and to equal treatment for our colleagues. She noted that the Senate previously voted down a proposal to create a new benefit for faculty and staff because it would provide lower benefits to same-sex couples as the result of the tax implications of marriage. The inequality affects the University directly. The resolution asks people to vote against the constitutional amendment, Professor Cramer said, and he is comfortable with that statement. This is an academic community and the façade of Northrop Auditorium says that the University is "dedicated to . . . the search for truth." Failing to comment on so fundamental an attack on human rights would be failing to live up to that responsibility.

Professor Bitterman asked if the concern is about the bounds. Is it on the docket because this is a human rights issue? Since the University Senate cannot get involved in every public policy issue that comes along. That is an important point, Professor Cramer said, although he indicated a reluctance to subscribe to the idea that the University Senate cannot discuss important matters in the absence of a clear and discernible University impact. Professor McCulloch said she believed the good point had been made at this Committee in the past: The constitutional amendment is about employment discrimination, so the University needs to be involved. That is the clearest connection to the University, Professor Cramer agreed: The University wants to be able to attract the best faculty and staff.

Additional discussion was deferred to the subsequent meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee.

4. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Cramer welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting and asked her to touch on topics she believes of importance.

Provost Hanson said there are a number of matters in train.

-- She met with the P&A Senate and discussed the change to the teaching-awards policy (that would make faculty-like P&A staff who deliver instruction also eligible for the awards). The P&A Senate made it clear that P&A staff do not want a separate award and wish to be eligible for the existing award. Provost Hanson said there remains a question about whether the criteria will disadvantage some teachers, but she is inclined to approve the change and see how it goes for a while.

-- Provost Hanson thanked the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) for initiating the process that led to the gender-equity faculty salary study and said she will move forward on identifying mechanisms to deal with inequities. She has received email traffic expressing other concerns about how salaries are set, and the implementation of the recommendations of the gender-equity study should lead to greater transparency in

salary-setting as a whole, which will be beneficial to the institution. She will be talking to the deans in May about getting the appropriate committees set up; she hopes to stick to the timeline recommended by the WFC. She said she is also glad to learn that there is a survey on climate being conducted because there may be issues that need to be addressed in that realm as well.

-- She offers her full support for a deeper look at how the policy on sabbaticals and leaves is working. There are likely steps that can be taken to improve its effectiveness.

-- This Committee has proposed an initiative to gather college constitutions and draft procedures for writing, amending, and adopting them; she believes the result of the initiative will be quite useful. After two and one-half months on the job, she is increasingly interested in addressing friction between the administration and the collegiate units.

-- She is thinking hard about interdisciplinary issues at the University. She is becoming familiar with the studies and the problems identified and there has to be a way to deal with the problems without requiring an administrative burden in each case and to make it easier for faculty and students to pursue interdisciplinary teaching.

-- Activities surrounding the proposal for a third semester continue, Provost Hanson said. The administration is gathering data on how the colleges see the advantages and pitfalls of the proposal.

-- Professors Cramer and Jacobs brought to her attention a matter she had not been aware of previously: There had been an effort to develop a policy on software intellectual property. She is trying to find out where that effort stands and learn what progress has been made.

-- She is aware of the continuing concern about the metrics used to evaluate graduate programs and financing, and around fellowships, and at this point she suspects that the process next year will be similar to the one used this year, but the issues that have been raised are under review. Provost Hanson said she would also like to see initiatives from the Graduate School about graduate-program review more generally, and undergraduate reviews. She said she would like to see a unified approach that would create less of a burden while also addressing the University's interest in quality improvements, accreditation requirements, and the public interest. She is just beginning to work with Vice Provosts McMaster and Schroeder to develop a way to work together on ways that departments can take steps toward program improvement. She said she would welcome any ideas or worries from Committee members.

Professor McCulloch recalled that early in her term as department head, she was told it was time for a review. From her perspective, seeing how the undergraduate and graduate programs work together was helpful, and the results of the review still guide the department, six years after the review. The review helped everyone reach an understanding of what the department is doing. She said she has always wondered why the University reviews only one part of a program when the goal is an integrated department. The review was a great deal of work but it helped a great deal as well.

Provost Hanson agreed that external reviews can take a lot of work and sometimes the results are not taken seriously (if the external reviewers are perceived as advocating for an accrediting agency in the field of the department being reviewed, for example). The University needs to find the right balance between external reviews and continuous self-reflection.

