

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, September 6, 2012  
1:00 – 3:00  
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, George Sheets

Absent: Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Ned Patterson, Richard Ziegler

Guests: none

Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents)

[In these minutes: (1) debriefing on the retreat; (2) definition of plagiarism; (3) reviews of committees; (4) college restrictions on Faculty Senate membership; (5) all-faculty email message; (6) questions for Senior Vice President Jones; (7) visit to the Morris campus]

**1. Debriefing on the Retreat**

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:00 and reviewed some of the major issues and action items that came out of the retreat on August 29:

-- She sent a message to the chair of the Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) asking that SCIT have a discussion about administrative attention across different offices to issues associated with digital pedagogy.

-- She advised Vice Provost Carney that the Committee had acted on behalf of the Faculty Senate to approve the revised policy on teaching awards.

-- Professor Cramer has agreed to chair an ad hoc committee to review the consultation that should take place when changes to Regents' policies are proposed.

-- She has appointed a subcommittee to advise the Committee on the process for decanal reviews; the members are Professors Pacala (chair), Lanyon, May, and Ropers-Huilman. Professor Pacala said he saw three major issues: the instrument used, the process of faculty participation in the reviews, and the outcome (how to share information on what happened).

-- The Committee discussed the comments that Vice President Pfutzenreuter had made at the retreat and the need to promote the values of the University, to understand why the state appears to have devalued the

---

\* 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.

University in recent years, and to help identify the multiple solutions that may exist to respond to the financial challenges that have arisen.

## **2. Definition of Plagiarism**

Professor McCormick reported that for some time Vice Provost Rinehart in Student Affairs and Dr. Dzik, the Director of the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, have been working on revisions to the Student Conduct Code (a Board of Regents' policy). They had consulted with Senate committees (the Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity, the Campus Committee on Student Behavior, and the Senate Committee on Student Affairs). Last spring they decided to add a definition of plagiarism to the Code; they brought the proposed wording to those committees for review. In May, however, some other units became aware of the proposal and felt it needed now (with the definition added) to come to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). The faculty in Writing Studies, for example, expressed concern about the proposed wording because it did not appear to take into account the educational process involved in teaching students about plagiarism. Mr. Rinehart and the Board of Regents' office agreed to slow down the process in order to allow additional consultation. SCEP had an informal summer meeting with a number of individuals, including those who are involved in conflict resolution and judicial proceedings. As a result of that discussion, Dr. Dzik reworked the definition and received additional feedback.

SCEP yesterday approved unanimously the revised definition that Dr. Dzik prepared, with the understanding that last-minute tweaking might still occur. Professor McCormick noted that while Mr. Rinehart and the Board of Regents did not need SCEP endorsement, they wished to have it because the definition is one that everyone will have to live with. Dr. Dzik did an impressive job of marshaling responses and information.

Committee members discussed the proposed definition and offered a number of editorial and substantive comments. Professor McCormick said he would convey them to Dr. Dzik. The final definition to be included in the Code (following a number of additional emails and discussion following this meeting) read as follows (between the \* \* \*):

\* \* \*

Plagiarism shall mean representing the words, creative work, or ideas of another person as one's own without providing proper documentation of source. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Copying information word for word from a source without using quotation marks and giving proper acknowledgement by way of footnote, endnote, or in-text citation;
- Representing the words, ideas, or data of another person as one's own without providing proper attribution to the author through quotation, reference, in-text citation, or footnote;
- Producing, without proper attribution, any form of work originated by another person, such as a musical phrase, a proof, a speech, an image, experimental data, laboratory report, graphic design or computer code;
- Paraphrasing, without sufficient acknowledgment, ideas taken from another person that the reader might reasonably mistake as the author's.
- Borrowing various words, ideas, phrases, or data from original sources and blending them with one's own without acknowledging the sources.

It is the responsibility of all students to understand the standards and methods of proper attribution and to clarify with each instructor the standards, expectations, and reference techniques appropriate to the subject area and class requirements, including group work and internet use. Students are encouraged to seek out information about these methods from instructors and other resources and to apply this information in all submissions of academic work.\*

[\*Footnote: Portions used with permission from New York Institute of Technology and University of Texas, San Antonio.]

\* \* \*

### **3. Reviews of Committees**

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the Committee on Committees, beginning last year, is charged to review the structure, charge, and membership of Senate committees with the goal of ascertaining whether they are functioning well. It has proposed to review a few committees each year. She and Professor Hancher met with the chair of the Committee on Committees to discuss the amount of time the reviews take, in light of the general institutional efforts to be more efficient, and suggested that the review schedule could be condensed and how a possible abbreviation of the process might work. They agree, however, that the Committee on Committees has a good process to provide a failsafe for committees that may not be working well.

Professor Lanyon suggested that after this year's reviews, the Committee on Committees develop a template so that if they do not see a problem with a particular committee, the review can be completed very quickly.