Professor Cramer said he strongly supports resuming reviews and continued discussion of metrics. It would be valuable, he said, to have programs say what they should be judged on, and while the University would not use those standards alone, external reviews could help. Then the results of the internal discussions and external reviews should be used to hold programs accountable. There may be some University-wide metrics that can be used, but not very many, and there will not be buy-in to reviews until units believe that the University understands them. Provost Hanson said she also believed it would be a salutary exercise for units to think about what they are doing—and they will get more bang for the buck if they do so in an integrated fashion.

Professor Ropers-Huilman expressed hope that Provost Hanson would think about metrics and fair rewards; often there are external reviews but nothing happens. So there is no incentive for ongoing, less formal, but substantive work. She said she hoped these elements could be tied together. Provost Hanson agreed and said the process should be fleshed out—and should sell itself as a way for departments to improve their own enterprise. In addition, the campus is up for an accreditation review in 2015, and the accreditors will look at the extent to which the institution monitors its undergraduate and graduate programs and its majors. There are a number of steps the administration can take, in terms of providing data to units, that can be of help.

Discussion turned massive open online courses (MOOCs). Provost Hanson suggested that the University should respond to what is happening by doing what it can to enhance opportunities for students. The University will continue to offer large lecture courses, they can be made available to others, and the institution can use the best available lecture on a subject in a course. The idea, Professor Brothen said, is that this is an idea that is gaining momentum and universities need to consider how to operate in that space. Provost Hanson agreed and said the University needs a thorough review of its strategy for online courses. Professor Brothen encouraged her to look carefully at the report on e-education provided by the outside consultants. Provost Hanson said she has done so and there are many questions on how to come up with a model for the University that intersects with questions about course articulation, the coherence of the educational experience, residency requirements, and so on. Professor Brothen said he has heard stories of University of Minnesota students in residence halls taking courses from other institutions. The University needs to understand its own policy on transfer of credit, the Provost replied.

In addition, Professor Boyle said, the University must sell to potential students what is available. Online universities have excellent marketing departments, so even if the University of Minnesota has the best course available, students might not choose it without good marketing.

Professor Hayes said that when she reads about free online courses taken by thousands of students, the question she has is about grading. How do they grade the work on the budget of a department? The courses are spun off into a separate company, Professor Cramer said, and the grading is all computer scoring. That works for some courses but not for others, Professor Hayes commented. She recalled that when Governor Pawlenty was in office, he said the state could save a lot of money on bricks and mortar by offering more online education. There was a hearing with representatives of the University, MnSCU, and Capella, and the three institutions delivered pretty much the same message: Online education is not cheaper and there is more overhead but it is more convenient for students and saves on transportation—but the institutions must charge more for it. The importance of online education is that it provides access to people who can't come to campus. With respect to people in other states, Professor Hayes said, she offers a blended course that typically includes 5-6 students taking it online. She

assigns students an in-class presentation and asked the online students when they could come to class for the presentation; one of them responded that he could not because he lived in Connecticut! Arranging for that student to complete the course required a lot more work. She said that next year she will indicate that unless a student can drive in for the final presentation, it won't work for him or her to enroll in the course. She said the University needs to think carefully about students outside Minnesota when it comes to e-learning.

Provost Hanson observed that it is not the University's goal to become the biggest online provider. But it should think about where its natural constituencies are, and they might include its own resident students in order help them solve conflicts. Access is also important, but nothing should get the University out of kilter with respect to its mission: This is a research university.

Professor Brothen commented that on the question of whether a student should take a course at the University or at a community college, it is preferable that the student take the course at the University.

Professor Cramer thanked Provost Hanson for joining the meeting.

5. ad hoc Committee on College Constitutions

Professor Cramer noted that Provost Hanson had mentioned the effort to assemble college constitutions. Professors Chomsky and Karen Miksch (from the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure) have agreed to be part of an ad hoc committee to assemble the constitutions and to develop review procedures and procedures by which they are prepared and adopted or amended. The goal is to have a website with all of the college constitutions.

In response to a question from Professor Ericksen, Professor Cramer said the website could include the constitutions for the coordinate campuses. To whom would such constitutions "belong," Provost Hanson or Senior Vice President Jones?

It was agreed that Professors Hancher, Ehlke, and Luepker would also be asked to serve on the ad hoc committee. [Prior to the meeting, all had agreed to do so.]

6. Discussion with Vice President Studham

Professor Cramer next welcomed Vice President Scott Studham, the University's new Chief Information Officer (CIO). He noted that the Committee had prepared a Brobdingnagian list of questions and provided them to Mr. Studham, but they will not be taken up today because of a lack of time (Mr. Studham had a previously open schedule shortened by a meeting with the President). So Professor Cramer asked Mr. Studham what the biggest challenge he would like to take on in the near future is and what it is that people are most excited about, even if it isn't the biggest challenge.

Mr. Studham began by observing that he has only been at the University for 60 days. He gave the Committee a brief overview of his background (CIO at University of Tennessee and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Chief Technology Officer for the National Center for Computational Sciences, and six times in his career he was the program manager or architect for one of the world's top ten supercomputers). He came to the University of Minnesota because President Kaler said he wanted to do things differently and

at a faster pace, an approach he has not experienced elsewhere. The leadership of the University drew him here.

His first 30 days here he spent with the technology people in the colleges, Mr. Studham said. There are about 1200 people who work in information technology, of whom about 400 report to his office. He said he has no interest in consolidating IT staff from academic functions into the central Office of Information Technology. The next 30 days he focused on the central Office of Information Technology organization, without intending any change during that period. It became obvious, however, that there were changes needed in the central organization because many people felt stifled and unengaged, even though they wanted to do the right things. So instead of listening for 30 days, he began to reshape the organization, and is about half done. One of the first changes he made was to eliminate the long message on the University telephone system that preceded the ability to leave a voice-mail message. (He reported that there are about 5.4 million voice-mail messages per year at the University, so if no one ever hit the # key to skip the message, it consumed approximately 22,000 hours. Committee members gave Mr. Studham a round of applause for that change.)

After the first 60 days, his plan is to spend about a month with the colleges, deans, and senate and consultative groups, Mr. Studham said, in order to start understanding the University. After that, he can talk about what he can do, what should change, and can talk about task forces and the like.

The challenge in defining their vision in academic technologies is to dream big while staying grounded in the here-and-now. First, there are two dimensions of information technology, gadgets and tools, and the University will always have new technology because it is here to educate. Second, what will the educational process in higher education look like 20 years from now? What does the University aspire to and what technology will open doors will be a fundamental conversation.

On the higher-education landscape, what is the biggest challenge looming that he must deal with, Professor Cramer asked? What the educational process will look like in 20 years, Mr. Studham replied, and how to adjust for it. How to differentiate the University of Minnesota from an online diploma mill as a value proposition for the state.

That is an undergraduate-centric and taxpayer-focused approach, which is fine, Professor Cramer commented; but what about graduate and professional education and the research mission? Mr. Studham said he was not as concerned that higher education would lose its brand in graduate study; that is something the University does well and it will not see online institutions do as well. What information-technology tools should one have eyes on for graduate education and research, Professor Cramer asked?

Professor Kohlstedt recalled that Professor Hancher had provided a question about the digital humanities (when the Committee's questions were being assembled). That is a field that seems to be growing fast, and Professor Hancher [not present at this meeting] inquired if Mr. Studham had any experience with the digital humanities, which will need to be facilitated by his office because many people in the humanities do not have the skill set required. The digital humanities will require leadership from his office, she observed.

Mr. Studham agreed and said he would make it broader. Academic technology will be solved by the faculty. The question is how to get them to think about new ways to teach without requiring that they be experts in technology. This is something he's thinking about. There are about 1200 people who "do"

technology at the University, many of whom do various bits and pieces, but few of whom do academic technology consulting. The University has 72 help desks, but he's not talking about help with passwords and the like; he said he would like to see a divestment in help desks and an investment in local academic technologists. There can be central help desks and local academic technology consultants. He said he is aware that this is a sensitive issue because being an academic technology consultant requires a different skill set from someone working at a help desk.

Professor Pacala agreed about the importance of the conversation about what higher education will be like in 20 years. The Committee has had a conversation with President Kaler about this topic; how will the conversation be accomplished, when, and who will be involved? It should be soon. It is a priority, Mr. Studham promised. There is talk about this in the Medical School as well, Professor Pacala related. Mr. Studham said he would put energy into the question in the next two or three months; with many leadership changes at the University, there are new opportunities emerging.

Apropos of the future of higher education, Professor Brothen noted the prediction of Professor Thrun of Stanford [who has 160,000 students in his online class on Artificial Intelligence] that in 50 years there will only be ten universities delivering courses. Professor Brothen expressed doubt because higher education is not known for quick change. Mr. Studham observed that the largest implementation of a student system in the world is at the University of Pakistan. A model like that would not work in the U.S. because of the structure of federal funding of grants and the importance of regional expertise and so on. Universities require highly intelligent people. Politics in Washington D.C. will not allow a total divestment in any state. The U.S. will not go from thousands of colleges and universities to ten, he said, although there may be shrinkage in the ranks of the smaller private institutions.

Professor Cramer said that no one wants to define simply graduating as "winning," and there should be content to the degree, but students increasingly seem just to want a degree. Professor Brothen said this had been discussed at the "intellectual future" meeting, where it was said that companies don't know what a baccalaureate degree is [i.e., what it is supposed to do for them], so why not just issue certificates—or why wouldn't students go somewhere that issues certificates that indicate they have learned specific skills that companies understand and want in their workers? That assumes that online education is or could be the equivalent of a University of Minnesota degree, but they are not the same. Professor Hayes said that there is a question of cost and management and the development of management models that allow online instruction with little additional cost.

Mr. Studham asked why not think about online enhancers because there are subjects that can be taught online. But he also recalled overhearing a conversation among students when he visited the Morris campus and pointed out that those kinds of exchanges cannot occur in online education. Professor Hayes commented that her field, mechanical engineering, would have a difficult time delivering many of its courses online.

Professor Bitterman commented that said that the graphic user interface revolutionized computing, making it accessible to everyone in the academy (and the wider community). Online learning is still GUI-based. To have a tactile component (simulations, etc.) would be a great advance. Who is leading what is next after the GUI? Mr. Studham said there are a couple of good schools and the larger game community. There are research spaces, but the Googles and gamers are investing multi-millions of dollars in research. How does the University jump on that, Professor Bitterman asked? Does it want to? Does, for example, the Medical School and School of Nursing, which need to develop and assess skills in

iterative decision making and hands-on procedures, need to move forward in those areas? Mr. Studham said there is value in computer-based teaching/simulation labs but it is very expensive and difficult. The University would need to seek a grant to explore it and people to do so. This is an area in its infancy.

Professor Cramer said he liked the idea of having more academic technology consulting. His advice, based on his experience, is that offering courses for faculty to take is not likely to be as successful as having someone offer to come to a department or class and help the faculty member with it. There are people in the Center for Teaching and Learning who will do that, Professor Ropers-Huilman said. Or provide consultants to talk with groups of faculty member to tell them about the possibilities and to engender conversation among the faculty, Professor Chomsky suggested. Or, Mr. Studham said, they could go to students who have taken a course and ask him or her to work with his office and the faculty member—that might be better than having someone from his office observe a class for three weeks and then offer advice.

Professor Jacobs asked Mr. Studham what he envisioned the role of the Digital Media Center to be. They and people from his office would coach technologists for the faculty—they would be the trainers and would explore what is next.

Professor Cramer said that he has had some successes and some failures using technology in his teaching, but if there is no easy mechanism for faculty members to share their experiences with each other, no one learns from that experience. He suggested that Mr. Studham's office might solicit information from faculty members about what they have done. Mr. Studham told the Committee about the Gartner "Hype Cycle" as a way of assessing new technologies and reported that he has asked the collegiate IT directors to help develop something similar for the University to assist in communicating what technologies are being used in the classroom. They have just started, but hope to produce a one-sheet communication about all pieces of technology and who is using them.

Professor Cramer thanked Mr. Studham for joining the meeting.

7. Faculty Senate Docket

Professor Cramer noted that the proposal for entrepreneurial leaves will be on the agenda of the next Committee meeting, so while it is proposed for the May 3 Faculty Senate docket, the Committee can withdraw it if there are problems.

The Committee agreed that the Committee on Educational Policy should take up an unsolicited proposal to amend the excused-absences policy to permit an excused absence on Election Day for students who need the time to vote.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the docket.

Professor Cramer adjourned the meeting at 2:50.

-- Gary Engstrand