### **4. College Restrictions on Membership in the Faculty Senate**

Professor Kohlstedt reported that a constitutional question has arisen: The Medical School has voted to require that two-thirds of the faculty members elected to the Faculty Senate from the Medical School must have tenured or tenure-track positions, must have been at the University for at least three years, and must have an appointment of at least 67% time. The two-thirds requirement does not reflect the distribution of tenured/tenure-track and contract faculty (primarily Clinical Scholars) in the Medical School. The question is whether the Medical School decision is in line with the language of the Senate constitution.

Professor Bitterman explained that many of the non-tenure track faculty are doctors whose main activity is the practice of medicine. These individuals often have limited activity in teaching or research. The idea behind the Medical School decision is that since these individuals are often only engaged in scholarship in the biomedical sciences to a limited extent, if they were to be represented in proportion to their numbers in the Faculty Senate, there could be a skewing of views presented in Senate discussions toward issues related to clinical practice and away from two of the core missions of the Medical School—teaching and research. Professor Pacala concurred and said that the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Medical School debated where to set the number and landed on two-thirds in order to ensure that the primary academic faculty voice will be heard in a properly proportionate way. Professor Bitterman added that many of the non-tenure track faculty are hired to meet patient demand and not to meet curricular or

research needs—although many will wind up engaged in these more traditional activities. They believe the non-tenure track faculty should have a meaningful voice; the question is the nature of their appointment and the extent of the representation.

Professor Luepker said that there is a larger problem, as the number of non-tenured faculty increases. It was noted, however, that except for the Medical School and perhaps one or two other colleges in the Academic Health Center, the number of non-tenure-track positions in other colleges has not increased.

Professor Hancher inquired about the next step. Professor Cramer asked if anything is broken. The assumption is that the non-tenure-track faculty do not share the values of the regular faculty; is that correct or do they deserve the same representation as everyone else? Professor Pacala said that question was discussed at length and there was a wide range of opinion; the voice that won the day was that the tenured and tenure-track faculty could become a minority and that would raise concerns about the views that could be expressed in the Faculty Senate. It relates to expertise, Professor Bitterman said: These are experts at practicing medicine and preceptorial teaching, but they are not necessarily experts on research and curriculum development, and thus on two major areas that require academic advice and decisions. They don't feel anything is broken right now, Professor Pacala concluded, but made the decision in anticipation of potential problems. Professor Sheets characterized the action as an attempt to address a problem that may occur in the future, as the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Medical School become a smaller proportion of the total faculty. He said it made sense for the Medical School faculty to think ahead and take steps.

Professor Luepker asked who has jurisdiction over the question, and said he understood why Professor Kohlstedt asked the ad hoc college constitutions committee to look at the issue. (Professor Luepker chairs the ad hoc committee.) The Committee debated jurisdiction and next step and whether it would be necessary to amend the Senate constitution if the Medical School requirement were to be permissible. It was agreed the Committee would await comments from the ad hoc college constitutions committee.

## **5. All-Faculty Email from Academic Freedom and Tenure**

Professor Kohlstedt reported that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure had forwarded to her a memo about academic freedom that it wished sent to all faculty. (In her capacity as chair of this Committee, she must give final approval to any message to be sent to all faculty members.) She and Professor Hancher reviewed it and concluded that it would be more appropriate to send a message that highlighted policies important to the faculty, including Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

The Committee agreed that Professor Kohlstedt should send a more general letter.

## **6. Questions for Senior Vice President Jones**

As it had done for the visitors at the Committee retreat in August, the Committee compiled a short set of questions to forward to Senior Vice President Jones in advance of his meeting with the Committee later in the month.

## **7. Visit to the Morris Campus**

Professor Kohlstedt reported that she and Professors Lanyon, McCormick, and Patterson had visited the Morris campus in late August. Professor Ratliff-Crain, who served as host on the Morris campus, said that the annual visit by Committee members helps the faculty at Morris reflect on being part of a larger university system and how the Morris campus relates to that system. He added that he has noticed the lack of representation of faculty at Crookston and Duluth (because those faculty voted in favor of collective bargaining), so that the Morris faculty are alone among the coordinate campus faculty members who participate in Senate governance.

Professor Kohlstedt commented that Morris is an impressive campus that is working toward energy self-sufficiency, that has close relationships with the community, and that has a liberal arts faculty very committed to research and teaching. The Institute for Advanced Studies has done positive work with the Morris faculty. She said that the Committee should remind its Twin Cities colleagues to add Morris colleagues to colloquium mailing lists and to draw on Morris faculty colleagues for disciplinary activities. Professor McCormick said, apropos of the last point, that the University needs easier web connections for seminars and meetings.

Professor Lanyon said that after the trip to Morris he looked at a number of campus websites and wondered about time to promotion for associate professors. Professor Ratliff-Crain said it is a complicated issue and suggested that, in general, time to promotion to full professor might be an issue for the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to take a look at (the committee that Professor Lanyon chairs).

Professor Kohlstedt thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota